

Software Engineering

Group coursework marking criteria

Summary

The marking scheme is designed to reflect the fact that this is a software engineering project rather than just a plain coding project. The emphasis is on the process rather than the code. So it may be the case that a well-designed and managed project that has is less strong in implementation terms scores better than a poorly designed project with a lot of fancy code. Bear in mind that a well - documented project has the potential for another development team to pick up and carry on where the original development team finished. But this is not the case for poorly documented work.

The emphasis should therefore be on demonstrating the process. This will require you to submit items as per the list of deliverables posted already on Study Direct.

Marking scheme

Marks are calculated as the sum of a base mark and a peer marking. The rules for peer marking are detailed on Study Direct. Each team will need to submit a set of peer marks for all of the members of your group. Remember that if peer marks award zero to a team member, we will interpret this as a signal that the team member contributed nothing to the project. If that is the case then we reserve the right to award the ghost member zero overall for the assignment. Remember to submit your peer marks as part of your overall submission. Failure to produce a set of peer review marks will result in you being given zero for that part of the marking scheme overall. It is perfectly acceptable to award the same peer mark to all group members.

The base mark will be assessed out of 100 for convenience, and then the base mark and the peer marks will be further combined to give an overall grade out of 100. Exactly how they will be combined will depend on the range of peer marks, but as a general guide the bias is significantly in favour of the base mark. More information on this is given on Study Direct.

Base mark criteria

Deliverable elements		Max marks available	What makes for a good score?
Planning elements	Project plan (PERT or Gantt chart or similar)	5	Clear sense of individual tasks, order of achievement and assignment of team members to tasks.
	Copies of notes, actions and minutes to evidence team organisation	5	Clear evidence of setting short term goals and achievement of goals. Evidence of distribution of tasks among team members and decision making.

Requirements documentation	Requirements document	20	Clear set of requirements covering user requirements. Adding clarity of vague requirements. Clear basis for testing subsequently.
Modelling documentation	High level designs (e.g. high level components and use cases)	10	That the design permits the achievement and delivery of the high level requirements whether expressed through textual requirements, use cases. Evidence of validation of the design using sequence diagrams, structured walkthroughs.
	Lower level designs (e.g. class and sequence diagrams)	20	
Software documentation	Electronic documentation (e.g. Javadocs or other text descriptions of classes and relevant APIs)	10	Completeness of documents covering key sections, describing key aspects of core components. Javadocs is one very good way of doing this – there are other ways also.
Code	Full code in electronic formats	15	General good coding practice and, essentially, that the code produced reflects the design documentation.
Testing documentation	Testing strategies Details and evidence of unit level testing Details and evidence of system level testing Summary of known issues or bugs Screen shots and evidence that the software is working	10	Demonstration of understanding of unit level and system level testing. Identification of edge type test cases. Linking system level tests back to requirements documentation. Linking unit tests back to design documentation.
Report	Short report describing any other issues	5	Clear summary of what works and what does not, and description of relative successes and failure of the project as a whole.

A small element (typically no more than 5-10%) of each section is reserved for those teams that deliver to an exceptional standard adding relevant value above and beyond the original specification.

Dr Kingsley Sage
Peter Overbury
Dan Arthur
Loic Verrall

February 2018

END