

School of Engineering and Computer Science

Te Kura Mātai Pūkaha, Pūrorohiko

Show all courses for current year

ENGR489

ENGR440

SWEN423

SWEN433

ENGR489 - Engineering Project (2020 T1,2)

Submission System Assessments

Preliminary_Report

Final Mark: A



| Question | Comment | Mark |
|-------------------------------------------------|------------|------|
| Supervisor - Introduction and Background Survey | | A |
| Supervisor - Work Done | at hate == | A |
| Supervisor - Future Plan | | A |
| Supervisor - Critical Thinking | | A |
| Supervisor - Written Communication | | A |

| | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Examiner1 - Introduction and Background Survey | <p>Overall the pieces are there, although the structure of the Introduction can be improved - see written communication section. In Chapter 1, I did not see blame for developers in [5], but rather that in the same way as usability issues can cause end users to make errors, so can unusable/complex security tools cause developers to produce software that is not secure.</p> <p>A couple of references should be added in Section 2.2: A reference for CIA triad as well as the negative effects of neglecting C, I, or A. In Section 2.3: Reference for the statement "Secure refers to..."</p> <p>I'm not sure what "sample groups" means, I assume it's potential participants, however, it's not clear. The tables on pages 7 and 9 could be made easier to understand with a column on the left hand side containing the dimensions used to compare this research with the existing studies, e.g. data collection, participants, etc. It's also not clear why these two works [9] and [20] were chosen over others? As this is the beginning of a Grounded Theory study, the number of references to existing literature is probably ok, given that there is a balance to be struck between understanding where the gaps are and becoming too "primed" by existing hypotheses.</p> | A- |
| Examiner1 - Work Done | The ethics application is comprehensive and time-consuming. I fully appreciate the time it takes to get ethics approval, so considering the challenges around COVID-19, the consultation already done with other parties, and the pilot study, this seems about right. | A |
| Examiner1 - Future Plan | I'd be a little concerned that theoretical saturation may not be reached within the available time for this project. In which case, what is the plan for dealing with this? There may need to be some artificial limits set for the number of interviews conducted or analysing a couple of emergent themes, rather than aiming to produce a comprehensive grounded theory. Related to this is the number of interview questions appended with the HEC application. Think about structuring these into sub-sections to help with time management during the interview and with planning what topics to cover during the interview. That is, whether the interview addresses a large number of topics with minimal probing, or whether the interview focuses in on a narrow topic that is probed in-depth. | B+ |
| Examiner1 - Critical Thinking | Why are interviews chosen as the method of data collection, as compared to, say, a diary study? Have questions provided in the ethics application been amended based on the pilot study? It's not clear whether these are the "final" questions or if there is a newer set. Specific feedback was requested and I'm wondering why Education has been picked out as an interesting factor. Is there literature to suggest this is a critical factor in explaining developers' decisions regarding security? Will the interview questions in this study probe that in depth? As for what will be interesting will depend on what emerges from the interview data. My advice is to pay attention to asking focused interview questions (use active listening) and then apply a rigorous coding process. | A- |
| Examiner1 - Written Communication | Written communication is mostly fine. The unexpected narrative flow in the introduction can be improved: introduce the topic, why is it important - that's the current para 1, para 3, and 8 - what this project investigates, what the aims are and how those aims will be achieved, followed by benefits. Take care with referencing online sources - look at for e.g. @misc entry at https://www.bibtex.com/e/entry-types/#misc . | A |

| | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Examiner2 - Introduction and Background Survey | <p>This report clearly introduces and motivates the project, and makes good reference to both related background material and existing research in similar areas, all of which is relevant. As a grounded-theory project it would not be appropriate to have further highly-related work involved at this point which could poison the well.</p> <p>It is not exactly "concise", as the marking guide requires, but since we've been asked to ignore the page limit I have ignored that as well. For the final report, some reorganisation of this (perhaps additional subsections) will probably provide helpful structure.</p> | A+ |
| Examiner2 - Work Done | <p>This type of project is not anticipated by the marking guide and it's not clear which TRL it could meet, but the report is clear that substantial work has been done and a complex HEC application has been completed already.</p> <p>The two passes of pilot study have contributed to the design for future work in the manner of a prototype. Consideration and mitigation of weaknesses is a strength of this work so far, and it appears to be the most thoroughly-prepared ethics application I have seen at this stage of a 489 project. This is significant design work and the need to pivot between in-person and online approaches has made it more complex still, which is communicated well.</p> | A |
| Examiner2 - Future Plan | <p>The plan is detailed and the timeframes seem plausible; I imagine there may have been some further modifications to adjust to the general situation now versus what was anticipated in the planning. In either case, a reasonable study can be conducted within the given timeframes provided that recruitment does not present major issues.</p> <p>The plan includes consideration of expected future external events that may impact on the project. Although the introduction indicated no changes since the proposal, it appears there are some material changes to the approach in use with initial analysis now immediately following the interviews themselves.</p> <p>I'm not sure how lengthening the process permits "at least" one interview per week - perhaps this is meant to be "at most", or there are external constraints on when expected participants are available? It appears that there are 13 weeks (15 including the break) in this period, so more than one per week is not needed to meet the numeric target from the introduction, but it may well happen - and we can't know until you've done it in this process - that you do need more interviews than that to get to where you want to be. Is there a plan for that situation? I do not recommend further extending the interview period given the timeline for the final report, and it is not clear that it is feasible to interview more frequently given the depth of analysis required. I would have liked to see some consideration of this "what if" situation, which is particular to this project.</p> | A- |

| | | |
|-----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| Examiner2 - Critical Thinking | <p>This report shows good attempts to mitigate the limitations it considers. I would like to see more consideration of the very-high-level elements of the experimental design, but given the tight page limit it is reasonable to have presented a fait accompli.</p> <p>The final report should address the general approaches that could be taken to investigating this topic, both within and instead of grounded theory, and make some note of why they were not used and why the choices you did make were appropriate (or perhaps weren't - it's fine if you wish you'd started out differently at the end as well, either for reasons you could have known at the time or not). The approach you have taken in the report to considering limitations, strengths, and weaknesses of different options is good, it would just be helpful to extend it a bit more broadly.</p> | A |
| Examiner2 - Written Communication | <p>The report is largely well-structured, but there are frequent composition errors (missing words, misapplied punctuation, minor misspellings). In some places it appears that fighting LaTeX has gotten in the way; that may be another area where the university closure has hindered you.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Plurals only end with s, no apostrophe (but possessives do have it) * Semicolons can only appear after a complete sentence, not in place of a colon to introduce a list. All semicolons in this report ought to be either colons or commas. * "principles outline"d * "Both had the similarities in which going into the interview stage" - I'm not sure what this was meant to say * "The efficiency being that of the potential to obtain open answers with an ultimate focus in mind" does not contain a principal verb and is not a sentence * "this was not an issue as with more clarity on questions" ?? * To include the tilde in the URL, either use the url package and \url or, if you can't do that, \textasciitilde will show something instead of a space. * To preserve case in BibTeX entries, wrap words or characters in {}. You can also do this for organisational authors, like the Human Ethics Committee. * It's not conventional to cite legislation as authored by the administering ministry; most common is with no author, or "Parliament of New Zealand" if you must, in either case usually without URL. | B |
| Final | | A |