GEP. Self-evaluation
Assignment 1: Context and scope of the project

Preliminary feedback (advice)

- This assignment contextualises the thesis and describes its scope, so it is **extremely important** to be well coordinated with your thesis supervisor/internal examiner. The supervisor/internal examiner must agree on the scope that is proposed.

- To make this delivery it is recommended to read carefully these files:
  - Module 2.1 - Integrated project management.pdf
  - Module 2.2 - Scope.pdf
  - Módulo 2.7.2 - Gestores de referencias.pdf (it is placed in Catalan and Spanish documentation section)
  - There are other files that expand on the information, but the ones above are essential.

- Any reference to a document (article, report, etc.) must be listed in a section called References or Bibliography and cited in the document in an in-text reference.
  - You can choose between two formats for in-text references:
    - (Author's surname, year)
      - "...three approaches can be identified: A, B and C (Meyer, 2010). (when the reference is not the subject of the sentence)
      - "... in Meyer (2010), three approaches are identified: A, B and C. (when the reference is the subject of the sentence)
    - [n]
      - "...three approaches can be identified: A, B and C [3]. (when the reference is not the subject of the sentence)
      - "... in [3], three approaches are identified: A, B and C. (when the reference is the subject of the sentence)

  - The bibliography
    - If you use the format (author's surname, year) for in-text references, the bibliography tends to be ordered alphabetically by author.
    - If you use the format [n] for in-text references, the bibliography tends to be ordered numerically, according to the order in which the references appear in the text.
    - The list of references should all be in the same format. You can find examples at https://bibliotecnica.upc.edu/investigadors/referencies-bibliografiques.
    - To create, fill and maintain a reference database, **it is highly advisable** to use a reference manager. Mendeley, which is free, is one option you can use among others (see documents). With Mendeley, you can fill the database directly from an internet browser (when you have the file on the paper, the newspaper article, etc. on your screen). Once you have created the database, you can print the bibliography according to a set of predefined academic formats, of which you can choose the one you like best. See https://bibliotecnica.upc.edu/investigadors/gestors-referencies-mendeley.

- On the title page, include the title of the thesis, the description and the Thesis Management (GEP) assignment number, your name as author, the name of the thesis supervisor and/or internal examiner, the name of the Thesis Management tutor, the specialisation and the date. It is generally a good idea to include an institutional logo.

- Address the main aspects of format correctly and consistently, including the use of bullet points, text justification, line spacing, indentation, the amount of blank space after a full stop and new paragraph, etc.

- Check that the basic format of the document meets the following criteria:
  - A table of contents or index is expected.
  - The pages must be numbered.
  - The figures and/or tables must be numbered, accompanied by a caption and cited clearly in the text (e.g. Figure 5 shows...).
  - The source of images/diagrams or tables should be specified, or it should be indicated that the material is "compiled by the author".

- In an informatics engineering thesis, it is vital to assess alternatives and **justify** the decision that is taken. Even in projects in which the client specifies the design of the solution and the tools to use, a good informatics engineer must be able to assess various solutions and software and hardware alternatives and explain why one alternative is the most suitable. Any financial or technical limitations must be described to conclude that, despite the results of the comparative analysis, a different solution should be adopted due to these restrictions.

GEP. Self-evaluation

Assignment 1: Context and scope of the project
NAME:

Assessment rubric

		Succesfully attained (4)	Suitably attained (3)	Unsuitably attained (2)	Not attained (1)
Content	**Context**	The project is contextualised in an excellent way that covers: a) centring the project in the framework of the Barcelona School of Informatics (FIB) and/or the company in which it is applied, b) defining the terms and concepts of the topic that is the object of the study, c) identifying the problem to be resolved and d) specifying the stakeholders (who the product is aimed at, who will use it and who will benefit from its results).	The project is contextualised sufficiently, as the following aspects are dealt with correctly: a) centring the project in the framework of the Barcelona School of Informatics (FIB) and/or the company in which it is applied, b) defining the terms and concepts of the topic that is the object of the study, c) identifying the problem to be resolved and d) specifying the stakeholders (who the product is aimed at, who will use it and who will benefit from its results).	The project is unsatisfactorily contextualised, as some of the following aspects are lacking or could clearly be improved: a) centring the project in the framework of the Barcelona School of Informatics (FIB) and/or the company in which it is applied, b) defining the terms and concepts of the topic that is the object of the study, c) identifying the problem to be resolved and d) specifying the stakeholders (who the product is aimed at, who will use it and who will benefit from its results).	The project is not contextualised or all the following aspects could clearly be improved: a) centring the project in the framework of the Barcelona School of Informatics (FIB) and/or the company in which it is applied, b) defining the terms and concepts of the topic that is the object of the study, c) identifying the problem to be resolved and d) specifying the stakeholders (who the product is aimed at, who will use it and who will benefit from its results).
	Justification	The decision of whether it is better to take advantage of and adapt an existing solution or design a new one is justified with excellence: the system to be developed is compared with existing alternatives and its value highlighted (in the case of projects with IT solutions) or it is compared with similar and previous studies (in the case of theoretical or research projects).	The decision of whether it is better to take advantage of and adapt an existing solution or design a new one is justified reasonably well. However, the comparison of existing alternatives (in the case of projects with IT solutions) or similar and previous studies (in the case of theoretical or research projects) could be improved.	The decision of whether it is better to take advantage of and adapt an existing solution or design a new one is justified unsatisfactorily. The comparison of existing solutions (in the case of projects with IT solutions) or similar and previous studies (in the case of theoretical or research projects) could clearly be improved or does not exist.	The decision of whether it is better to take advantage of and adapt an existing solution or design a new one is not justified or is very badly justified, in terms of the comparison of existing alternatives (in the case of projects with IT solutions) or similar and previous studies (in the case of theoretical or research projects).
	Scope	The scope of the project is defined with excellence. The following aspects are included: a) definition of the general objective(s) of the project, b) specification of the sub objectives, c) identification of other functional and non-functional requirements and d) identification and definition of potential obstacles and risks.	The scope of the project is defined reasonably well. The following aspects are covered although there are some shortfalls: a) definition of the general objective(s) of the project, b) specification of the sub objectives, c) identification of other functional and non-functional requirements and d) identification and definition of potential obstacles and risks.	The scope of the project is defined unsatisfactorily. Some of the following aspects are not covered or could be improved significantly: a) definition of the general objective(s) of the project, b) specification of the sub objectives, c) identification of other functional and non-functional requirements and d) identification and definition of potential obstacles and risks.	The scope of the project is not defined or all of the following aspects could clearly be improved: a) definition of the general objective(s) of the project, b) specification of the sub objectives, c) identification of other functional and non-functional requirements and d) identification and definition of potential obstacles and risks.
	Methodology and rigour	The work methodology is identified and described excellently in relation to methodologies studied in the degree (and it is explained how it is adapted to the specific project) or the work methods are described perfectly. The monitoring tools used to show that the objectives have been met are also explained.	The work methodology is identified and described well (as well as how it is adapted to the specific project) or the work methods are described well. The monitoring tools used to show that the objectives have been met are explained. Some or all of the above aspects could be improved.	The work methodology (as well as how it is adapted to the specific project) is unsatisfactorily identified or the work methods are not sufficiently described. The monitoring tools used to show that the objectives are met are not addressed or they could clearly be improved.	Neither the work methodology nor the monitoring tools used to show that the objectives have been met are explained or they are dealt with very badly.

	References	Throughout the text, the references that justify the arguments appear in the right place and format. An ordered list of references is included at the end of the document. All the references are listed using the same style.	Throughout the text, the references that justify the arguments appear in the right place and format, except for some omissions or incorrect citations. An ordered list of references is included at the end of the document and almost all are in the same style.	Throughout the text, there are few references that justify the ideas that are presented. The style that is used is arbitrary. At the end of the document there is an incomplete, non-uniform list of references.	Throughout the text there are very few or no references that justify the ideas that are presented. The bibliographic references at the end of the document are in no apparent order and have a non-uniform style.
Structure and style	**Organisation**	The document is structured excellently: logically, well formatted and with well-linked sections. The title page includes relevant data. The pages, tables and figures are numbered.	The document is structured quite well. There is room for improvement in some of these aspects: the logical order, links between sections, formatting, title page data and page, table and figure numbering.	There are aspects that can clearly be improved in some of the following areas: the logical order, links between sections, formatting, title page data and page, table and figure numbering.	The information provided does not seem to be organised. Many aspects could be improved. There is no rigour in the structure or in the formatting.
	Clarity	The content is very clear and ideas flow logically. There is no need to read a paragraph twice, because the writing style is very precise.	The content is clear and ideas flow logically. Despite minor problems, the document is readable.	Ideas do not flow logically. It is difficult to figure out what the text is saying. Some paragraphs need to be read twice to understand their meaning.	It is very difficult to understand the content. Ideas do not flow logically. Most of the paragraphs need to be read twice to figure out what they mean.
	Writing	The document is free of grammar and spelling mistakes.	Few grammar and spelling mistakes.	Some grammar and spelling mistakes.	The document is full of grammar and spelling mistakes.

Final feedback

Context	
Justification	
Scope	Remember that I'm an economist and that – therefore – I may be wrong with following appreciation, but I'm convinced that you do not distinguish between objectives or sub-objectives and tasks / activities / work packages. I suggest you to define goals / objectives referring to the results you expect to achieve once activities / tasks / work packages are completed. I'm sure that you can easily define other possible risks / obstacles and retell the two mentioned in the text, as 'time limit' and 'dynamic pipeline framework' do not really describe risks / obstacles.
Methodology and rigour	I'm also convinced that it has no sense to justify the use of a Scrum methodology on your personal time constraints.
References	
Organisation	
Clarity	
Writing	