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|  | School of Computing and Creative Technologies  Assessment Brief |

# Submission details

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Module title**: | Systems Development Group Project |
| **Module code**: | UFCF7S-30-2 |
| **Module Leader:** | Elias Pimenidis & Shelan Jeawak |
| **Assessment title:** | Group Project Portfolio |
| **Year:** | 2025-26 |
| **Assessment type**: | Written Assessment to be submitted on Blackboard |
| **Assessment weighting:** | 100% |
| **Size or length of assessment:** | 10000 words for a group of five students (incorporating main body of the report 6000 max and reflective essay 800 max each student). |
| **Module learning outcomes assessed by this task:** | MO1 Apply the knowledge and skills associated with software development life cycle to design, develop and manage a sustainable system project.  MO2 Design and plan for testing of a product that will address the project's requirements efficiently and effectively  MO3 Communicate professional teamworking and demonstrate employability skills.  MO4 Demonstrate awareness of safety, ethical and legal issues in building systems that will be using and processing personal and corporate data |
| **Use of AI in assessment:** | You can use Generative AI in this assignment for research or for checking spelling, grammar etc., but not for writing the contents of your portfolio. We encourage you to use the UWE approved AI tool, Studiosity, to get feedback on your report writing and structure. |
| **Guidance on Referencing (inc AI):** | Please note that the aim of referencing is to demonstrate you have read and understood a range of sources to evidence your key points. You need to list the references consistently and in such a way as to ensure the reader can follow up on the sources for themselves. UWE Harvard style of referencing required.  [Referencing - Study skills | UWE Bristol](https://www.uwe.ac.uk/study/study-support/study-skills/referencing)  [Using generative AI at UWE Bristol - Study skills | UWE Bristol](https://www.uwe.ac.uk/study/study-support/study-skills/using-generative-ai-at-uwe-bristol)  You can use Generative AI in this assignment for research or for checking spelling, grammar etc., but not for writing your essay.  You can seek appropriate references using the resources provided by UWE Library. You can also use the resources available at Home Feed | ResearchGate <https://www.researchgate.net/> . Google Scholar, <https://scholar.google.com/> is another option. Finally, you can also try <https://arxiv.org/> , a site maintained by Cornell University. |

# Submission and feedback dates

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Submission deadline:** | Before 14:00 on 2 April 2026  Is **NOT** eligible for 48-hour late submission window  All times are 24-hour clock, current local time (at time of submission) in the UK. |
| **Submission format:** | The submission folder (zipped) should contain the following. 1. Group report to be submitted as a word or PDF document via the submission link available on Blackboard. The file should incorporate the main body of the group report, all individual reflection essays. The notes from your formative feedback sessions and group member CVs, should be added in an appendix. 2. A copy of your demonstration slides, the ones that will be used for the in-person demonstration. Everything must be submitted in a single zip folder that should be labelled as **SDGP02526-YOURSTUDENTNUMBER.** |
| **Marks and Feedback due on:** | 6 May 2026 |
| **Marks and Feedback will be provided via:** | Formative feedback will be provided verbally, every week that the class runs to each group by their group mentor. There will also be **two sessions for Formative Feedback**. **These will involve mentor feedback and peer feedback by one of the other groups in your class.**  On returning your marked work, tutors will include written feedback to highlight areas that you could further improve your work. Written feedback will be provided along with your mark via Blackboard. |

# Completing your assessment

**What am I required to do on this assessment?**

Choose one of the case studies available. As a group study their details, discuss with your tutor / mentor and analyse the requirements.

* Establish Aims and objectives for the project.
* Produce a validated set of Functional and Non-Functional Requirements. Use your mentor as the source for validation.
* Develop a project plan and a Risk register and continue monitoring and updating these. Consider the skills that you have in your group and identify any gaps based on the CVs prepared and shared within the group.
* Design the system to be implemented. Based on the Requirements and the design, produce a test plan.
* Implement the system and test it, according to the test plan developed in the previous stage.
* Compile the report as per the structure that will be provided during the on-campus sessions.
* Individually each student must attach to the main body of the report a reflective evaluation of the project management methods employed by the group, how they have supported the completion of the project, and how they have enhanced his/her individual learning and helped the development of professional skills. Maximum 800 words each.
* The report should not exceed 10000 words in total. This should include the main body of the report 6000 words max. and 800 words for each student (for a five-student group). As a group produce a demonstration of your software, culminating with a critical evaluation of the group work and its outcome. The demonstration must not exceed 18 minutes in length, will be delivered in person with all members of the group present. **If a student misses the demonstration, they will receive zero marks for this part of the assessment.**

Working on this assignment will help you to develop an insight into the different methods, skills, and techniques used in managing a project that will shape your employability potential. You will learn how to contribute effectively to a project as a member of a team, how to coordinate the efforts of a team, and how to present the outcome of your project professionally, and effectively.

If you have questions about this assignment, please discuss them with your tutor / group mentor during the weekly workshops or raise your questions during the weekly online seminar.

**Where should I start?**

Read and watch / listen to all the materials that are provided in Blackboard. These are updated weekly.

**What do I need to do to pass?**

Refer to the marking criteria and achievement of the minimum mark of 40% or above.

**How do I achieve high marks in this assessment?**

By using knowledge attained from module sessions and own research and engaging in critical analysis.

Presenting your analysis at workshops and incorporating formative feedback into your reflective analysis.

**How does the learning and teaching relate to the assessment?**

All weekly online sessions, and weekly on campus workshops are related to this assessment. The pre-recorded videos will let you understand the key elements of each topic that contributes to the organisation, management, and delivery of the project. The workshops will allow you to work with your group members on site and seek and use feedback from your tutor / group mentor to support you in advancing and enhancing your work.

Formative feedback will be given during the scheduled workshops, as this is much valuable to enhancing your learning. We will not be providing feedback by email. You will be required to record your feedback and the student coordinating the work of your group during that week, will need to email a record of the feedback to the group mentor.

**What additional resources may help me complete this assessment?**

* Additional reading materials
* Specific UWE library study skills pages
  + <https://www.uwe.ac.uk/study/study-support/study-skills>
  + [Critical thinking and writing - Reading and writing | UWE Bristol](https://www.uwe.ac.uk/study/study-support/study-skills/reading-and-writing/critical-thinking-and-writing)
  + [Writing - Reading and writing | UWE Bristol](https://www.uwe.ac.uk/study/study-support/study-skills/reading-and-writing/writing)
  + [How to give a presentation](https://www.uwe.ac.uk/study/study-support/study-skills/presenting-and-working-with-others)
  + [Writing feedback - Writing | UWE Bristol](https://www.uwe.ac.uk/study/study-support/study-skills/reading-and-writing/writing/writing-feedback#section-4)
  + [Studiosity - Study support | UWE Bristol](https://www.uwe.ac.uk/study/study-support/studiosity) for quick feedback on your writing
* Bespoke coursework surgery sessions as listed in the module schedule

**What do I do if I am concerned about completing this assessment?**

It is recommended that you review all of the relevant materials on Blackboard. You can also speak to your module leader for advice and guidance.

UWE Bristol offer a range of Assessment Support Options that you can explore through [this link](https://www.uwe.ac.uk/study/academic-information/personal-circumstances), and both [Student Support Advisers](https://www.uwe.ac.uk/study/study-support/student-support-advisers) and [Wellbeing Support](https://www.uwe.ac.uk/life/health-and-wellbeing/get-wellbeing-support) are available.

For further information, please see the [Student study essentials](https://www.uwe.ac.uk/study/academic-information/student-study-essentials).

**How do I avoid an Assessment Offence on this module?**

Use the support above if you feel unable to submit your own work for this module.

Details re assessment offences can be found here [academic-conduct-policy-and-academic-misconduct-procedures](https://www.uwe.ac.uk/-/media/uwe/documents/study/academic-conduct-policy-and-academic-misconduct-procedures.pdf)

# Marks and Feedback

**Your assessment will be marked according to the following marking criteria.**

**You can use these to evaluate your own work before you submit.**

**NOTE – you must have been present in at least six workshops/group feedback sessions, including the two Formative Feedback Sessions to be able to claim marks in the two top mark bands.**

Group Report – 50% of portfolio marks

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Weightings** | **86-100 (Outstanding)** | **70-85 (Excellent)** | **60-69 (Very Good)** | **50-59 (Good)** | **40-49 (Adequate)** | **30-39 (Poor/Inadequate)** | **0-29 (Very Poor)** |
|  |
| **Aims and Objectives** 10 | Aims and objectives clearly stated and exceeded. These satisfy the SMART properties. | Aims and objectives clearly stated and fully met. Mostly demonstrate SMART properties. | Aims and objectives clearly stated and have been met. Very good work. | Aims and objectives clearly stated and have been met to a good extent. | Aims and objectives  could be more clearly  stated and have been  met to some extent. | Aims and objectives could be more clearly stated and have been partially met. | Aims and objectives barely specified and it is not clear if these have been met. |  |
| **Literature Review**  10 | Outstanding analysis of relevant works Provides critical review of relevant applications and projects. Demonstrates outstanding insight into the problem.  Excellent use of appropriate sources (both in quantity 10 - and quality).  All sources are appropriately cited and referenced.  It leads to the requirements section effectively. Excellent Text flow. | Excellent analysis of relevant works. Critical review of relevant applications and research projects included. Demonstrates excellent insight into the problem. Excellent use of appropriate sources - appropriately cited and referenced. Provides some links to support the requirements section. | Very good analysis of relevant works. Critical review of relevant applications and research projects. Demonstrates very good insight into the problem. Good use of sources - appropriately cited and referenced. | Good analysis of relevant works. Good review of relevant applications and/or research projects. Demonstrates good insight into the problem. Good use of sources. Most are appropriately cited and referenced. | Adequate analysis of relevant works. Provides some review of relevant applications but lacks depth. Demonstrates some insight into the problem.  Some Good use of sources. Sources need to be appropriately cited and referenced. | Poor analysis of relevant works which demonstrates little or no insight into the problem | Little or no analysis of relevant works is provided |  |
| **Project Planning & Team Roles**  15 | Outstanding Breakdown of tasks. Exceptionally well linked to the requirements and a very impressive Gantt Chart  Clear and consistent Risk Register. | Excellent Breakdown of tasks. An Excellent link to the requirements and a very good Gantt Chart  An Excellent analysis of risks and planning against their impacts on the project. | Very Good Breakdown of tasks. A Very Good attempt to link to requirements and to develop a Gantt Chart  A Very Good presentation of risks and assessment of their impacts on the plan | Good Breakdown of tasks. A Good attempt to link to requirements and to develop a Gantt Chart  A Good attempt to present risks and assess their impacts on the plan | Adequate Breakdown of tasks. An adequate attempt to link to requirements and to develop a Gantt Chart | Poor breakdown of tasks. Some attempt to produce a Gantt Chart | Little or no planning. No diagrams or Gantt chart |  |
| **Requirements** 15 | Outstanding description, analysis, and presentation of the requirements. Requirements are linked to the literature review. At least 6 appropriate functional and 6 non-functional requirements or combination of the two | Excellent description, analysis, and presentation of the requirements. Some links with the literature review are evidenced. At least 6 appropriate functional and 6 non-functional requirements or combination of the two | Very good description, analysis, and presentation of the requirements. At least 6 appropriate functional and 6 non-functional requirements or combination of the two | Good description, analysis, and presentation of the requirements. At least 6 appropriate functional and 6 non-functional requirements or combination of the two | Adequate description, analysis, and presentation of the requirements. At least 6 appropriate functional and 6 non-functional requirements or combination of the two | Poor description, analysis, and presentation of the requirements | Little or no description, analysis, and presentation of the requirements |  |
| **Design and Test Plan**  15 | Provides and discusses in great detail all design steps and appropriate diagrams and test plans Outstanding presentation and discussion of the diagrams. | Provides and discusses in detail all design steps and appropriate diagrams and test plans Excellent presentation and discussion of the diagrams. | Provides and discusses clearly all design steps and appropriate diagrams and test plans  Very good presentation and discussion of the diagrams | Provides and discusses the design steps of most of the appropriate diagrams and suitable test plans Good presentation and discussion of the diagrams. | Design steps are not clearly defined. Provides some of the appropriate diagrams and some test plans | The design steps are not clearly defined or presented. Most diagrams are missing | Little or no presentation of required design steps. Most diagrams are missing. |  |
| **Implementation and Testing**  15 | Impressive demonstration of programming and software development skills.  Demonstrates outstanding insight into the technologies employed.  Appropriate software testing; tests all aspects of the product in great detail. | Excellent demonstration of programming and software development skills.  Demonstrates excellent insight into the technologies employed. Appropriate software testing; tests all aspects of the product in great detail.  Excellent reflection on the test results | Very good demonstration of programming and software development skills.  Demonstrates very good insight into the technologies employed. Appropriate software testing; tests all aspects of the product in great detail. Very good reflection on the test results. | Good demonstration of programming and software development skills.  Demonstrates good insight into the technologies employed. Appropriate software testing; tests most aspects of the product in detail.  Good reflection on the tests’ results. | Some demonstration of programming and software development skills.  Demonstrates some insight into the technologies employed. Some or Poor software testing; tests some aspects of the product. Some reflection on the test results. | Little or no demonstration of programming and software development skills.  Demonstrates some insight into the technologies employed. Poor software testing; tests some aspects of the product. Limited reflection on the test results | Little or no demonstration of programming skills.  Demonstrates little or no insight into the technologies employed. Little or no software testing. Limited or no reflection on the test results |  |
| **Report Quality** 5 | Uses appropriate terminology accurately. Professionally presented in both layout on the page and logical structure.  Impressively presented in an appropriate style.  Grammatically of an extremely high standard. | Uses appropriate terminology accurately.  Professionally presented in both layout on the page and logical structure. Very well presented in an appropriate style.  Grammatically of a very high standard. | A good grasp of the appropriate terminology.  Well presented in both layout on the page and logical structure.  Presented in an appropriate style.  Good grammatical standard. | Mostly uses appropriate terminology.  Well presented in both layout on the page and logical structure.  Presented in reasonable way which allows it to be easily read.  Lacking in clarity and grammatical structure. | Often fails to use appropriate terminology.  May lack in layout and/or logical structure. May show a lack of clarity and comprehension. Lacking grammatical structure. Results and products of the project are likely to be poor and/or incomplete and well below of what is expected in a junior role in a work environment | Lack of or inaccurate use of the appropriate terminology.  Typically fails to accurately or completely describe the work done  Will often contain little indication of which parts of the problem are understood and which are not.  Often shows a lack of structure, comprehension, clarity and grammatical quality.  Results and products of the project are poor and/or incomplete. | No use of the appropriate terminology.  Fails to describe the problem and the work done.  Shows a lack of structure, comprehension, clarity and grammatical quality. Results and products of the project are insignificant, poor and/or incomplete |  |
| **Evaluation & Lessons Learned**  15 | A thorough analysis of risks, detailed evaluation, and planning against their impacts on the project. Results and products of the project are of publishable quality comparable to or better than that found in the products of professional companies. Outstanding reflection on the test results.  Have utilised Formative Mentor and Peer Feedback to substantially improve their work. | Considers acheivements and learning opportunities exploited. Addresses shortfalls with appropriate suggetions for forward planning. Results and products of the project are likely to be of publishable quality in the professional world.  Have utilised Formative Mentor and Peer Feedback to considerably improve their work | Results and products of the project would require some rewriting and improvement to be of publishable quality in the professional world. Identifies areas where improvements will need to be achieved, but does not thoroughly discuss and evaluate the impact of shortfalls | Results and products of the project would require significant rewriting and improvement to be of publishable quality in the professional world. Attempst to identify where efforts did not deliver and attempts to raise the question as to what will need to be done further | Mostly a. descriptive account of successes and missed opportunities. Does not explore any alternative approaches or methodlogies that could have been utilised | Finds difficulty in articulating and evaluative account, often repeating parts from different sections, without demonstrating an ability to consider a remedial plan. | Little effort or clarity of thought to conisder poor outcomes and potentailly better options that could have been chosen. |  |

Individual Reflective Essay – 30% of portfolio marks

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Mark** | **100-86**  **Outstanding** | **85-70**  **Excellent** | **69-60**  **Very Good** | **59-50**  **Good** | **49-40**  **Adequate** | **39-30**  **Poor / Inadequate** | **29-0**  **Very Poor** |
| **Individual Reflective Evaluation** | * The essay has surpassed expectations at “Excellent” level. * The work demonstrates excellent ability to critically discuss the group work and own contribution. * There has been some good use of appropriate references. * Demonstrates a good appreciation of sustainability issues and ability to link those to the key elements of the system produced. | * Excellent work in terms of discussing group management practice. * Thorough discussion and analysis of own contribution and personal lessons learned. * Discusses ethical and legal issues effectively * Discusses the impact of Risk management in the management of the project | * A well-structured discussion of group management practice. * A good attempt to critically discuss role management and rotation. * A good attempt to discuss own contribution * Demonstrates good understanding of the role of risk * Demonstrates good awareness of ethics and legal issues | * Attempts to discuss the effectiveness of the work of the group. * Describes the roles and the way they were managed by the group. * Explains own role. * Identifies some ethical issues. * Is unclear about the role of risk management for the project | * Identifies roles among group members. * Explains own role. * Does all the above in a descriptive manner, not being able to comment as to the effectiveness of the work clearly * Some attempt to identify ethical issues | * Makes some attempt to describe how the project was run and managed. * There is no clarity what roles were assigned to group members * Attempts to describe but unclear as to own contribution | * Not clear about how the project was planned, tasked and run. * Fails to explain own contribution to the project. |

Group Demonstration and evaluation – 20% of portfolio marks

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Mark** | **100-86**  **Outstanding** | **85-70**  **Excellent** | **69-60**  **Very Good** | **59-50**  **Good** | **49-40**  **Adequate** | **39-30**  **Poor / Inadequate** | **29-0**  **Very Poor** |
| **Group Demonstration & Evaluation** | * The system demonstrated has surpassed expectations at every level. * Management of the project is at professional level. * There is clear evidence that all students have contributed fairly and have experienced the challenges of all roles. * Sustainability issues have been considered and there is evidence of effort to address them. * **The group has gone beyond evaluation. Have proposed clear ways of how to improve the quality of the project and the submitted documentation.** | * Excellent work with all the functionality delivered and all non-functional requirements having surpassed expectations. * Excellent demonstrations of using the management tools. * A clear risk register that shows evidence of rigorous risk process * Objectives and requirements have been fully evaluated with a good level of criticality. | * **Very good** work. * **All of the requirements have been met to a very good level.** * **There is clarity at every level of the management of the project.** * **Both objectives and requirements have been evaluated.** | * Aims and objectives have been **met to a good extent.** * **Most of the functional requirements have been met.** * **There is good clarity of tasks and roles in the project plan.** * **The way responsibilities were assigned and managed is clear.** * **The project has been evaluated vs objectives and some effort to assess the requirements.** | * Aims and objectives have been **met to some extent.** * **A limited number of Requirements have been delivered.** * **There is some reasonable logic in the management structure.** * **Some clarity as to a responsibility matrix has been presented and discussed.** * **An attempt to fully evaluate the project vs objectives.** | * Aimsand objectiveshave been **partially met**. * **Some functionality is present, but there is some element of difficulty in showing it.** * **There is some project management structure, but the responsibilities over time are unclear.** * **Vague attempt to evaluating the project.** | * Not clear if aims and objectives have been met. * Unclear as to how the work was managed * System does not deliver much or any functionality * No effort to evaluate the project |

1. In line with UWE Bristol’s [Assessment Content Limit Policy](https://www.uwe.ac.uk/about/structure-and-governance/policies) (formerly the Word Count Policy), word count includes all text, including (but not limited to): the main body of text (including headings), all citations (both in and out of brackets), text boxes, tables and graphs, figures and diagrams, quotes, lists.
2. UWE Bristol’s Academic Conduct Policy and Academic Misconduct Procedures (Assessment Offence Policy) is available from the [Academic Integrity](https://www.uwe.ac.uk/study/academic-information/assessments/academic-integrity) webpages and requires that you submit work that is entirely your own and reflects your own learning, so it is important to:
   * Ensure you reference all sources used, using the [UWE Harvard](https://www.uwe.ac.uk/study/study-support/study-skills/referencing/uwe-bristol-harvard)/[OSCOLA](https://www.uwe.ac.uk/study/study-support/study-skills/referencing/oscola) system (amend as appropriate) and the guidance available on [UWE’s Study Skills referencing pages](https://www.uwe.ac.uk/study/study-support/study-skills/referencing).
   * Refer to peer reviewed primary sources, rather than using AI or secondary sources
   * Avoid copying and pasting any work into this assessment, including your own previous assessments, work from other students or internet sources
   * Develop your own style, arguments and wording, so avoid copying sources and changing individual words but keeping, essentially, the same sentences and/or structures from other sources
   * Never give your work to others who may copy it
   * If an individual assessment, develop your own work and preparation, and do not allow anyone to make amends on your work (including proof-readers, who may highlight issues but not edit the work).

**When submitting your work, you will be required to confirm that the work is your own,** and text-matching software and other methods are routinely used to check submissions against other submissions to the university and internet sources. Details of what constitutes plagiarism and how to avoid it can be found on UWE’s Study Skills [pages about avoiding plagiarism](https://www.uwe.ac.uk/study/study-support/study-skills/reading-and-writing/plagiarism).

**When submitting your work, you will be required to confirm that the work is your own,** and text-matching software and other methods are routinely used to check submissions against other submissions to the university and internet sources. Details of what constitutes plagiarism and how to avoid it can be found on UWE’s Study Skills [pages about avoiding plagiarism](https://www.uwe.ac.uk/study/study-support/study-skills/reading-and-writing/plagiarism) .