statements are backed up with supporting evidence, that all sources you use - whether referring to their ideas, quoting directly or paraphrasing - are correctly referenced in the text. Correct use of referencing acknowledges the academic whose work has informed yours, enables the reader to find the sources you have used and demonstrates your ability to find and analyse relevant information.

Failure to properly acknowledge the work of others is an academic offence and may result in your work incurring a penalty or, in the most serious cases, you being removed from the course for academic dishonesty.

If you are unsure about referencing or plagiarism there are useful resources available in the Study Skills Hub which is accessible from the menu on the left hand side. If you are still experiencing difficulties with academic integrity then you can **contact the Study Skills Team** for individualised support.

Submission Instructions

- Submit your saved document below before the end of Unit 11.
- After the deadline, the submission page will be locked.
- Use Harvard referencing for all citations and references.
- If you need to apply for Late Submission, please complete the **late submission of coursework form**.

Submission status

Attempt number	This is attempt 1.
Submission status	Submitted for grading
Grading status	Graded
Time remaining	Assignment was submitted 2 hours 26 mins early
Last modified	Monday, 14 July 2025, 9:28 PM
File submissions	**Individual Presentation- Fahad.pptx** 14 July 2025, 9:28 PM Turnitin ID: 2715044861 **Transcript File- fahad.docx** 14 July 2025, 9:28 PM Turnitin ID: 2715044903
Submission comments	**Comments (0)**

Feedback

Grade	68 % (Merit)
Graded on	Sunday, 20 July 2025, 9:44 AM
Graded by	 Stelios Sotiriadis

Feedback comments

Knowledge and understanding

The presentation demonstrates very good understanding of neural networks and object recognition, with accurate technical detail on CNNs, transfer learning, and CIFAR-10. The comparison between the custom model and MobileNetV2 is clear and well-grounded in practical application. There's evidence of independent comprehension but originality in challenging ideas or perspectives is limited.

Presentation and communication skills

The script reads clearly and maintains logical flow across slides, with appropriate technical language for an academic audience. However, it does not simulate audience engagement or spontaneity, and leans heavily on explanatory content that might be read out. It lacks dynamism or improvisation that would suit a live delivery.

Criticality

There is some critical reflection, especially in comparing both models and noting their trade-offs (e.g. overfitting, generalisation, training time). Discussion of confusion matrix results and single image testing shows analysis, though limited in theoretical critique or deeper synthesis of implications.

Structure and presentation

The structure is logical and consistent with clear headings, flow of technical content, and use of subpoints. The transcript is long but well-organised, with only minor grammatical issues. The content aligns with typical academic presentation structure.

Use of relevant sources

The references are accurate, current, and relevant to the models and tools used, including foundational and recent sources like TensorFlow docs. Source use supports the discussion well but could benefit from a few more contrasting academic perspectives.