

Cardiff School of Technologies

Assessment Brief

Module Code

Module Title

CIS7008

Technology Project Management

Academic Year

Semester

2022/2023

1

Module Leader email

hkahtan@cardiffmet.ac.uk

Content

CONTENT.....	1
ASSESSMENT DETAILS	3
SUBMISSION DETAILS	4
ASSESSMENT CRITERIA	5
FURTHER INFORMATION.....	10
Preparing for placement.....	10
Equality and diversity	10
Students with additional requirements.....	10

Who can answer questions about my assessment?	11
Referencing and independent learning	11
Technical submission problems	12
Extensions and mitigating circumstances	12
Unfair academic practice.....	12
How is my work graded?	13

Assessment Details

Assessment title	Abr.	Weighting
A case study report of an information technology/information systems project	WRIT2	50 %

Pass marks are 40% for undergraduate work and 50% for postgraduate work unless stated otherwise.

Task/assessment brief:

WRIT 2 is a team submission

Students work as a team and each team must identify and investigate a case project. When selecting the project, the team should consider a range of factors such as the scale and scope of the project, availability of and access of adequate information about the project and the team members familiarity with the work involved.

Students can select their own information technology/information systems case project. Students develop the case study through various workshop activities.

Please refer to the CIS7008 Technology project management handbook for more details on the workshop activities.

Expected report content:- An outline of the key aspects on the case project Information used in selecting the project and the benefits in studying the project. Analysis and major challenges associated with the management of project and effectiveness of the PM tools in managing those. Risk and benefits associated with the project and major outcomes of the project. Project management lessons learned from studying the case project.

Each team will have a team leader who will coordinate the submission of the report. Team members will have to jointly prepare the report and each student will have to ensure that the team leader will have all the required content well before the submission deadline.

Word count (or equivalent):

2000

This a reflection of the effort required for the assessment. Word counts will normally include any text, tables, calculations, figures, subtitles and citations. Reference lists and contents of appendices are excluded from the word count. Contents of appendices are not usually considered when determining your final assessment grade.

Below is the expected content of the case study report (2000 words);

The following showcases the main features of the case study report and is provided as one example.

- Introduction to your case project.
- Rationale in selecting your case project and benefits of studying the project.
- Your research methodology in studying this case project.
- Project management principles and project implementation strategy of your case project
- Risks and benefits associated with the project
- Major outcomes of the project

- Major challenges associated with the management of the project and the effectiveness of the project management tools in managing those
- Project management lessons learned from the project
- Conclusion
- References

More details on fair contribution marks, guidelines and marking template are provided in the Module Moodle site.

Submission Details

Submission Deadline:	Week 12	Estimated Feedback Return Date	This will normally be 20 working days after initial submission.
Submission Time:	By 4.00pm on the deadline day.		
Moodle/Turnitin:	Any assessments submitted after the deadline will not be marked and will be recorded as a non-attempt unless you have had an extension request agreed or have approved mitigating circumstances. See the School Moodle pages for more information on extensions and mitigating circumstances.		
File Format:	The assessment must be submitted as a pdf document (save the document as a pdf in your software) and submit through the Turnitin submission point in Moodle.		
	<p>Your assessment should be titled with your:</p> <p>student ID number, module code and assessment ID, e.g. st12345678 BHL5007 WRIT2</p>		
Feedback	<p>Feedback for the assessment will be provided electronically via Moodle. Feedback will be provided with comments on your strengths and the areas which you can improve. View the guidance on how to access your feedback.</p> <p>All marks are provisional and are subject to quality assurance processes and confirmation at the programme Examination Board.</p>		

Assessment Criteria

Learning outcomes assessed

- LO1** Critically evaluate techniques for managing people, mitigating risk, estimating cost and ensuring quality and methodologies for project management
- LO2** Critically review balances between project variables, such as time, cost, quality and scope
- LO3** Identify key management processes, stakeholders, as well as organisational factors relating to the management of information technology projects.
- LO4** Demonstrate proficiency in applying a range of project management concepts, tools and techniques to facilitate the delivery of desired outcomes in information technology projects.

This assessment is designed to demonstrate a student's completion of the following Learning Outcomes:

Case Study Report Content		Objectives	Marks
Title page			*
Introduction	- Introduction to the case project. A justification should be provided on why this case study was chosen and why it is important to investigate.	Plan, monitor and control small scale technology projects. (LO1,LO2)	5
Case Study Selection	- Rationale in selecting the case project and the benefits of studying the project.	Determine the resource requirements of projects in a range of domains. (LO1,LO2)	4
Research Methodology	- Detailed research methodology in studying this case project.		4
Project Management	- Definition of project management principles and a detailed project implementation strategy for the case project.	Select and make use of appropriate software and approaches for project management functions and estimate effort using modelling techniques. (LO3,LO4)	6
Risks and Benefits	- Identification of risks and benefits associated with the project		6
Outcomes	- Highlighting the major outcomes of the project		4
Challenges	- Identification of the major challenges associated with the management of the project and the effectiveness of the project management tools in managing those challenges	Critically evaluate the main theories and principles of software quality assurance and metrics, software reuse and business process re-engineering (LO1,LO2,LO3,LO4)	6
Lessons Learned	- Identification of the lessons learned from managing this project.		6
Conclusion	- Summarizing the overall case study processes.	Plan, monitor and control small scale technology projects. (LO1,LO2)	5
References			*
Appendices			*
Writing	Evidence of: Format: Arial 12pt, 1.5 line spaced, justified; Pagination; Grammar, spelling, punctuation; Writing style (sentence structure, paragraph structure, flow of narrative)		4
Total			50

Other skills/attributes developed

This includes elements of the Cardiff Met EDGE (Ethical, Digital, Global and Entrepreneurial skills) and other attributes developed in students through the completion of the module and assessment. These will also be highlighted in the module guidance, which should be read by all students completing the module. Assessments are not just a way of auditing student knowledge. They are a process which provides additional learning and development through the preparation for and completion of the assessment.

This module assessment provides opportunities for students to demonstrate development of the following EDGE Competencies:

- Ethical concerns of team management and human centred approaches to conflict resolution.
- Digital management methods are examined and used throughout the module and tasks.
- Perspectives of global software development (GSD) are examined and discussed. Task involves reasoning of multi-cultural teams in multiple countries.
- How Project Management can be used to assist tight budgets and the entrepreneurial development.

Marking/Assessment Criteria

70 – 100% (Distinction)	The requirements detailed in the specification are met fully. An excellent critique of the three chosen papers that effectively focuses on the overall effectiveness and usefulness of the work it is critiquing. Excellent integration and balance of your opinion to produce reasonable and convincing arguments that are backed up with quality arguments and research. An excellent introduction and conclusion. The report is excellently presented, coherently written, with a good logical flow of content. In particular, the contents laid out are all present and are of a high standard. The report is formatted to contain all relevant sections. Higher grades of A will show evidence of creativity & extra effort such as reading around the subject or commenting on the merits or otherwise of the system/research documented.
60-69% (Merit)	The requirements detailed in the specification are almost fully met. A good critique of the three chosen papers that has (in many places) effectively focused on the overall effectiveness and usefulness of the work it is critiquing. Good integration and balance of your opinion. Reasonable and convincing arguments that are backed up with quality arguments and research. A good introduction and conclusion. The report is well presented, coherently written, with a good logical flow of content. The report is formatted to contain all relevant sections. The content will be complete and will be to a competent but less exacting standard than for a 70+. In general, the report will contain all the essential sections, it will be well-written, but the high standard may be less consistent in some sections of the report than others.
50-59% (Pass)	The requirements detailed in the specification are somewhat met. A fairly good critique of the three chosen papers that has in a few places focused on the overall effectiveness and usefulness of the work it is critiquing. A fairly good integration and balance of your opinion to produce fairly reasonable and convincing arguments that are backed up with some quality arguments and research. A fairly good introduction and conclusion. The report is fairly well presented and written, with a fairly good logical flow of content. In particular, the contents laid out are all present and are of a fairly good standard. The content will be somewhat complete and will be of an acceptable level. The report will contain all the essential sections, written to a fairly good level.
40-49% (Fail)	The requirements detailed in the specification have not been met or poorly met in places. An incomplete/ not effective/ non-existent critique of the three chosen papers that has no focus on the overall effectiveness and usefulness of the work it

	is critiquing. A very poor integration and balance of your opinion, poor arguments that are not backed up with quality arguments and research. A poor/average introduction and conclusion. Overall, the report is poor (both in terms of presentation and writing), with no logical flow of content. Content and presentation are lacking in most aspects.
<35% (Clear Fail)	The requirements detailed in the specification have not been met. No critique of the three chosen papers is present. No focus on the overall effectiveness and usefulness of the work it is critiquing has been provided. No integration and balance of your opinion, very poor arguments that are not backed up with quality arguments and research. A poor introduction and conclusion. Overall, the report is very poor (both in terms of presentation and writing), with no logical flow of content. Content and presentation are lacking in all aspects.

Further Information on assessment, referencing and grading can be found in the Module Handbook (on Moodle)

Marking/Assessment Criteria

Questions	<35% Clear Fail	35-39% Fail	40-49% 3rd	50-59% 2:2	60-69% 2:1	>70% 1st
Introduction (5%)	A very poor or no introduction; A very poor (or no) context is provided; A very poor (or no) justification provided of why this case study was chosen and why it is important to investigate.	A poor introduction; A poor context is provided; A poor justification is provided on why this case study was chosen and why it is important to investigate.	An average introduction; An average context is provided; An average justification is provided for why this case study was chosen and why it is important to investigate.	A fairly clear introduction; A good context provided; A good justification is provided for why this case study was chosen and why it is important to investigate.	A clear introduction; A very good context provided; A very good justification is provided for why this case study was chosen and why it is important to investigate.	A very clear introduction; Excellent context; Excellent justification is provided on why this case study was chosen and why it is important to investigate.
Case Study Selection (4%)	A very poor or no case study selection; A very poor (or no) context is provided; A very poor (or no) justification is provided for selecting this case project and the benefits of studying it.	A poor case study selection; A poor context is provided; A poor justification provided for selecting this case project and the benefits of studying the project.	An average case study selection; An average context is provided; An average justification is provided for selecting this case project and the benefits of studying the project.	A fairly clear case study selection; A good context provided; A good justification is provided for selecting this case project and the benefits of studying the project.	A clear case study selection; A very good context is provided; A very good justification is provided for selecting this case project and the benefits of studying the project.	A very clear case study selection; Excellent context; Excellent justification provided in selecting this case project and the benefits of studying the project.
Research Methodology (4%)	A very poor or no research methodology; A very poor (or no) context is provided; A very poor (or no) detailed research methodology is used in studying this case project.	A poor research methodology; A poor context is provided; A poor detailed research methodology is used in studying this case project.	An average research methodology; An average context is provided; An average detailed research methodology is used in studying this case project.	A fairly clear research methodology; A good context provided; A good detailed research methodology is used in studying this case project.	A clear research methodology; A very good context provided; A very good detailed research methodology is used in studying this case project.	A very clear research methodology; Excellent context; Excellent detailed research methodology is used in studying this case project.
Project Management (6%)	A very poor or no project management; A very poor (or no) context is provided; A very poor (or no) definition of project management principles and a detailed project implementation strategy for the case project.	A poor project management; A poor context is provided; A poor definition of project management principles and a detailed project implementation strategy for the case project.	An average project management; An average context is provided; An average definition of project management principles and a detailed project implementation strategy for the case project.	A fairly clear project management; A good context provided; A good definition of project management principles and a detailed project implementation strategy for the case project.	A clear project management; A very good context provided; A very good definition of project management principles and a detailed project implementation strategy for the case project.	A very clear project management; Excellent context; Excellent definition of project management principles and a detailed project implementation strategy for the case project.
Risks and Benefits (6%)	A very poor or no risks and benefits; A very poor (or no) context is provided; A very poor (or no) identification of risks and benefits associated with the project.	A poor risks and benefits; A poor context is provided; A poor identification of risks and benefits associated with the project.	An average risks and benefits; An average context is provided; An average identification of risks and benefits associated with the project.	A fairly clear risks and benefits; A good context provided; A good identification of risks and benefits associated with the project.	A clear risks and benefits; A very good context provided; A very good identification of risks and benefits associated with the project.	A very clear risks and benefits; Excellent context; Excellent identification of risks and benefits associated with the project.
Outcomes (4%)	A very poor or no outcomes; A very poor (or no) context is provided; A very poor (or no) highlighting the major outcomes of the project.	A poor outcomes; A poor context is provided; A poor highlighting the major outcomes of the project.	An average outcomes; An average context is provided; An average highlighting the major outcomes of the project.	A fairly clear outcomes; A good context provided; A good highlighting the major outcomes of the project.	A clear outcomes; A very good context provided; A very good highlighting the major outcomes of the project.	A very clear outcomes; Excellent context; Excellent highlighting the major outcomes of the project.

Challenges (6%)	A very poor or no challenges; A very poor (or no) context is provided; A very poor (or no) identification of the major challenges associated with the management of the project and the effectiveness of the project management tools in managing those challenges.	A poor challenges; A poor context is provided; A poor identification of the major challenges associated with the management of the project and the effectiveness of the project management tools in managing those challenges.	An average challenges; An average context is provided; An average identification of the major challenges associated with the management of the project and the effectiveness of the project management tools in managing those challenges.	A fairly clear challenges; A good context provided; A good identification of the major challenges associated with the management of the project and the effectiveness of the project management tools in managing those challenges.	A clear challenges; A very good context provided; A very good identification of the major challenges associated with the management of the project and the effectiveness of the project management tools in managing those challenges.	A very clear challenges; Excellent context; Excellent identification of the major challenges associated with the management of the project and the effectiveness of the project management tools in managing those challenges.
Lessons Learned (6%)	A very poor or no lessons learned; A very poor (or no) context is provided; A very poor (or no) identification of the lessons learned from managing this project.	A poor lesson learned; A poor context is provided; A poor identification of the lessons learned from managing this project.	An average lesson learned; An average context is provided; An average identification of the lessons learned from managing this project.	A fairly clear lessons learned; A good context provided; A good identification of the lessons learned from managing this project.	A clear lesson learned; A very good context provided; A very good identification of the lessons learned from managing this project.	A very clear lessons learned; Excellent context; Excellent identification of the lessons learned from managing this project.
Conclusion (5%)	A very poor summary. A summary with little or no detail, no depth and no insight that covers none of the relevant points of the case study processes.	A poor summary. A summary with little detail, depth and insight that covers very few of the relevant points of the case study processes.	An average summary. A summary with average detail, depth and insight that covers a few of the relevant points of the case study processes.	A good and fairly convincing summary. A somewhat detailed, in-depth and insightful summary that covers some of the relevant points of the case study processes.	A very good and convincing summary. A detailed, in-depth and insightful summary that covers nearly all of the relevant points of the case study processes.	Excellent and very convincing summary. A detailed, in-depth and insightful summary that covers all of the relevant points of the case study processes.
Writing (4%)	Very Poor format: Arial 12pt, 1.5 line spaced, justified; Pagination; Very poor grammar, spelling, punctuation; Very poor writing style (sentence structure, paragraph structure, flow of narrative)	Poor format: Arial 12pt, 1.5 line spaced, justified; Pagination; Poor grammar, spelling, punctuation; Poor writing style (sentence structure, paragraph structure, flow of narrative)	Average formatting: Arial 12pt, 1.5 line spaced, justified; Pagination; Average grammar, spelling, punctuation; Average writing style (sentence structure, paragraph structure, flow of narrative)	Good formatting: Arial 12pt, 1.5 line spaced, justified; Pagination; Good grammar, spelling, punctuation; Good writing style (sentence structure, paragraph structure, flow of narrative)	Very good formatting: Arial 12pt, 1.5 line spaced, justified; Pagination; Very good grammar, spelling, punctuation; Very good writing style (sentence structure, paragraph structure, flow of narrative)	Excellent format: Arial 12pt, 1.5 line spaced, justified; Pagination; Excellent grammar, spelling, punctuation; Excellent writing style (sentence structure, paragraph structure, flow of narrative)

Further Information

Preparing for placement

As detailed in the [Academic Handbook](#), Cardiff Metropolitan University will ensure that a risk assessment of the work-based or placement learning opportunity is completed before you commence the opportunity. We will also ensure that a written agreement setting out the responsibilities of all parties exists between the university, the student and the work-based or placement learning provider.

You will need to complete the necessary pre-placement preparation as directed and please speak with your Module Leader if there's anything that you're uncertain about. All pre-placement preparation needs to be completed prior to commencing placement. Until the necessary documentation is completed, any placement activity will not be recognised by the university.

Equality and diversity

Cardiff Metropolitan University is committed to promoting and implementing best practice in Equality and Diversity (E&D) in order to provide a working and learning environment to enable both staff and students to reach their full potential.

We wish to work beyond the legislative requirements in the delivery of E&D policies, and aim for equality of opportunity to be embedded in everything we do. Cardiff Metropolitan University is an organisation where diversity is valued,

equality is promoted and services are delivered to support all staff and students.

The University is aware of the need to recognise people's identities as multi-dimensional and is committed to providing a positive working and learning environment free from discrimination, harassment, and victimisation on the grounds of age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion and belief, sex or sexual orientation.

As a placement student, you are bound by the same policies and we expect you to treat peers, colleagues, university staff, and all others with dignity and respect at all times. Should you have any concerns regarding this, please contact your Module Leader.

Students with additional requirements

Cardiff Metropolitan University and placement providers are required to ensure equality of opportunity for all students. To support student needs, we and placement providers will make 'reasonable adjustments' and ensure proportional changes to processes and procedures to provide an accessible working and learning environment.

'Reasonable adjustments' are the adjustments made by educational and placement providers to ensure equality for students or employees with a disability. These adjustments could be removing physical barriers or providing certain aids

or equipment. Reasonable adjustments in education can include allowing students to audio-record lectures or have longer time within exams. The requirements of your module and placement need to be adhered to by all students, however reasonable adjustments can adapt how the requirements are achieved.

In order to adhere to the Equality Act, if you have disclosed in your placement preparation that you have a mental or physical disability and are being supported by the Cardiff Metropolitan University Wellbeing Service, your additional needs in relation to placement will be discussed with a relevant member of staff. The impact of your disability will be discussed and reasonable adjustments for placements will be identified and considered. With your permission, we will disclose this information to your placement provider to ensure they can support your needs.

This information (with your consent) is also shared with Cardiff Metropolitan Wellbeing Service to ensure parity and effective support.

We strongly advise that you remain open, honest and proactive regarding any difficulties that may occur within your placement and keep Cardiff Metropolitan staff updated so that we can support you appropriately.

You have the right not to disclose your disability in your preparation for placement, and you may elect not to attend a meeting to discuss its impact. However, in this instance we will not be able to support you or make adjustments

and this could impact on your placement experience and overall performance.

In some cases, students may have a condition which they do not regard as a disability, however if adjustments are required within their placements in order to manage this condition, students will be required to disclose this through Student Services. We are unable to make adjustments without an assessment of need having been made.

Who can answer questions about my assessment?

Questions about the assessment should be directed to the staff member who has set the task/assessment brief. This will usually be the Module Leader. They will be happy to answer any queries you have.

Staff members can often provide feedback on an assignment plan but cannot review any drafts of your work prior to submission. The only exception to this rule is for Dissertation Supervisors to provide feedback on a draft of your dissertation.

Referencing and independent learning

Please ensure you reference a range of credible sources, with due attention to the academic literature in the area. The time spent on research and reading from good quality sources will be reflected in the quality of your submitted work.

Remember that what you get out of university depends on what you put in. Your teaching sessions typically represent between 10% and 30% of the time you are expected to study for your degree. A 20-credit module represents 200 hours of study time. The rest of your time should be taken up by self-directed study.

Unless stated otherwise you must use the **HARVARD** referencing system. Further guidance on referencing can be found in the Study Smart area on Moodle and at www.citethemrightonline.com (use your university login details to access the site). Correct referencing is an easy way to improve your marks and essential in achieving higher grades on most assessments.

Technical submission problems

It is strongly advised that you submit your work at least 24 hours before the deadline to allow time to resolve any last minute problems you might have. If you are having issues with IT or Turnitin you should contact the IT Helpdesk on (+44) 2920 417000. You may require evidence of the Helpdesk call if you are trying to demonstrate that a fault with Moodle or Turnitin was the cause of a late submission.

Extensions and mitigating circumstances

Short extensions on assessment deadlines can be requested in specific circumstances. If you are encountering particular hardship which has been affecting your studies, then you may be able to apply for mitigating circumstances. This can give the teachers on your programme more scope to adapt the assessment requirements to support your needs. Extensions and mitigating circumstances policies and procedures are regularly updated. You should refer to your degree programme or school Moodle pages for information on extensions and mitigating circumstances.

Unfair academic practice

Cardiff Met takes issues of unfair practice **extremely seriously**. The University has procedures and penalties for dealing with unfair academic practice. These are

explained in full in the University's Unfair Practice regulations and procedures under [Volume 1, Section 8](#) of the Academic Handbook. The Module Leader reserves the right to interview students regarding any aspect of their work submitted for assessment.

Types of Unfair Practice, include:

Plagiarism, which can be defined as using without acknowledgement another person's words or ideas and submitting them for assessment as though it were one's own work, for instance by copying, translating from one language to another or unacknowledged paraphrasing. Further examples include:

- Use of any quotation(s) from the published or unpublished work of other persons, whether published in textbooks, articles, the Web, or in any other format, where quotations have not been clearly identified as such by being placed in quotation marks and acknowledged.
- Use of another person's words or ideas that have been slightly changed or paraphrased to make it look different from the original.
- Summarising another person's ideas, judgments, diagrams, figures, or computer programmes without reference to that person in the text and the source in a bibliography/reference list.
- Use of assessment writing services, essay banks and/or any other similar agencies (NB. Students are commonly being blackmailed after using essay mills).
- Use of unacknowledged material downloaded from the Internet.
- Re-use of one's own material except as authorised by your degree programme.

Collusion, which can be defined as when work that that has been undertaken with others is submitted and passed off as solely

the work of one person. Modules will clearly identify where joint preparation and joint submission are permitted, in all other cases they are not.

Fabrication of data, making false claims to have carried out experiments, observations, interviews or other forms of data collection and analysis, or acting dishonestly in any other way.

How is my work graded?

Assessment grading is subject to thorough quality control processes. You can view a summary of these processes on the [Assessment Explained Infographic](#).

Grading of work at each level of Cardiff Met degree courses is benchmarked against a set of general requirements set out in [Volume 1, Section 4.3](#) of our Academic Handbook. A simplified version of these Grade Band Descriptors (GBDs) with short videos explaining some of the academic terminology used can be accessed for [Foundation](#), [1st year](#), [2nd year](#) and [3rd year](#) undergraduate and [MSc programmes](#).

We would strongly recommend looking at the [Study Smart](#) area of Moodle to find out more about assessments and key academic skills which can have a significant impact on your grades. Always check your work thoroughly before submission.



Cardiff Met
MetCaerdydd