



# Coursework Assessment Brief

## *Academic Year 2014-15*

|   |  |                          |
|---|--|--------------------------|
| <b>Module:</b>  | <b>CMP5215: Software Design UG2</b>  |                          |
| <b>Assessment Title:</b>  | Group Project.   |                          |
| <b>Assessment Identifier:</b>   | <b>CWRK</b>  | Weighting: Weighting 40% |
| <b>School:</b>  | Computing, Telecommunication and Networks (CTN)  |                          |
| <b>Module Co-ordinator:</b>   | Professor Zhiming Liu  |                          |
| <b>Hand in deadline date:</b>   | 21/04/2015   |                          |
| <b>Hand back date:</b>  | 08/05/2015   |                          |
| <b>Re-assessment hand in deadline date:</b>                               | 29 <sup>th</sup> June 2015 at 2:00pm   |                          |
| <b>Support available for students required to submit a re-assessment:</b> | Timetabled revisions sessions will be arranged for the period immediately preceding the hand in date   |                          |
| <b>NOTE:</b>  | At the first assessment attempt, the full range of marks is available. At the re-assessment attempt the mark is capped and the maximum mark that can be achieved is 40%.   |                          |
| <b>Assessment Summary</b>   | <p>The Coursework Assessments is in the form of a Team Project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5 (at most 6) students form a small software design project team;</li> <li>• The project description and requirements are provided in the Moodle site of the module.</li> <li>• The team project includes the project management that will keep a record of attendance of project team meetings, and this is basis for assessment of individual team member's diligence;</li> <li>• The project submission is a group project report that includes the requirements models (or specification), the design models (or specification), and the relation between the design, the critical evaluation, use of tools and project management report.</li> <li>• The assessment criteria are defined by the four components: Requirements analysis (<b>r</b>), Design (<b>d</b>), Critical evaluation (<b>e</b>), and Use of tool (<b>t</b>). The marks on these components are equally given to the student of each project team. A mark of Diligence (<b>m</b>) is given to each individual student according to the project management</li> </ul> |                          |

report.

- The total mark for any individual student is calculated by the formula

$$\text{total} = m+r+d+e+t$$

The assessment criteria is given in the **Table of Assessment Criteria and Associated Grading Criteria** later in this brief.

## IMPORTANT STATEMENTS

### ***Standard Undergraduate Assessment Regulations***

From the start of the 2014/15 academic year, your studies will be governed by version 5 of the Standard Undergraduate Assessment Regulations (SUAR 5).

Under these regulations you are permitted two attempts at assessment for each module: a first sit and re-assessment attempt.

This means that you will be required to withdraw from the course if, following the reassessment attempt, you have not passed.

### ***Cheating and Plagiarism***

Both cheating and plagiarism are totally unacceptable and the University maintains a strict policy against them. It is YOUR responsibility to be aware of this policy and to act accordingly. Please refer to the Academic Registry Guidance at <https://icity.bcu.ac.uk/Academic-Registry/Information-for-Students/Assessment/Avoiding-Allegations-of-Cheating>

The basic principles are:

- Don't pass off anyone else's work as your own, including work from "essay banks". This is plagiarism and is viewed extremely seriously by the University.
- Don't submit a piece of work in whole or in part that has already been submitted for assessment elsewhere. This is called duplication and, like plagiarism, is viewed extremely seriously by the University.
- Always acknowledge all of the sources that you have used in your coursework assignment or project.
- If you are using the exact words of another person, always put them in quotation marks.
- Check that you know whether the coursework is to be produced individually or whether you can work with others.
- If you are doing group work, be sure about what you are supposed to do on your own.
- Never make up or falsify data to prove your point.
- Never allow others to copy your work.
- Never lend disks, memory sticks or copies of your coursework to any other student in the University; this may lead you being accused of collusion.

By submitting coursework, either physically or electronically, you are confirming that it is your own work (or, in the case of a group submission, that it is the result of joint work undertaken by members of the group that you represent) and that you have read and understand the University's guidance on plagiarism and cheating.

Students should be aware that, at the discretion of the module co-ordinator, coursework may be submitted to an electronic detection system in order to help ascertain if any plagiarised material is present.

## **Electronic Submission of Work**

Students should also be aware that it is their responsibility to ensure that work submitted in electronic format can be opened on a faculty computer and to check that any electronic submissions have been successfully uploaded. If it cannot be opened it will not be marked. Any required file formats will be specified in the assignment brief and failure to comply with these submission requirements will result in work not being marked.

Students must retain a copy of all electronic work they have submitted and resubmit if requested.

### **Learning Outcomes to be Assessed:**

- 1. Experience of team work in software design;**
- 2. Basic understanding, techniques and use of UML of requirements modelling and analysis;**
- 3. Basic understanding, techniques and use of UML in software design;**
- 4. Experience in team project management;**
- 5. The use of a CASE tool for creating models.**

### **Assessment Details:**

Enter a description of the assessment or where the assessment can be found (e.g. online tests)

The moodle site of the module at <http://moodle.bcu.ac.uk/course/view.php?id=3175>

### **Assessment Criteria:**

Enter a description of the assessment criteria

**Table of Assessment Criteria and Associated Grading Criteria**

| <b>Assessment Criteria</b><br>→               | <b>1. Diligence</b>  | <b>2. Requirements</b>   | <b>3. Designs</b>   | <b>4. Critical Evaluation</b>   | <b>5. use of Tool</b>    |
|---|--|--|---|---|--------------------------|
| <b>Weighting:</b>                             | <b>20</b>  | <b>25</b>  | <b>25</b>   | <b>15</b>   | <b>15</b>                |
| <b>Grading Criteria</b><br><br><b>0 – 29%</b> | No much attendance, evidence of no much contribution or disruptive behaviour | No evidence of systematic requirements analysis, no significant requirements identified and modelled | No evidence of systematic design of any use case, only some sketchy design of some operations | No or unacceptable evaluation of models – consistency, completeness and correctness. No checking. | Near to zero use of tool |

|                 |  |   |  |  |   |
|-----------------|--|---|--|--|---|
| <b>30 – 39%</b> | About 50% or less attendance to project meetings and team activities, made some contribution to the team work, and no evidence of serious disruptive behaviour | At least one significant use case and some signification functionality, only sketchy models of the functionality in the project description.                        | Systematic design of a couple of use cases, with reasonable collaboration diagrams or design sequence diagrams                         | Major deficiencies in presentation and discussion of the quality of the models, and justification of decision making. No checking is done. | Some attempts but evidence of little practice in creating models using the tool |
| <b>40 – 49%</b> | Attended a majority of the project meeting and team activities, made reasonable contribution, and no evidence disruptive behaviour                             | A couple of significant use cases involving signification functionality, at least a reasonable class diagram  | Systematics designs a couple of use cases, with good collaboration or sequence models  | Reasonable presentation, some basic evaluations but significant shortcomings exists, no checking is done.                                  | Evidence of basic use of the tool   |
| <b>50 – 59%</b> | Good attendance of project meetings and team activities, reasonably committed, reliable, responsible and collaborative   | Good description of several important use cases, a meaningful use case diagram, a couple reasonable use case sequence diagrams, and a reasonably good class diagram | Systematic designs a couple of use cases, with good collaboration or sequence diagrams, and basic understanding of the design patterns | Presentation is clear, some basic evaluation of the models and checking  | Most diagrams are generated by the tool   |

|                  |  |   |   |  |  |
|------------------|--|---|---|--|--|
| <b>60 – 69%</b>  | Attendance of most project meetings, good commitment, reliability and responsibility, and quite good collaboration | Fairly good set of related use cases and operations identified, good use case diagram, some good use case sequence diagrams, good class diagrams, some contracts of system operations | Systematic design of a good set of related use cases, with their collaboration or sequence diagram, evidence of reasonable understanding of the design patterns | Good presentation, with justification of decision-making, fair amount of quality discussion of models, and some checking is done.  | Nearly diagrams are created by the tool  |
| <b>70 – 79%</b>  | Very good attendance, very good commitment, reliability and responsibility, and very good collaborative            | Good use case descriptions, meaningful use case diagrams, system sequence diagrams, a good class diagram and a fair amount of meaningful contracts of use case operations             | Systematic design of the majority of the use cases with their collaboration or sequence diagrams, evidence of good understanding of the design patterns         | Very clear and well structured presentation, good and clear justification of decision making, clear evaluation of the models and discussions of their relations, evidence of consistency and completeness checking | Demonstrated good understanding and practice of the full functionality of the tool             |
| <b>80 – 100%</b> | Nearly full attendance of project meetings, fully committed, reliable and responsible and collaborative            | A comprehensive and coherent requirements model presented   | A comprehensive and coherent requirements model presented, evidence of good understanding of the design patterns  | Very well structured and clear good presentation, coherent and comprehensive justification of decision-making, and quality control of the requirements and design processes  | Comprehensive use of the tool with critical and constructive evaluation of the tool summarised |

|                  |                                   |  |   |   |  |
|------------------|-----------------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| <b>Checklist</b> | The section of project management | Coverage of use cases, and points of discussion in the project description | Coverage of use cases, and point of discussion in the project description | Coverage of use cases, system operations, design patterns as well as points discussion in the project description | Models in the reports, and critical evaluation of the tool |
|------------------|-----------------------------------|--|---|---|--|

**Resources:**

Any resources required for this task will be made available on the module's moodle website as required.

Please make sure you visit this resource regularly as it may be used to provide additional information and updates on previously given information, for you to progress with your allocated task.

**Submission Details:**

The submission is the final team project reports by Moodle upload in PDF or Microsoft Word Document.

**Workload:**

*The final project report is required to, in addition to the UML diagrams required in the project description, have over 3000 words for discussion of concepts, techniques, justification of decision making, explanation of the meaning of the UML diagrams, etc.*

*You should specify the notional hours that a typical student would be expected to take to pass this assignment*

**Feedback:**

*Provide information on how feedback will be provided for each assessment and the statement*

Marks and Feedback on your work will normally be provided within 20 working days of its submission deadline.