

ASSESSMENT BRIEF 3

COURSE: Bachelor of Information Technology/ Bachelor of Information Technology with a specialization in Cyber Security	
Unit Code:	SENG205
Unit Title:	Software Engineering
Type of Assessment:	Project Report
Length/Duration:	3000 Words (+/- 10%)
Unit Learning Outcomes addressed:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Describe compare and contrast various methodologies for software development processes 2. Importance of and approaches to project and change management 3. Describe modern tools and the contexts for their appropriate use for software development, configuration, support, installation, and managing incremental updates 4. Be able to select an appropriate development method for a complex problem and give technical reasons for the choice 5. Be able to define adequate metrics over a defined software process and critically and objectively determine its capability level and course of action towards improvement 6. Be able to gather requirements, develop specifications, design, and develop test plans individually and in a team.
Submission Date:	Week 11
Assessment Task:	Complete Project Documentation
Total Mark:	50 marks
Weighting:	40 % of the units total marks
Students are advised that submission of an Assessment Task past the due date without a formally signed approved Assignment Extension Form (Kent Website MyKent Student Link> FORM – Assignment Extension Application Form – Student Login Required) or previously approved application for other extenuating circumstances impacting course of study, incurs a 5% penalty per calendar day , calculated by deduction from the <u>total mark</u> . For example. An Assessment Task marked out of 40 will incur a 2 mark penalty <u>for each calendar day</u> . More information, please refer to (Kent Website MyKent Student Link > POLICY – Assessment Policy & Procedures – Student Login Required)	

ASSESSMENT DESCRIPTION:

Your **Assessment 3** will be Complete Project Documentation presented as a formal report to the client showing plans, detailed requirements elicitation, detailed requirements analysis and prioritization, high level design, detailed component design, justifications for the choice of software development models, justifications for the suggestions of modern tools and the contexts for their appropriate use for software development, create a Hi-Fidelity prototype following the design principles learned as part of the unit, formal documentation, budget breakdown, test plan, and detailed project timeline. You need to write 3000 words report for Assessment 3 and work in groups.

Further details of assignment are provided on the Moodle site in “Project Outline” Document in Assessment Briefs folder. The student's contribution and performance towards preparing the report will be accessed via peer review document.

Please see the marking rubrics for what is expected to be completed in Assessment 3. **As you will be working on the same “Project Outline” as you did in Assessment 2, you need to work in the same groups which were created in assessment 2.**

ASSESSMENT SUBMISSION:

The Project Report will be submitted in **week 11** of the trimester. Assignment should be submitted on time. However, consideration will be offered only under severe medical conditions or unanticipated extenuating circumstances. You must provide appropriate supporting paper for consideration.

- **One group member (Leader) should submit the Word Document containing the project report.**
- **All other group members should submit the Individual Contribution forms.**

MARKING GUIDE (RUBRIC):

Assessment Attributes	Fail (0-49%)	Pass (50-64%)	Credit (65-74%)	Distinction (75-84%)	High Distinction (>85%)
Research 10	Little evidence of research. Sources are missing, Inappropriate, poorly integrated or lacking credibility. Lacks clear link of sources with essay. No in text citations	A minimum of 5 academic sources. Basic use of sources to support ideas, generally well-integrated, most sources are credible. May be weaknesses with paraphrasing or integration /application.	Research is generally thorough. Good use of sources to support ideas, mostly well integrated, sources are credible. May be minor weaknesses with paraphrasing or integration/ application.	Thorough research is indicated. Very good use of sources to support ideas, well integrated, sources are credible. May be minor weaknesses with paraphrasing or integration/application.	Thorough research is indicated. Professional use of sources to support ideas, well integrated, sources are credible. Very minor, if any, weaknesses with paraphrasing or Integration/application.
Use case diagram 5	Poor standard of use case diagrams, justifications of the suggestions of modern tools .	Basic standard of use design diagrams, justifications of the suggestions of modern tools .	Good standard of use design diagrams, justifications of the suggestions of modern tools .	Very good standard of use design diagrams, justifications of the suggestions of modern tools .	Professional standard of use design diagrams, justifications of the suggestions of modern tools .
Sequence diagram 5	Poor standard of sequence diagrams, justifications of the suggestions of modern tools .	Basic standard of sequence diagrams, justifications of the suggestions of modern tools .	Good standard of sequence diagrams, justifications of the suggestions of modern tools .	Very good standard of sequence diagrams, justifications of the suggestions of modern tools .	Professional standard of sequence diagrams, justifications of the suggestions of modern tools .
Code repository and project management 20	No code repository and project management activities	Basic code repository (versioning) and limited project management activities	Good standard of code repository (versioning) with project management activities	Very good standard of code repository (versioning) with project management activities	Professional standard of code repository (versioning) with project management activities

Testing and QA artifacts 15	No testing and quality assurance activities	Basic testing evidence with quality assurance activities	Good standard of testing evidence with quality assurance activities	Very good standard of testing evidence with quality assurance activities	Professional standard of testing evidence with quality assurance activities
Requirement prioritisation 5	No requirement prioritisation techniques.	Basic standard of requirement prioritisation techniques with incomplete explanation.	Good standard of requirement prioritisation techniques and explanation.	Very good standard of requirement prioritisation technique with the discussion of its pros and cons related to the project.	Professional standard of requirement prioritisation technique with critical analysis and use of modern tools
Time, Budget, and Test Plan 10	Poor standard of project time line, budget breakdown and test plan	Basic standard of project time line, budget breakdown and test plan.	Good standard of project time line, budget breakdown and test plan.	Very good standard of project time line, budget breakdown and test plan.	Professional standard of project time line, budget breakdown and test plan.
Structure, Language /Presentation 10	Topic, concepts and thesis are not clear in introduction, and the materials in the body is generally poorly sequenced. Poor standard of writing: word limit may not be adhered to. Incorrect format (e.g. includes Table of content; bullet points; graphs etc.)	Topic, concepts and thesis are stated with some clarity in introduction. Materials in the body generally sequenced. A minimum of 2500 words. Basic and sound standard of writing; some errors in punctuation, grammar and spelling. Inconsistencies with the formatting.	Topic, concepts and thesis are clearly conveyed in introduction. Materials in the body is logically and clearly sequenced. Very few weaknesses. Good standard of writing; few errors in punctuation, grammar and spelling. Almost correct format.	Topic, concepts and thesis are clearly outlined in introduction. Materials in the body is logically and clearly sequenced. Minor weaknesses. Very good standard of writing; few errors in punctuation, grammar and spelling. Almost correct format.	Topic, concepts and thesis are clearly outlined in introduction. Materials in the body is logically and clearly sequenced. Very minor, if any, weaknesses. Professional standard of writing; few errors in punctuation, grammar and spelling. Almost correct format.
Group and Good Organization 5	Group has serious issues with member engagement. Ideas are not exchanged. The group atmosphere is highly competitive and/or individualistic. Conflicts that arise are not dealt with or cannot be resolved and/or there are no effective group interactions. The group does not establish roles for each member and/or the workload is unequally distributed.	Group is only engaged with encouragement or not all members are engaged. Ideas may not be exchanged effectively. There is a general atmosphere of respect for group members, but some members of the group do not feel free to ask questions and contribute. There is no decision-making process, decisions are mainly made by individuals. No clear roles for each member, and/or the workload is unequally distributed.	Group is engaged but can be distracted. Ideas are exchanged with encouragement. There is a general atmosphere of respect for group members, but some members of the group do not feel free to ask questions and contribute. Members are generally able to resolve conflicts through open discussion with outside assistance. A procedure for making decision is established by the group, but it not clear and/or it focuses on individuals. The group establishes informal roles for each member. The workload could be distributed more equally.	Everyone is engaged most of the time. The exchange of ideas is effective most of the time. There is a general atmosphere of respect for all group members. The majority of group members feel free to ask questions and contribute. Members are generally able to resolve conflicts through open discussion. A clear procedure for making decisions is informally established by the group. The group establishes clear and formal roles for each member and distributes the workload equally.	Everyone is fully engaged with effective exchange of ideas. Members of the group share respect for each other. All members of the group feel free to ask questions and contribute. Conflicts are resolved with open dialogue and compromise. A clear procedure for making decisions is formally established by the group. The group establishes and documents clear and formal roles for each member and distributes the workload equally.
Referencing 10	No referencing is evident or, if done, is inconsistent and technically incorrect. No or minimal reference list, mixed styles. No in text citations. Lack of ethical use of sources to support ideas	Basic and sound attempt to reference sources; may be some inconsistencies and technical errors in style. Reference list is generally completed with 1 or 2 reference missing. Ethical use of sources to support ideas, well integrated, sources are credible and cited.	Good attempt to reference sources; inconsistencies and technical errors in style. Few inaccuracies in reference list and all references are listed. Ethical use of sources to support ideas, well integrated, sources are credible and cited.	Very good attempt to reference sources; very minor inconsistencies and technical errors in style. Thorough and consistent reference list and all references are listed. Ethical use of sources to support ideas, well integrated, sources are credible and cited.	Professional level of referencing and acknowledgment; no errors of style evident. Thorough and consistent reference list and all references are listed. Ethical use of sources to support ideas, well integrated, sources are credible and cited.
Individual Contribution (evaluated individually via Q&A in presentation) 5	Work is incomplete, inaccurate, or does not meet basic project requirements. Failing to achieve these 5 marks will result in an overall project failure.	Produces work that meets minimum requirements with frequent errors or gaps in quality.	Completes work to a satisfactory standard with occasional minor errors; meets project requirements.	Consistently delivers high-quality work with attention to detail, exceeding project requirements.	Produces outstanding, meticulous work that surpasses project expectations and contributes to project excellence.

*Workload Distribution (no marks assigned, only weight indicated)	If a student's contribution is below 20%, they will receive an F for this project. The final mark awarded will be either the actual group project mark or 49, whichever is lower.	If a student's contribution is between 20%-25%, they will receive an P or lower for this project. The final mark awarded will be either the actual group project mark or 64, whichever is lower.	For contributions of 25% or higher, the group project mark will be awarded as it is.
--	---	--	--

GENERAL NOTES FOR ASSESSMENT TASKS

Content for Assessment Task papers should incorporate a formal introduction, main points and conclusion.

Appropriate academic writing and referencing are inevitable academic skills that you must develop and demonstrate in work being presented for assessment. The content of high quality work presented by a student must be fully referenced within-text citations and a Reference List at the end. Kent strongly recommends you refer to the Academic Learning Support Workshop materials available on the Kent Learning Management System (Moodle). For details please click the link <http://moodle.kent.edu.au/kentmoodle/mod/folder/view.php?id=3606> and download the file titled "Harvard Referencing Workbook". This Moodle Site is the location for Workbooks and information that are presented to Kent Students in the ALS Workshops conducted at the beginning of each Trimester.

Kent recommends a minimum of **FIVE (5)** references in work being presented for assessment. Unless otherwise specifically instructed by your Lecturer or as detailed in the Unit Outline for the specific Assessment Task, any paper with less than five (5) references may be deemed not meeting a satisfactory standard and possibly be failed.

Content in Assessment tasks that includes sources that are not properly referenced according to the "*Harvard Referencing Workbook*" will be penalised.

Marks will be deducted for failure to adhere to the word count if this is specifically stated for the Assessment Task in the Unit Outline. As a general rule there is an allowable discretionary variance to the word count in that it is generally accepted that a student may go over or under by 10% than the stated length.

Use of generative artificial intelligence tools are not permitted to be used for this assessment. Please respect this and be aware that where unauthorized use is detected, it will be considered as academic misconduct and penalties will apply.

GENERAL NOTES FOR REFERENCING

References are assessed for their quality. Students should draw on quality academic sources, such as books, chapters from edited books, journals etc. The textbook for the Unit of study can be used as a reference, but not the Lecturer Notes. The Assessor will want to see evidence that a student is capable of conducting their own research. Also, in order to help Assessors determine a student's understanding of the work they cite, all in-text references (not just direct quotes) must include the specific page number(s) if shown in the original. Before preparing your Assessment Task or own contribution, please review this 'YouTube' video (Avoiding Plagiarism through Referencing) by clicking on the following link: <http://moodle.kent.edu.au/kentmoodle/mod/folder/view.php?id=3606>

A search for peer-reviewed journal articles may also assist students. These type of journal articles can be located in the online journal databases and can be accessed from the Kent Library homepage. Wikipedia, online dictionaries and online encyclopaedias are acceptable as a starting point to gain knowledge about a topic, but should not be over-used – these should constitute no more than 10% of your total list of references/sources. Additional information and literature can be used where these are produced by legitimate sources, such as government departments, research institutes such as the National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC), or international

organisations such as the World Health Organisation (WHO). Legitimate organisations and government departments produce peer reviewed reports and articles and are therefore very useful and mostly very current. The content of the following link explains why it is not acceptable to use non-peer reviewed websites (Why can't I just Google?): <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=N39mnu1Pkgw> (thank you to La Trobe University for access to this video).