Assessment Specification

Module Details

Module Code	MDF03
Module Title	Study Group Project
Module Leader	Prof Emmanuel Merchan
Module Tutors	Prof Dmitry Pavlyuk, Prof Aleksandr Grakovski, Associate Prof Nadezda Spiridovska Associate Prof Samuel Moveh
Year	2023-2024
Component/Element Number	A3
Total number of assessments for this module	3
Weighting	50%
Total Assignment Time	-
Element Description	Element A3 – Conference Presentation and Viva (50 points): The team should submit an abstract to be accepted in the RatSif conference and participate in delivering a presentation of the project. The team should answer questions from the audience and tutors.

Dates

Date issued to students	05/02/2024
Date to be returned to students	-
Submission Date	18/04/2024
Submission Place	Moodle
Submission Time	17:00
Submission Notes	-

Feedback

Feedback provision will be	Feedback will be provided in the Moodle environment

Contents

Section 1: Overview of Assessment

This assignment assesses the following module learning outcomes:

This is worth **50%** of the module marks.

Module Learning Outcomes	Reference
Demonstrate comprehensive understanding of core research methods and scientific writing conventions (A1, A3)	MO1
Apply research techniques and critical thinking skills in an applied engineering project (A1, A3)	MO2
Demonstrate ability to collaborate effectively in an interdisciplinary research team using agile methods(A2, A3)	MO3
Develop self-reflective ability to evaluate research competencies and translate skills to practice (A1, A3)	MO4
Effectively communicate research and findings through professional written and oral presentations (A2, A3)	MO5

The assignment is described in more detail in **Moodle**. Module is available here https://e.tsi.lv/course/view.php?id=3297

All members of the team should contribute to the presentation.

Each member of the team should start by briefly summarising their contribution and how they developed their skills and knowledge during the project.

If you have questions about the assignment, **ask your course leader.**

Section 2: Task Specification

The students must submit the accepted abstract and the presentation to be delivered in the RatSif conference.

The students must present the results in an oral presentation according to the conference program. Each member of the team should be prepared to answer at least one question on an aspect of their project.

YOU SHOULD NOT EXPECT TO GET ANY REMINDERS FROM TUTORS ABOUT ANY OF THESE RESPONSIBILITIES OR DEADLINES

Section 3: Deliverables

#	Tasks	Points	Submission date	Submission Place
1	Your abstract and presentation should cover the main areas evidenced in your portfolio, including: • Your background research on the topic area and your technical approach; • Team coordination, delegation and project management; • Your technical implementation (phases, stages and final deliverables), including challenges encountered and how you addressed them; • Your conclusions, recommendations, and reflections as to further work that could be done.	50	18/04/2024	Moodle
	TOTAL	50		

Section 4: Marking Criteria

Criterion	Poor/Fail (<4)	Good (5-6)	Very Good / Merit (7-8)	Excellent / Distinction (9-10)
Research depth and knowledge of the problem space	Research wholly lacking, poor quality/ quantity or largely disconnected from the project focus.	Reasonable knowledge of topic. Some research, though patchy in places or not based on good/current sources.	A clear grasp of the topic area, though perhaps unevenly distributed in team, supported by generally good depth and breadth of research	Excellent team knowledge of the problem area, shared throughout the team. Contemporary and quality evidence reviewed and actively/effectively harnessed.
Technical or analytical work and quality / originality of the team's deliverables	Technical/analytical work not evident, or wholly derivative (e..g taken wholly from existing work without team innovation)	Technical/analytical work evident, though limited, unfinished or lacking iteration and development stages.	Strong technical/analytical work and good quality deliverables, perhaps with some gaps or evident minor issues	Highly professional, innovative and well- presented deliverables completed to a strong technical standard. Very significant work evident.
Team Project Management	No clear team process or project control. Variation of effort and distinct lack of focus in task choice and prioritisation.	Some evidence of project management or control, but perhaps retrospectively justified or lacking in productivity gains overall	The team approach generally structured, though perhaps without particularly strong testing/adoption of the methodology	Very well documented and organised with reference to PM tools and techniques. Team reflection on the pros and cons of their approach.
Team Learning	No evidence of team learning. Tasks presented did not require team to extend themselves in any way	Some evidence of team learning. Tasks presented did not always require significant growth and development of skills.	Generally good evidence of team learning. Some strong skills and knowledge development around the project topic and tools.	Team learning evident on several fronts and clear evidence of individuals pushing themselves to raise levels of technical or teamworking performance
Viva Performance	Poor, unrehearsed, significantly over / under time. Project unclear. Approach and presentation of project timeline and extent chaotic or very poorly described. Questions not answered well.	Fair if a little confusing or under- prepared in presentation style and flow. Questions attempted, with some good answers	Well presented, with a coherent narrative thread. Questions mostly well fielded, perhaps with minor gaps or oversights evident.	Polished, well- rehearsed and ran to time. Project clearly described and a strong narrative around research and development. Questions answered satisfactorily.

Section 5: Feedback mechanisms

Feedback in Moodle environment.

Appendices and Additional Information

None.