Software Engineering Group Project

COMP2043.GRP

Session 07:

Report Writing & Peer Assessment

Overview

- Writing tips
- Notes on citations
- Peer assessment

Reports (1)

- Interim report due **5 December 2024**
- One common interim group report
  - Submit through Moodle
- Study the GRP Student Handbook very carefully regarding the report requirements

Reports (2)

- Team final reports due **2 April 2025**
  - One common final group report
  - Electronic copy (through Moodle)
- Individual final reports due **22 April 2025**
  - Electronic copy (through Moodle)
- Study the GRP Student Handbook very carefully regarding the requirements

General Writing Tips (1)

- Make sure you read the GRP Student Handbook for
  - expected content
  - suggested structure
  - size restrictions

(Applies to both group and individual reports)

General Writing Tips (2)

- Appoint an Editor:
  - Overall responsibility for document
  - Integrates contributions from all other writers
  - Ensures consistency (typesetting, layout, style of figures, language, . . .) and cohesiveness (that everything fits together)

General Writing Tips (3)

- Allow plenty of time: very hard for most people to write a really good report at the last minute
  - Iterate: go over the text again and again, trying to identify exactly what the message is of each piece of text, and then how to express that clearly and succinctly
  - Try to get feedback from outside the group, e.g. supervisor and friends
- You only have 7000–8000 words (20–25 pages)

Language

- Do use a spelling checker! (Obvious, but . . .)
- Strive for a clear language, appropriate in style for a technical document:
  - Prof. David Brailsford's do's and dont's (on Moodle)
  - Swap sections among the group members for proof reading

Typesetting and Layout (1)

- Keep it simple
- Number chapters, sections, figures, examples, pages
- Include a table of contents
- Use typographical devices like lists where this helps giving structure to the text and getting your message across

Typesetting and Layout (2)

- Adopt proper typographical conventions. e.g.:
  - Correct typesetting of mathematics
  - Program code and code fragments in a typewriter font.
    - Use italic (or possibly bold) for emphasis
  - Don't underline
  - Don't underline headings. Ugly!

- If you want to achieve truly professional results with relative ease, consider using **LaTeX**
  - (Your supervisor may insist that you use it …)

Content (1)

- Keep your audience in mind!
  - In this case, you are writing for a general CS audience
  - Ask yourselves: Would your fellow CS students understand?
- Aim to make the report reasonably self-contained
- Do use pictures, diagrams, examples to help getting your message across
  (But avoid gratuitous decoration!)

Content (2)

- Keep your writing focused!
  - Make sure everything you include is necessary and relevant:
    - What is the message?
    - How does it contribute to the whole?
  - Do use appendices for bulky material that is mainly needed for reference
- Make sure you use citations to:
  - correctly attribute sources
  - support your arguments and claims

Citation (1)

- Author-date (or "Harvard style") referencing is a good style:
  - "(Smith 2008)" or "(Smith 2009a, p. 1)", if citation not grammatically part of the sentence
  - "Smith (2008)" or "Smith (2009a, p. 1)" if it is
- See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Parenthetical_referencing
- Sort the list of references alphabetically by author(s), and year

Citation (2)

- Numerical keys in square brackets ("[3]") is an alternative, but hard to maintain by hand as numbers change when additions are made to the list of references
- Another alternative is alphanumerical keys systematically made up of letters from the author(s) last name(s) and publication year ("AMS style", "Authorship trigraph")
  - Easier to maintain by hand

Citation (3)

- Be aware that using a citation as part of a sentence is considered bad style:
  - BAD
    - In (Smith 2008) it is claimed . . .
    - In [2] it is claimed . . .
    - In [Smi08] it is claimed . . .
  - GOOD
    - Smith (2008) claims . . .
    - Smith [2] claims . . .
    - Smith [Smi08] claims . . .

Citing URLs

- If you must cite web pages:
- Give URL along with date when the page was accessed.
- Consider using an On-demand Archiving System such as WebCite, http://www.webcitation.org/:
  - free(!)
  - archives the web page in question
  - provides a stable URL to the archived copy

Recap: COMP2043.GRP Assessment I

Group Task	Weight
Group Project Site	2%
Completion of Ethical Approval	3%
Interim Group Report	15%
Final Group Report	30%
Software & Documentation	15%
Demonstration	10%
Presentation	10%
Q&A	10%
Promotional Digital Artefact	5%

Recap: COMP2043.GRP Assessment II

Overall Individual Mark

Task Marks	
Individual Mark for Group Work	80%
Individual Report	20%

Recap: COMP2043.GRP Assessment III

- Main parts of the Individual Report:
  - Summary of own individual contribution to the project
  - Reflection on the project and own role within it
  - Peer assessment
  - See an example of a reflection (not "perfect"):
    - https://15writers.com/sample-reports/personal-reflection-report/

Peer Assessment (1)

- Each team member evaluates all other team members along a number of dimensions:
  - Research and Information gathering
  - Creative input
  - Co-operation within group
  - Communication within group
  - Concrete contribution
  - Attendance at meetings
- The assessments are part of the individual report and is in strict confidence

Peer Assessment (2)

- The peer ratings are used as follows:
  - An Individual Received Numerical Peer Rating (IRNPR) is computed for each group member
    - This is a weighted average of all received ratings from the peers
  - The average IRNPR is computed for each group
  - The Individual Mark for Group Work is finally computed by scaling the Collective Group Mark according to how much above or below the group average each individual's IRNPR is

Peer Assessment (3)

- Example:
  - Suppose that the Collective Group Mark is 65
  - Suppose further that the IRNPRs are 75, 65, 55, 55, 50
  - The average IRNPR for this group is thus 60
  - The Individual Marks for Group Work would then be along the lines 75, 68, 62, 62, 59
- Note that the average of the Individual Marks for Group Work equals the Collective Group Mark

Peer Assessment Form

	None	Lacking	Adequate	Good	Excellent
Research & information gathering					
Creative input					
Co-operation within group					
Communication within group					
Concrete contribution					
Attendance at meetings					

Justification of assigned ratings:

Concrete contribution: Quality and quantity of concrete contribution to *group deliverables*: writing, coding, testing, open day display, preparations for presentations, etc.

Note: a written justification is also required.

How to Interpret the Form? (1)

- Adequate signifies having performed as well as can be expected. For example, a member who:
  - carried out a fair share of the work (9h/week!)
  - was reasonable, approachable, friendly
  - attended most meetings, mostly on-time, absent only with good cause
- Good and Excellent signify performance above and very much above this level, respectively
- Lacking and None signify performance below and very much below this level, respectively

How to Interpret the Form? (2)

- It is not uncommon that a couple of peers excel in one or two respects
- It would be unusual for a peer of yours to be excellent in all respects
- It would be very unusual for all of your peers to be excellent in all respects
- **If you don't submit, it is interpreted as top marks to all teammates!**

How to Interpret the Form? (3)

Assesment of a typical group mate:

	None	Lacking	Adequate	Good	Excellent
Research & information gathering			x		
Creative input		x			
Co-operation within group			x		
Communication within group					x
Concrete contribution			x		
Attendance at meetings				x	

Justification of assigned ratings:

John generally pulled his weight throughout the project, delivering his fair share of work to a good standard in a timely way. However, he did take a bit of a backseat in the design discussions. On the other hand, he later greatly facilitated communication within the group. He missed a few meetings, but always with good cause.

Vetting of Peer Assessment

- The peer assessments are vetted by the supervisor to ensure the process has been carried out in a fair and serious manner

- If there is reason to believe this is not the case, the supervisor will discuss with the module convenor, and together they can decide to:
  - adjust individual peer ratings as necessary, or
  - disregard all peer ratings and assign individual marks directly

Peer Assessment: Implications

- It is a great privilege to be allowed to do this
- You should consider the implications
  - Ensure your hard work is seen and appreciated
  - …
- Don't try to cheat the system

- Enjoy~