Assignment 3c – Final Report

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Deliverables | **Approximately 2500 words** (excluding reference list, title page, and table of contents and any appendices). Acceptable range from 2200 to 3000 words |
| Due date | Monday, 3 June, 11:59pm. Start of Week 13 |
| Value | 30% |
| Marking rubric | Download a copy from the Assignment 3c page in Learnline. |
| Task overview | Write a professional report that describes your design project to an (imaginary) audience such as a decision maker for an aid charity or non-governmental organisation (NGO). It should be a ‘stand-alone’ document presenting your design, explaining how it is innovative and original, and outlining its feasibility from technical, cultural, economic and environmental points of view.  NOTE: You are encouraged to re-use parts of your previous assignments for this report, but it is expected that improvements and changes will have been made where needed. |
| Task details | Your assignment should contain the following:   * A title page, with your project title, and team details. * An introduction with purpose, project justification, and scope. * Further research on design criteria, design alternatives and a decision matrix that outlines the process of determining your design concept. * A detailed description of your design, including accompanying drawings/sketches/photos of your prototype or of the design itself. * Description of how the design could be implemented in the community. * Explanation of the limitations of your design. * Discussion of the economic, environmental, cultural and technical feasibility and sustainability of the design in terms of its suitability for the community. * Conclusion * Appendix A - reflection on project management (individual). * Appendix B – sample of meeting minutes/ records   Each team member will also be required to evaluate their own and their teammates’ contribution to the project and teamwork skills. |
| Outline/structure | Use the following guide to structure your report. Your report should include the following components:   * **Title page**   Include project title, team member names, student numbers, and each team member’s role (i.e. Coordinator, Researcher, or Designer).   * **Table of contents**   Include all of your sections from the introduction onwards and their page numbers. For a detailed work-through on how to do this see the following link <http://youtu.be/4N8mjfpAd8w>   * **Report Body** * **References** * **Appendices** * **Marking rubric**   **Report Body**  The body of your report should include the following sections numbered as indicated below. *(Nb. do not include ‘Coordinator’, ‘Researcher’, ‘Designer’, and so on, in the naming of your sections. These have only been included below to show you who is responsible for each section.)*  **1.0 Introduction *(Coordinator)***  1.1 Purpose of this final report  In one or two sentences describe how this report relates to your design project and provide a basic outline of what it covers.  1.2 Project background and justification  One or two paragraphs that set the scene for your project and why it is necessary. This must include a detailed description of the issue or problem that your design is looking to address.  1.3 Project scope  This should explain what your design project is setting out to achieve. State the specific aim of your design in one or two sentences, followed by an outline of the scope of the project. The scope states what your project will and will not do via inclusions, exclusions, constraints and assumptions. Conclude the section with a statement of the key deliverables your project will provide to the community. Your key deliverables should address the problems raised in the project justification above.  **2.0 Design research *(Researcher)***  2.1 Design criteria  Describe the specific requirements that your team decided your design must meet, and how these suit the specific needs of the community. Include justification for these requirements using in-text referencing where required. These criteria will feed straight into your decision matrix section below.  2.2 Design options  Describe the technology and designs that your team investigated while deciding on a final approach, and outline the strengths and weaknesses of each. This may include information from your previous assignments as well as research on other design aspects that you found in the later part of the semester. Note that your preferred design should be included as one of the options. These options will feed straight into your decision matrix section below. Be sure to use in-text referencing where required.  **3.0 Evaluation of options *(Coordinator)***  3.1 Design options  Briefly state the design options from above that you will be evaluating using the decision matrix. Note that your preferred design should be included as one of the options.  3.2 Decision matrix  a) Before presenting the decision matrix, briefly state the criteria (from above), and briefly explain and justify the rankings, weightings, and rating schemes that you used in developing the decision matrix. This should have been worked out by the team.  b) Present the decision matrix table.  c) Then provide a summary and analysis of the outcome, and a discussion of why your design is the most suitable.  **4.0 Design concept *(Designer)***  4.1 Design description  Start with an overview followed by a discussion of the various aspects and components in more detail. Mention general construction, materials, functionality, required equipment, etc. referring to your diagram/s and or photos of your prototype or design provided below.  You should include clearly labelled pictures of your design, or drawings, that you think convey your design best.  Include a clear explanation of how your design is innovative and/or original. How does it differ from existing technologies in use? Or how does your design concept adapt, or modify/improve, an existing technology?  4.2 Implementation  Explain how your design will be implemented in the community. This should include how your design will be introduced, any education or training that may be required, and consideration of any ongoing maintenance.  4.3 Costs  Provide an estimate of design, construction and maintenance costs associated with completion and construction of the design, in local currency. Consider if there are any potential economic benefits to the community which could result from the project.  4.4 Describe the remaining limitations and possible improvements for your finished design.  **5.0 Feasibility and Sustainability *(Researcher)***  Provide a researched discussion and justification of the feasibility and sustainability of your design from cultural, environmental, economic and technical points of view, with key areas of strength and weakness (or uncertainty) identified. Use suitable sub-headings. You must include in-text referencing.  **6.0 Conclusion *(Coordinator)***  The conclusion should encompass the information you have provided in this document. Include your thoughts on what the design has achieved.  **References *(Coordinator)***  In APA format, list references provided by all team members for their sections. There should be a minimum of 6 credible resources included in your list.  **Appendix A: Reflection on project management *(Each team member)***  (300 – 400 words for each person)  Each person to separately describe:   1. How closely did your project management match your Project Management Plan? Were meetings and related record keeping (e.g. minutes) performed? If so, was it effective, and how? 2. What was the most successful aspect of the management of your project/team? Why? 3. What was the major difficulty you faced with the management of the project/team? Why? 4. Each person to give a clear set of practical suggestions to avoid the issues encountered in the future.   **Appendix B: Meeting records *(Coordinator)***  Include a sample of records which were kept at meetings. |
| Formatting | Your document needs to be presented professionally using the following format (look up Microsoft ‘Help’ for formatting instructions):   * Single document, MS Word. * Margins: Top & Bottom (3.00cm), Left & Right (2.50cm) * Body text: Times New Roman (or alternative legible and professional font), 12pt size, left alignment with 1.5 line spacing. * Paragraph spacing: 0pt ‘before’ and 12pt ‘after’. * Headers/footers with appropriate details. * Marking rubric copied in at the end. |
| Preparation | Below is a rough guide for each role for the final report. As always, check the marking rubric for a more detailed guide on the responsibilities of each of the team roles. Note: For two member teams – the coordinator role is shared.  Each individual is responsible for fulfilling their assigned role as follows:   * **Team coordinator:**   The Introduction, Evaluation of Alternatives and Conclusion sections, and compile the Reference List and Meeting Records. The coordinator is also responsible for combining all team members’ parts into a well-presented report (ensuring it has a title page, table of contents, etc.), and that it is formatted to the requirements above.   * **Researcher:**   Design Research, and Feasibility and Sustainability sections  **Designer:**   * Design Concept section   **Each member** of the team is responsible for:   * Writing an individual reflection on the project management (Appendix A) * Ensuring that the report is cohesive overall, (ie the different sections complement each other well) * Completing a Peer Assessment of themselves and their teammates |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Coordinator name:** | |  | | | | | | |  | **Peer mark:**  **/5**  **TOTAL:**  **/95** |
| Comments: | | | | | | | | |  |
| **Reflection:** | **/10** | | **Coordinator role:** |  |  | **/85** | | | |
| * Excellent, clear discussion on how well the project management plan was adhered to, and what effect this had on the project. * Excellent, clear discussion on what worked well in the project * Excellent, clear discussion on what did not work well in the project * Clear, thoughtful, practical suggestions to avoid the issues encountered in future   8.5—9.0—9.5—10 | | | * Introduction clearly and concisely conveys all aspects of project justification, aim, and scope. * Evaluation using Decision Matrix is thorough, logical, and highly appropriate to the design. * Conclusion accurately yet concisely captures the outcomes. * Reference list is complete and correct using APA style, with more than 6 credible sources. * Professional overall physical layout & appearance; includes all report elements. * Always acknowledges work of others with in-text citations in correct APA style * Excellent structure & flow * Writing is always formal with no spelling/grammar/punctuation errors     73—74—75—76—77—78—79—80—81—82—82—84—85 | | | | | 13-15  8.5-10  8.5-10  8.5-10  8.5-10  8.5-10  8.5-10  8.5-10 | | High Distinction  (85-100%) |
| * Very good discussion on how well the project management plan was adhered to, and what effect this had on the project. * Very good discussion on what worked well in the project * Very good discussion on what did not work well in the project * Clear, practical suggestions to avoid the issues encountered in future   7.5—8 | | | * Introduction clearly conveys all aspects of project justification, aim, and scope. * Evaluation using Decision Matrix is thorough & logical. * Conclusion accurately captures the outcomes. * Reference list is complete with very few minor errors in APA style, and includes at least 6 credible sources. * Near-professional overall physical layout & appearance; includes all report elements. * Always acknowledges work of others with in-text citations, minor format errors. * Very good structure & flow * Writing is mostly formal with very few spelling/grammar/punctuation errors   64—65—66—67—68—69—70—71—72 | | | | 11.5-12.5  7.5-8  7.5-8  7.5-8  7.5-8  7.5-8  7.5-8  7.5-8 | | | Distinction  (75-84%) |
| * Good discussion on how well the project management plan was adhered to, and what effect this had on the project. * Good discussion on what worked well in the project * Good discussion on what did not work well in the project * Some practical suggestions to avoid the issues encountered in future   6.5—7 | | | * Introduction clearly conveys most aspects of project justification, aim, and scope. * Evaluation using Decision Matrix is fairly thorough & logical. * Conclusion captures the main project outcomes. * Reference list is almost complete with several minor errors in APA style, and includes at least 5 credible sources. * Good overall physical layout & appearance; includes almost all report elements. * Almost always acknowledges work of others with minor format errors. * Good structure & flow * Writing is generally formal with few spelling/grammar/punctuation errors   56—57—58—59—60—61—62—63 | | | | 10-11  6.5-7  6.5-7  6.5-7  6.5-7  6.5-7  6.5-7  6.5-7 | | | Credit  (65-74%) |
| * Basic discussion on how well the project management plan was adhered to, and what effect this had on the project. * Basic discussion of what worked well * Basic discussion of what didn’t work * Few practical suggestions to avoid the issues encountered in future   5—5.5—6 | | | * Introduction conveys most aspects of project justification, aim, and scope, but some detail/accuracy/clarity is lacking. * Evaluation using Decision Matrix is provided, with all steps followed but detail/ accuracy/ clarity is lacking. * Conclusion captures some of the main project outcomes. * Reference list is almost complete, and includes at least 5 credible sources, but with some major errors in APA style. * Acceptable overall physical layout & appearance; some report elements missing * Sometimes acknowledges the work of others with some format errors. * Acceptable structure & flow * Writing is sometimes formal with several spelling/grammar/punctuation errors   43—44—45—46—47—48—49—50—51—52—53—54—55 | | | | 7.5-9.5  5-6  5-6  5-6  5-6  5-6  5-6  5-6 | | | Pass  (50-64%) |
| * No discussion on how well the project management plan was adhered to, and what effect this had on the project. * Discussion of what worked well very limited, or non-existent. * Discussion of what didn’t work very limited, or non-existent * No practical or useful suggestions to avoid the issues encountered in future   0—4.5 | | | * Introduction fails to convey the project justification, aim, and scope, or significant lack of detail/accuracy/clarity. * Evaluation using Decision Matrix not provided, or is very unclear or incomplete. * Conclusion not provided, or fails to capture the project outcomes. * Numerous major errors in reference list according to APA style OR very incomplete OR includes less than 5 credible sources. * Overall physical layout and & appearance poor; most report elements missing * Consistent failures to acknowledge work of others in correct format. * Poor structure & flow makes comprehension difficult * Informal writing, many spelling/grammar/punctuation error   0—42 | | | | 0-7  0-4.5  0-4.5  0-4.5  0-4.5  0-4.5  0-4.5  0-4.5 | | | Fail  (0-49%) |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Researcher name:** | |  | | | | | |  | | **Peer mark:**  **/5**  **TOTAL:**  **/95** |
| Comments:. | | | | | | | |  | |
| **Reflection:** | **/10** | | **Researcher role:** |  |  | **/85** | | | |
| * Excellent, clear discussion on how well the project management plan was adhered to, and what effect this had on the project. * Excellent, clear discussion on what worked well in the project * Excellent, clear discussion on what did not work well in the project * Clear, thoughtful, practical suggestions to avoid the issues encountered in future   8.5—9.0—9.5—10 | | | * Design criteria are specific with excellent discussion of relevance to community needs * Design alternatives are very well researched and highly relevant to the project’s design aims * Feasibility and sustainability of the design are assessed carefully and astutely with thorough, credible supporting research. * Always acknowledges work of others with in-text citations in correct APA style * Excellent structure & flow * Writing is always formal with no spelling/grammar/punctuation errors   73—74—75—76—77—78—79—80—81—82—82—84—85 | | | | | 13-15  13-15  21.5-25  8.5-10  8.5-10  8.5-10 | | High Distinction  (85-100%) |
| * Very good discussion on how well the project management plan was adhered to, and what effect this had on the project. * Very good discussion on what worked well in the project * Very good discussion on what did not work well in the project * Clear, practical suggestions to avoid the issues encountered in future   7.5—8 | | | * Most design criteria are specific with very good discussion of relevance to community needs * Design alternatives are well researched and relevant to the project’s design aims * Feasibility and sustainability of the design are assessed carefully with credible supporting research. * Always acknowledges work of others with in-text citations, minor format errors. * Very good structure & flow * Writing is mostly formal with very few spelling/grammar/punctuation errors   64—65—66—67—68—69—70—71—72 | | | | 11.5-12.5  11.5-12.5  19-21  7.5-8  7.5-8  7.5-8 | | | Distinction  (75-84%) |
| * Good discussion on how well the project management plan was adhered to, and what effect this had on the project. * Good discussion on what worked well in the project * Good discussion on what did not work well in the project * Some practical suggestions to avoid the issues encountered in future   6.5—7 | | | * Design criteria are adequate with some discussion of relevance to community needs * Design alternatives are researched and relevant to the project’s design aims * Feasibility and sustainability of the design are assessed moderately well with some credible supporting research. * Almost always acknowledges work of others with minor format errors. * Good structure & flow * Writing is generally formal with few spelling/grammar/punctuation errors   56—57—58—59—60—61—62—63 | | | | 10-11  10-11  16.5-18.5  6.5-7  6.5-7  6.5-7 | | | Credit  (65-74%) |
| * Basic discussion on how well the project management plan was adhered to, and what effect this had on the project. * Basic discussion of what worked well * Basic discussion of what didn’t work * Few practical suggestions to avoid the issues encountered in future   5—5.5—6 | | | * Design criteria are adequate with basic discussion of relevance to community needs * Design alternatives are included and mostly relevant to the project’s design aims * Basic discussion of feasibility and sustainability of the design is provided, with basic supporting research. * Sometimes acknowledges the work of others with in-text citations, some format errors. * Acceptable structure & flow * Writing is sometimes formal with several spelling/grammar/punctuation errors   43—44—45—46—47—48—49—50—51—52—53—54—55 | | | | | 7.5-9  7.5-9  12.5-16  5-6  5-6  5-6 | | Pass  (50-64%) |
| * No discussion on how well the project management plan was adhered to, and what effect this had on the project. * Discussion of what worked well very limited, or non-existent. * Discussion of what didn’t work very limited, or non-existent * No practical or useful suggestions to avoid the issues encountered in future   0—4.5 | | | * Design criteria are unspecific or absent with little/no discussion of relevance to community needs * Design alternatives are omitted or irrelevant to the project’s design aims * Poor assessment of feasibility and sustainability of the design is provided. Insufficient credible supporting research. * Consistent failures to acknowledge work of others in correct format. * Poor structure & flow makes comprehension difficult * Informal writing, many spelling/grammar/punctuation errors   0—42 | | | | | | 0-7  0-7  0-12  0-4.5  0-4.5  0-4.5 | Fail  (0-49%) |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Designer name:** |  | | |  | **Peer mark:**  **/5**  **TOTAL:**  **/95** |
| Comments: | | | |  |
| **Reflection:** | **/10** | **Designer role:** | **/85** | |
| * Excellent, clear discussion on how well the project management plan was adhered to, and what effect this had on the project. * Excellent, clear discussion on what worked well in the project * Excellent, clear discussion on what did not work well in the project * Clear, thoughtful, practical suggestions to avoid the issues encountered in future   8.5—9.0—9.5—10 | | * Description of design is thorough, clear, and easy to follow with accurate, clear and well labelled diagrams * Clear explanation of how the design concept is creative and innovative with comparison to existing approaches * Excellent explanation of how the design will be implemented in the community * Costs are clear, comprehensive, and well justified. * Excellent discussion of limitations and possible improvements. * Always acknowledges work of others with in-text citations in correct APA style * Excellent structure & flow * Writing is always formal with no spelling/grammar/punctuation errors   73—74—75—76—77—78—79—80—81—82—82—84—85 | | 13-15  8.5-10  8.5-10  8.5-10  8.5-10  8.5-10  8.5-10  8.5-10 | High Distinction  (85-100%) |
| * Very good discussion on how well the project management plan was adhered to, and what effect this had on the project. * Very good discussion on what worked well in the project * Very good discussion on what did not work well in the project * Clear, practical suggestions to avoid the issues encountered in future   7.5—8 | | * Description of design is detailed and easy to follow with clear and labelled diagrams * Explanation of how the design concept is creative and innovative with comparison to existing approaches * Detailed and clear explanation of how the design will be implemented in the community * Costs are clear, and well justified. * Very good discussion of limitations and possible improvements. * Always acknowledges work of others with in-text citations, minor format errors. * Very good structure & flow * Writing is mostly formal with very few spelling/grammar/punctuation errors   64—65—66—67—68—69—70—71—72 | | 11.5-12.5  7.5-8  7.5-8  7.5-8  7.5-8  7.5-8  7.5-8  7.5-8 | Distinction  (75-84%) |
| * Good discussion on how well the project management plan was adhered to, and what effect this had on the project. * Good discussion on what worked well in the project * Good discussion on what did not work well in the project * Some practical suggestions to avoid the issues encountered in future   6.5—7 | | * Description of design is moderately clear, somewhat detailed, and easy to follow; clear diagram included but some detail lacking * Some explanation of how the design concept is creative and innovative with comparison to existing approaches * Good explanation of how the design will be implemented in the community * Costs are clear, and mostly justified. * Good discussion of limitations and possible improvements. * Almost always acknowledges work of others with minor format errors. * Good structure & flow * Writing is generally formal with few spelling/grammar/punctuation errors   56—57—58—59—60—61—62—63 | | 10-11  6.5-7  6.5-7  6.5-7  6.5-7  6.5-7  6.5-7  6.5-7 | Credit  (65-74%) |
| * Basic discussion on how well the project management plan was adhered to, and what effect this had on the project. * Basic discussion of what worked well * Basic discussion of what didn’t work * Few practical suggestions to avoid the issues encountered in future   5—5.5—6 | | * Description of design is basic, generally easy to follow, with most details provided. Diagram is unclear or poorly presented * Poor or doubtful explanation of how the design concept is creative and innovative with comparison to existing approaches * Basic explanation of how the design will be implemented in the community * Costs are provided and mostly justified. * Limited discussion of limitations and possible improvements. * Sometimes acknowledges the work of others with in-text citations, some format errors. * Acceptable structure & flow * Writing is sometimes formal with several spelling/grammar/punctuation errors   43—44—45—46—47—48—49—50—51—52—53—54—55 | | 7.5-9.5  5-6  5-6  5-6  5-6  5-6  5-6  5-6 | Pass  (50-64%) |
| * No discussion on how well the project management plan was adhered to, and what effect this had on the project. * Discussion of what worked well very limited, or non-existent. * Discussion of what didn’t work very limited, or non-existent * No practical or useful suggestions to avoid the issues encountered in future   0—4.5 | | * Description of design is poor / difficult to follow / significantly lacking detail. No diagram provided. * No explanation of how the design concept is creative and innovative with comparison to existing approaches * Little to no explanation of how the design will be implemented in the community * Costs are not provided, or completely unjustified. * No discussion of limitations or possible improvements. * Consistent failures to acknowledge work of others in correct format. * Poor structure & flow makes comprehension difficult * Informal writing, many spelling/grammar/punctuation errors   0—42 | | 0-7  0-4.5  0-4.5  0-4.5  0-4.5  0-4.5  0-4.5  0-4.5 | Fail  (0-49%) |