

COM6103 – Team Software Project

Final Assessment Brief

This document specifies the requirements for you to complete the assessments for this module.

Working independently as a team of six students, you are required to develop software to the specification of a client. At the beginning of the semester, each team will be provided with a project brief and requirements for software specified by a client. The following criteria will be used to assess your ability to work in a team to build software to the specification of a client

- Teamwork (30%)
- Documentation (40%)
- Delivered software (30%)

All the assessment elements are due **by 3pm on Thursday 12th May 2022**.

1. Teamwork (Weighting - 30%)

For teamwork, we want to understand

- How you organised your team and what tools were used.
- How the team communicated throughout the project and ensured members were carried along.
- The balance of contributions from team members during the project iterations.

To assess this, the following will be reviewed

- Final team report
- Team supervisory meeting notes
- Feedback from the client meetings
- GitLab commits

2. Documentation (Weighting - 40%)

With this criterion, we want to evaluate

- how your team carried out its projects

- how you adequately describe/present the solution developed to the client - including how it could be used in your absence.

A large part of the team documentation mark will be based on the quality of your team report, the extent to which it details all the requested information, including changes to stories and basic information about using your system.

Team documentation will be graded using a number of mediums which include

- Final team report
- User guide
- Setup guide (how can the client set up the software developed?)
- Test results

3. Delivered Software (Weighting - 30%)

With this criterion, we want to evaluate how well your delivered software meets the requirements specified.

Particularly, we are interested in answering the following questions

- How usable is the product?
- Does it meet the client's requirements?
- Is the product developed to specification?

The software will be graded using a number of mediums some of which include

- The basic organisation of your code into units, and its overall structure
- The amount of work completed to date, and the extent to which you are on track to delivering a good quality product
- Client feedback on the quality of the product
- Basic functional test of the product
- Walkthrough video

Each team is required to produce a **3-minute video walkthrough of their software** showing various functionalities developed. This must be added to a '/video' folder of your team's GitLab repository and you should provide a link to it in the report.

Note: The last commit in the teams' GitLab repository before **3pm on Thursday 12th May 2022** will be considered as the final software delivered. You must ensure that last-minute changes/commits do not cause defects in your software. If for any reason you would like a different commit/tag in the repository to be graded, it must be specified in the report.

4. Final Team Report

As part of the documentation, to evidence progress on the project and how the team self-managed, all teams are required to **submit an 18-page report (~approx. 8,000 words) via Blackboard by 3pm on Thursday 12th May 2022.**

In this report, we want you to describe to us

- how your team carried out the project, i.e. the process you followed
- what programming language was used
- what features were delivered
- what features could not be delivered
- what challenges you faced as a team
- how you tested the software built
- how you communicated within your team.

As a minimum the report should contain

- **Introduction/background to the project**
- **Project scope and objectives**
- **Team name and list of members**
- **Product backlog** – A list of user stories that make up the complete product
- **Analysis & Design** - System architecture, UML diagrams, Algorithm /Database design.
- **Evidence of Testing** - Test plan, Test documentation and Test results
- **Team management & communication**
 - Describe how you managed your team, who did what?
 - Describe how you communicated as a team and challenges that were involved (if any)
 - Include a sample or two of meeting minutes
 - Ideally, this should be for each iteration/sprint
- **Planned & Completed Features**
 - Present the planned and completed user stories/features in each iteration
- **Uncompleted Features**
 - What features were not completed and why?
- **Screenshots of relevant pages**
- **Conclusion**
 - Ideally, this should include what was learnt, challenges faced and how it was resolved
- **Appendix**
 - User guide (maximum 2 pages)
 - Setup guide (maximum 2 pages)
 - Other documents you think are relevant can be added here

Note - The Appendix is not included in the word count, but please do not include unnecessary items.

5. Assigning Individual Marks for Team Projects

Team marks are scaled for each student in proportion to their individual performance. The scaling factor is derived from the scores assigned to you by each of your teammates in a peer review. We will ask you to score yourself and your teammates on a scale of 1–10 according to the following aspects:

1. Attendance and punctuality (to group meetings, joint working sessions, etc.)
2. Ability to work effectively with other team members
3. Contribution to content and organisation of project deliverables
4. Quality of contributions
5. Timeliness of contributions

You will be expected to support the scores you give with explanatory comments.

The scaling factor is computed from these scores such that 1.0 corresponds to the average team member contribution and anything above or below 1 represents an above or below the average effort. As an example, consider a (fictional) team of four members, Helen, Ali, Wang and Rob, who get a team project mark of 65%.

In the following table we use each person's scores for each team member to give an average score out of 10:

		Markee			
		Helen	Ali	Wang	Rob
Marker	Helen	8	6	6	5
	Ali	7	7	6	5
	Wang	7	6	7	5
	Rob	7	6	6	6
Average		7.25	6.25	6.25	5.25
Team Average		6.25	6.25	6.25	6.25
Factor		1.16	1	1	0.84
Team Mark		65%	65%	65%	65%
Final Mark		75.4%	65%	65%	54.6%

Each team member has an overall average score. The average of these averages - the *team average* - is 6.25. This allows us to compute each person's individual factor - the person's average score, divided by the team average. This gives Helen a factor that is > 1 , reflecting the higher level of contribution that the team agree they have put into the project. Ali and Wang score a factor of 1, a factor corresponding to the average level of contribution and effort. Rob, who has perhaps been experiencing some difficulties in relation to their work, scores a sub-one factor of 0.84. As a result, Helen gets the highest overall mark (75.4%),

while Ali and Wang essentially get the team mark (65%) and Rob gets less than the team mark (54.6%).

The prior scenario describes a team that is, to some extent, carrying a team member, with another member having to do more work as a result. The best outcome is where everybody scores a factor that is 1 (or very close to 1) because they have worked well together as a team to achieve the best team mark possible.

Please note the following:

1. **Scores assigned to individuals and accompanying comments will be kept confidential.** We will disclose the factors, and where appropriate anonymised comments.
2. **We reserve the right to manually adjust factors in the case of certain individuals or teams,** if we have reason to believe that scores have been assigned unjustly.

6. Assessment Criteria

Teamwork		Weighting: 30%
70%-100%	Excellent teamwork. The feedback from the team advisors and clients were excellent. The teamwork section of the final report provided excellent evidence of how the team self-managed and handled challenges. Very good references to the tools and processes used to ensure clear communication. The team's processes were explained in-depth and example evidence provided. The Gitlab repository shows even contributions from the team members.	
60%-69%	Good teamwork. The feedback from the team advisors and clients were good. The teamwork section of the final report provided good evidence of how the team self-managed and handled challenges. Good references to the tools and processes used to ensure clear communication. The team's processes were explained, and some example evidence was provided. The Gitlab repository shows almost even contributions from the team members.	
50%-59%	Average teamwork. The feedback from the team advisors and clients evidenced average teamwork. The teamwork section of the final report provided sufficient evidence describing how the team self-managed and handled challenges. Sufficient reference to the tools and processes used to ensure communication. The team's processes were presented, and some example evidence was provided. The Gitlab repository shows contributions from the team members were not even.	
40%-49%	Limited teamwork. The feedback from the team advisors and clients evidenced limited teamwork, only a few individuals did most of the work. The teamwork section of the final report provided limited evidence of team management and communication. The team's processes were not explained	

	in-depth, and limited evidence provided. The Gitlab repository shows only a few individuals did most of the work.	
Documentation		Weighting: 40%
70%-100%	The deliverables are complete and excellent. The final report presented a very good introduction, clearly written user stories, very good analysis & design, and very good evidence of testing. The setup guide and user guide are very well written, clear to read and easy to follow.	
60%-69%	Well presented and almost complete deliverables. The final report presented a good introduction, user stories, good analysis & design, and good evidence of testing. The setup guide and user guide are well written, clear to read and easy to follow with minor limitations.	
50%-59%	The deliverables are partially complete. The final report contained a partially complete introduction, partially complete user stories, partially complete analysis & design and partially complete testing documentation. The setup guide and user guide are sufficient but not easy to follow.	
40%-49%	The deliverables are limited. The final report contained -limited introduction, user stories, analysis & design and test documentation. The setup guide and user guide are scant and not easy to follow.	
Delivered Software		Weighting: 30%
70%-100%	The overall product is excellent, can be used and adequately meets the client's requirements. The specification and priorities of the client have been taken into consideration. Many of the user stories are complete or almost complete. The client's feedback on the quality of the product is excellent. The walkthrough video shows the main functionalities of the software and does not exceed three minutes.	
60%-69%	The overall product is good, can be used and meets some of the client's requirements. Some of the specification and priorities of the client have been taken into consideration. Many of the user stories are complete or almost complete. The client's feedback on the quality of the product is good. The walkthrough video shows the main functionalities of the software and does not exceed three minutes.	
50%-59%	The overall product is partially complete when compared to the client's requirement. Not more than 50% of the specification and priorities of the client have been taken into consideration. Some of the user stories are complete but with many incomplete. The client's feedback on the quality of the product is that it is partially complete. The walkthrough video shows some functionalities of the software.	
40%-49%	The overall product is limited when compared to the customers' requirement. Many of the user stories are incomplete. The specification and priorities of the client have not been taken into consideration. The client's feedback on the quality of the product is that it is limited.	

Submission

The final report must be submitted in **PDF format** using Blackboard (MOLE).

The submission deadline is **3pm on Thursday 12th May 2022**.

The standard penalties for late submission of work apply:

<https://sites.google.com/sheffield.ac.uk/comughandbook/general-information/assessment/late-submission>

Unfair Means

This is a **team** assignment and you must **not** collaborate with other teams.

The standard rules concerning unfair means apply:

<https://sites.google.com/sheffield.ac.uk/comughandbook/general-information/assessment/unfair-means>

Questions

If you have any questions concerning what is required by this assignment please email them to:

o.olayinka@sheffield.ac.uk