SCHOOL OF DESIGN, ENGINEERING & COMPUTING

ASSIGNMENT – 2009/10

Course:	**MSc Computing Framework**
Unit:	**Software Project Management**
Assignment Number:	**1**
Unit Leader:	**Dr Keith Phalp**
Issue Date:	**4/12/2009**
Due Date:	**8/02/2010**

This is an individual assignment

Task Description

*Critically review whether the main arguments put forward in the journal article by Yourdon (Yourdon, 1995) can help managers of software projects increase the likelihood that **all** project stakeholders view software development projects as successful.*

In doing so, you should describe the differing stakeholder roles and their individual perspectives and criteria for success. You should also discuss whether Yourdon's advice seems consistent with your understanding of software management, particularly planning, estimating, and prioritising on software projects, from concept (including acquisition) through requirements, specification, design, implementation, testing, delivery and maintenance.

You might also describe any mechanisms that you would try to adopt to ensure that the needs (or wants) of these stakeholder groups would be best addressed by the software for which you are responsible.

In answering you must draw upon appropriate sources from the literature to support your arguments.

Your answer, in the form of an academic paper, should be a maximum of 4000 words long, excluding your list of references.

Reference
Yourdon, E., 1995. When Good Enough Software is Best. *IEEE Software ,* 12 (3), May 1995, pp79-81.

Learning Outcomes Assessed

This assignment assesses all the Intended Learning Outcomes for this unit.

Assessment Criteria/Marking Scheme

- 20% Demonstrating critical awareness of the main arguments in this article.
- 50% Critical review of the value of this article to project managers, particularly addressing the issues raised with respect to stakeholder views of project success, and the extent to which Yourdon's advice meets your understanding of software project management.

- 20% For evidence of appropriate research and use of that research to support your critique.
- 10% For a clear conclusion to your essay, consistent with the preceding discussion and summarising your main arguments.

Marks will be deducted for poorly written answers, for answers that exceed the word count and for answers that fail to correctly cite references.

Signature of Unit Leader …………………………………………
(Dr Keith Phalp)

Signature of QA ……………………………………………………..
(Dr Cornelius Ncube)