

This document is for Coventry University students for their own use in completing their assessed work for this module and should not be passed to third parties or posted on any website. Any infringements of this rule should be reported to facultyregistry.eec@coventry.ac.uk.

Faculty of Engineering, Environment and Computing 206CDE Real World Project



Assignment Brief

Module Title Real World Project	Individual Submission	Cohort Sept	Module Code 206CDE
Coursework Title (e.g. CWK1) Resit/Deferral Coursework			Hand out date: 4 th February 2022
Lecturer Dr Will Blewitt			Due date and time: Date: 8 th April 2022 Online: 18:00:00
Estimated Time (hrs): 150 Page Limit: Employability Portfolio – 7 sides of A4 Project Report – 5 sides of A4	Coursework type: Cw Resit/Deferral		20 Credits (100% of Module Mark)
Submission arrangement: Online via Aula File types and method of recording: PDF document Mark and Feedback date (DD/MM/YY): 22/4/22 Mark and Feedback method (e.g. in lecture, electronic via Aula): Marks and summative feedback will be available two weeks after assessment.			

Module Learning Outcomes Assessed:

1. Demonstrate an ability to work both individually and within teams to deadlines. Show evidence of planning and apply professional and interpersonal skills so as to communicate effectively, both verbally and in writing.
2. Demonstrate understanding of the requirements of potential future employers and institutions offering graduate level employment and/or industrial placements, and to formulate medium term plans for enhancing their employability and academic development.
3. Identify and practice established principles within the students programme of study. Apply and express the underlying concepts and principles outside the context in which they were first studied, including where appropriate, the application of those principles in a work context.
4. Effectively communicate information, arguments and analysis in a variety of forms. Demonstrate a commitment to undertake further study and develop existing skills.
5. Demonstrate an awareness and ability to apply social, professional, legal and ethical standards as documented in professional codes of conduct of computing & IT professional bodies. e.g. BCS.

Task and Mark distribution:

Overview

This is the resit/deferral assessment for those who did not achieve a pass mark for their 206CDE coursework submission last semester and those who deferred their submission to semester 2.

1. Task 1: Employability Portfolio (30% of Assignment Grade)

Assesses Learning Outcomes 1, 2, 4, and 5

In your previous submission you compiled an Employability Portfolio. You should, based on feedback from last semester's submission, improve this. As a reminder, the employability portfolio is expected to consist of the following:

- a. Identify **three** potential **job opportunities** you would consider applying for. You shall **save the job specifications** of these opportunities to submit as part of your **employability portfolio**.
- b. You will select **one** of the above job opportunities to be the **focus** of your employability portfolio. For that job role, you will **research the job** and **employer** (including their recruitment/interview process), and use that research to:
 - Create a **tailored CV** of **no more than 2 sides** of A4. You should **annotate** this to demonstrate the relevance of the research.
 - Write a **tailored Cover Letter** of **no more than 1 side** of A4. You should **annotate** this to demonstrate the relevance of the research.
- c. You will **combine** these task elements into a **single Word Document**. A **handy checklist** is provided below:
 - i. **Three potential job specifications**
 - ii. **Research into target job and employer**
 - iii. **Tailored CV with annotations**
 - iv. **Tailored Cover Letter with annotations**

2. Task 2: Group Project (70% of Assignment Grade)

Assesses Learning Outcomes 1, 3, 4 and 5

You will improve upon your team's software deliverables, enhancing at least one of the software products created in a meaningful way. This might involve the addition of new features, improving the user interface or experience, or adding new levels. This will be assessed in the following ways:

- a. **Individual Contribution.** You will record a video log describing, in detail, the contributions you have made to the project (both during the semester in which the module ran, and this resit period). This video will be no more than 10 minutes in length. You should include within the video log recorded footage of the software in action demonstrating the enhancements you have made, even if the software is not feature-complete. You should also include a link to the project's code repository within the video.

Marks will be awarded for the magnitude of the contribution made to the software (both during the semester in which the module ran, and this resit period), the detail of the content within the video log, the accessibility of the content to the view, and the overall quality of the video presentation. This video log worth 40% of the overall assignment grade.

- b. **Overall Project Review.** As an individual, you will **prepare a report** highlighting your work on the project. This report is worth 30% of the overall assignment grade. Within this report, which must be **no longer than five pages** including figures/screenshots/images, you should:
 - i. **Introduce the Project.** What was the customer specification? What was your pitch? What changed based on pitch feedback?
 - ii. **Discuss the Project's Conduct.** How well did the team work? Were there communication issues? Did everyone put the same effort in? Over the course of development, what changes did you find you had to make to the initial concept? Why?

This document is for Coventry University students for their own use in completing their assessed work for this module and should not be passed to third parties or posted on any website. Any infringements of this rule should be reported to facultyregistry.eec@coventry.ac.uk.

- iii. **Evaluate the Project's Quality.** Did the product meet your expectations? Did it meet the customer's expectations? Did you employ professional software engineering practises (e.g., the use of design patterns in your code)?
- iv. **Outline Your Personal Contributions.** What did **you** do? Which parts of the project did you take ownership of? What are you proudest of? How did the project feed into your professional skills development?
- v. **How You Would Improve the Project.** If there were problems with teamwork, how would you address those in the future? Were there any features you didn't get implemented? How could you get the product to more closely reflect the customer's vision?
- vi. **Include a video practically demonstrating the software product.** This could be a link to a webhosted video, or you could upload the video to your Coventry GitHub Repository. The Project Group can make a single demonstration video rather than each individual making their own **but** if this is the case every member of the Group must feature in the video.
- vii. **Include a link to the GitHub Repository.** You **must** add **Will Blewitt (ac9550)**, **Michael Richards (aa5999)**, **Ian Evans (ab8809)** and **Ian Dunwell (aa6537)** as collaborators to facilitate **marking – failure** to do so may lead to a **zero mark** in this portion of the assignment.

!!! SUBMISSION DEADLINE – 8/4/22 !!!

You have to make three Aula Submissions for this module on the same deadline. Ensure that you submit the Employability Portfolio to the Employability Portfolio Resit submission point, the Contribution Video Log to the Contribution Resit submission point, and the Project Report to the Project Report Resit submission point.

Ensure that you have added the above members of staff to your GitHub Repository as collaborators, and to your LinkedIn Profile as contacts, prior to submission. No commits or uploads should be made to the GitHub Repository after the deadline; doing so will lead to Academic Conduct investigations and potential exclusion from the University.

This document is for Coventry University students for their own use in completing their assessed work for this module and should not be passed to third parties or posted on any website. Any infringements of this rule should be reported to **facultyregistry.eec@coventry.ac.uk**.

Notes:

1. You are expected to use the [Coventry University APA](#) style for referencing. For support and advice on this students can contact [Centre for Academic Writing \(CAW\)](#).
2. Please notify your registry course support team and module leader for disability support.
3. Any student requiring an extension or deferral should follow the university process as outlined [here](#).
4. The University cannot take responsibility for any coursework lost or corrupted on disks, laptops or personal computer. Students should therefore regularly back-up any work and are advised to save it on the University system.
5. If there are technical or performance issues that prevent students submitting coursework through the online coursework submission system on the day of a coursework deadline, an appropriate extension to the coursework submission deadline will be agreed. This extension will normally be 24 hours or the next working day if the deadline falls on a Friday or over the weekend period. This will be communicated via your Module Leader.
6. You are encouraged to check the originality of your work by using the draft Turnitin links on Aula.
7. Collusion between students (where sections of your work are similar to the work submitted by other students in this or previous module cohorts) is taken extremely seriously and will be reported to the academic conduct panel. This applies to both courseworks and exam answers.
8. A marked difference between your writing style, knowledge and skill level demonstrated in class discussion, any test conditions and that demonstrated in a coursework assignment may result in you having to undertake a Viva Voce in order to prove the coursework assignment is entirely your own work.
9. If you make use of the services of a proof reader in your work you must keep your original version and make it available as a demonstration of your written efforts.
10. You must not submit work for assessment that you have already submitted (partially or in full), either for your current course or for another qualification of this university, with the exception of resits, where for the coursework, you maybe asked to rework and improve a previous attempt. This requirement will be specifically detailed in your assignment brief or specific course or module information. Where earlier work by you is citable, i.e. it has already been published/submitted, you must reference it clearly. **Identical pieces of work submitted concurrently may also be considered to be self-plagiarism.**

Mark allocation guidelines to students (to be edited by staff per assessment)

0-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70+	80+
Work mainly incomplete and /or weaknesses in most areas	Most elements completed; weaknesses outweigh strengths	Most elements are strong, minor weaknesses	Strengths in all elements	Most work exceeds the standard expected	All work substantially exceeds the standard expected

This document is for Coventry University students for their own use in completing their assessed work for this module and should not be passed to third parties or posted on any website. Any infringements of this rule should be reported to facultyregistry.eec@coventry.ac.uk.

Marking Rubric

GRADE	EMPLOYABILITY PORTFOLIO (30%)	VIDEO LOG (CONTRIBUTION) (40%)	GROUP PROJECT (REPORT) (30%)
First ≥70	Three job opportunities have been considered with exhaustive research into one role and employer, including research into their recruitment/interview process. The cover letter is well-written with little scope for improvement; annotations provide compelling justifications for the customisations made. Annotated CV is neatly structured and eye-catching , and includes links to professional social media and a portfolio site .	Consistently high-quality contributions to all software deliverables associated with the project throughout the semester and resit period. Video log is well-edited and includes detailed footage of the software in action. Takes initiative when doing so benefits the project. Meaningful input to enhance the existing software product's design and adherence to customer specification .	Project clearly introduced with meaningful discussion of pitch feedback . Reviews the team's effectiveness objectively and professionally , and highlights areas of weakness and areas for improvement constructively . Evaluation of project software quality is reflective and objective . Personal contributions are clearly highlighted and illustrated with code snippets or screengrabs . Good use of professional software engineering skills has been evidenced (e.g. use of appropriate software design patterns) using code snippets. Demo video does a good job honestly conveying the software's capabilities.
Upper Second 60-69	Three job opportunities have been considered with some research into one role and employer. The cover letter is well-written with no typographical/typesetting errors, and annotations make good use of what research was undertaken. CV is similarly well-structured with no typos, and some evidence that research has fed into it. CV includes links to professional social media accounts and a portfolio site .	Mostly high-quality contributions. At least one example of a high quality addition to the code of each software deliverable. Some initiative shown . Some evidence of input to enhance the software design and adherence to spec . Video is well-structured and provides meaningful insight into contributions.	Project introduction describes customer specification, pitch , and final software design . Team effectiveness review occasionally lacks professionalism and suggestions for improvement are not always framed constructively . Personal contributions (including good software engineering) are evidenced through code snippets and screengrabs . Evaluation of the project software quality is reflective but not always objective. Demo video conveys the software capabilities.
Lower Second 50-59	Three job opportunities have been considered, with limited research into a selected job role and employer. Cover letter has minimal annotations and has poor structure/ some typos . CV is cleanly formatted and well-structured with no typos , and at least some annotations. CV includes links to professional social media accounts and portfolio website .	Some high-quality contributions, but most are middling . One example of enhancement to the code of at least two software deliverables. Little input into enhancing the design of software solution. Limited initiative. Video includes some footage of the software, and limited discussion of contributions.	Project introduction describes the customer specification and eventual software design, but doesn't address pitch feedback. Team effectiveness review is often personal reflection and lacks some professionalism . Personal contributions are shown but do not convey good software engineering practise and do not make good use of the included figures/snippets. Evaluation is subjective but highlights good points. Demo video is included.
Third 40-49	Fewer than three job opportunities have been considered, with one selected to be the focus. Limited research into either the role or the employer is present, and has been used to inform either the CV or cover letter but not both . Cover letter has typos , poor grammar and poor structure, but is readable . CV isn't cleanly formatted but is legible .	Some middling-quality contributions but most are poor . One example of enhancing the code of one software deliverable. No enhancement to overall design of the software. Video includes either footage of the improved software or discussion of contributions.	Project introduction doesn't address customer specification and simply describes the end-software . The team effectiveness review is earnest but unprofessional and likely involves explicit criticism of other team members . Personal contributions are minimally presented , but some code snippets are present. Evaluation is subjective but highlights one valid point. Demo video is not well-structured but shows software doing something.
Fail <40	Only one job opportunity has been considered and this is the focus of the portfolio. No research into the role or employer. Cover letter is incoherent or maps poorly to the chosen role. CV not formatted/legible/relevant to role.	Limited improvements to the project. Minimal contributions . Alternatively, video is not narrated, does not include footage of the software, etc.	Report does not follow the specified structure. Typos affect legibility of the document, and much of the document is reflective commentary without meaningful analysis or suggestions for improvement. No demo video is present.
Late submission/ Inaccessible Repo or LinkedIn	0	0	0