

Assessment Brief - Coursework

Academic Year	2024-25
Semester	Year Long (semesters 1,2)
Module Number	CM4605
Module Title	Individual Research Project
Assessment Method	A submission comprising a written Report, Project solution, source code, Presentation, and a Viva Voce.
Deadline (time and date)	End of 2 nd Semester 25 th April (Friday) 2025, 1 PM
Submission	Assessment Dropbox in the Module Study Area in Campus Moodle.
Word Limit	20000 words
Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) text	IS NOT authorised.
Module Co-ordinator	Sahdiya Hussain

What knowledge and/or skills will I develop by undertaking the assessment?

By undertaking this research project, you will develop essential skills in problem identification and framing, data collection, preprocessing and feature extraction, model development and evaluation, and in the communication of research findings.

You must clearly define the research problem or question that the project aims to address, and understand the context, significance, and potential impact of the research. You will then undertake a comprehensive literature review and background research, conducting an in-depth analysis of the existing work in the field, identifying gaps, and formulating clear research objectives. You will then gather data that is relevant to addressing the objectives from various sources, ensuring data quality and integrity, and then preprocess the data, by cleaning, transforming, and handling missing values if

What knowledge and/or skills will I develop by undertaking the assessment?

any. This should be followed by an exploratory data analysis, where you perform in-depth analysis of the data to understand its characteristics, patterns, and relationships, using visualisation techniques to gain insights and identify potential drivers or predictors.

Subsequently, you will perform feature selection and extraction, model development and training, model evaluation and validation, and interpret the research findings. You will apply appropriate machine learning algorithms and techniques dealing with any data imbalance issues, train and optimise the models, assess their performance using relevant metrics, and validate the models' generalisation. Finally, students communicate and disseminate their research, preparing a comprehensive report or dissertation and presenting their findings at academic forums, while also reflecting on the research experience and its impact on their personal and professional growth.

You will address social, ethical, professional, legal and security issues, involved in carrying out the entire research project. You will also produce a professionally documented report and effectively communicate findings through thesis writing including reflecting on the research experience and its impact on your personal and professional growth. Finally, you will learn to summarise your findings and research experience at a viva voce demonstration. Through this process, you will be well-prepared to tackle real-world challenges in AI and data science with innovative and ethical solutions.

On successful completion of the assessment students will be able to achieve the following

Learning Outcomes:

1. Develop comprehensive literature reviews to evaluate existing research and identify gaps in current knowledge within AI and Data Science.
2. Demonstrate Proficiency in using advanced AI and Data Science techniques to solve complex problems, by implementing and adapting relevant algorithms, models, and methodologies.
3. Execute comprehensive experiments using appropriate statistical methods to analyse results and assess the performance and limitations of AI/ML models.
4. Address the ethical implications of AI and Data Science research, including issues of bias, security, privacy, and societal impact, adhering to responsible research practices.
5. Communicate complex AI and Data Science concepts, methodologies, and findings through well-structured technical reports, presentations, and academic papers tailored to both technical and non-technical audiences.

Please also refer to the Module Descriptor, available from the module Moodle study area.

What is expected of me in this assessment?

Task(s) – content

This module is an individual based module, and all assessments described below should be undertaken individually. It is your responsibility to manage your time. Any concerns should be highlighted to your assigned project supervisor to ensure a swift resolution. You are expected to work across two semesters (24 weeks minimum) the details of which are indicated below.

Week	Task/Activity
Week 1	Introduction to the Module Project Proposal Submission
Week 2	Critical Reading and Literature Review
Week 3	Student Presentations of Proposals
Week 4	
Week 5	Research Methods for AI/DS
Week 6	Refining and Validating Research Questions Literature Review Draft Submission
Week 7	Data Requirements, Collection (Primary/Secondary), Security and Preprocessing
Week 8	Social, Ethical, Professional, Legal and Security Issues
Week 9	SPER Clearance Submission Research Methodology Submission
Week 10	Evaluation Planning
Week 11	Data Acquisition Show and Tell
Week 12	Data Acquisition Show and Tell Evaluation Plan Submission
Week 13	Organising your Project Artefacts (Citation management, Mindmapping/Concept mapping)
Week 14	Communicating your Findings - Thesis, Paper and Presentation Forms
Week 15	Project Progress Presentation
Week 16	

What is expected of me in this assessment?

Week 17	
Week 18	Making Research Presentations
Week 19	Project Implementation and Evaluation Demo
Week 20	
Week 21	
Week 22	Facing your Viva
Week 23	Finalising the Artefacts
Week 24	IRP Submission (Project Report, Final Codes)

Task(s) – format

This assessment is worth 100% of the module grade. Please read this section thoroughly and raise any clarifications with the module coordinator. The submission will determine your Individual Module Grade. The module has six formative submissions and Two summative submissions with a presentation and demo of the project followed by a viva voce examination.

Formative Submissions

- 1 Project Proposal
- 2 Literature Review Document
- 3 SPER Clearance Form
- 4 Research methodology
- 5 Evaluation plan submission
- 6 Weekly Logs

Summative Submissions

1. Final Project Report
2. Final Code

A presentation and demo of the project

A Viva voce examination

The formative submissions do not count towards your final grade, however the project proposal and the SPER clearance form is required by the University. The formative assessments will guide you in the right direction, as timely submissions are reviewed, and feedback given by your supervisor at supervisory meetings that you would set up. Further details on timing and content of these submissions will be given in class.

What is expected of me in this assessment?

The assessment is a combination of two artefacts (Project Report and Code) and a presentation and demo of the project followed by a viva voce examination, altogether is worth 100% of your grade marked by a panel of 2 independent examiners, and your supervisor. Attendance at the Viva Voce demonstration is mandatory.

- Non-attendance will result in an automatic NS (non-submission) for the module.
- For the report, exceeding the word count will be penalised. Please see the section "What else is important to my assessment?"

How will I be graded?

A number of subgrades will be provided for each criterion on the feedback grid which is specific to the assessment. The overall grade for the assessment will be calculated using the algorithm below.

A	At least 50% of the subgrades to be at Grade A, at least 75% of the subgrades to be at Grade B or better, and normally 100% of the subgrades to be at Grade C or better.
B	At least 50% of the subgrades to be at Grade B or better, at least 75% of the subgrades to be at Grade C or better, and normally 100% of the subgrades to be at Grade D or better.
C	At least 50% of the subgrades to be at Grade C or better, and at least 75% of the subgrades to be at Grade D or better.
D	At least 50% of the subgrades to be at Grade D or better, and at least 75% of the subgrades to be at Grade E or better.
E	At least 50% of the subgrades to be at Grade E or better.
F	Failing to achieve at least 50% of the subgrades to be at Grade E or better.
NS	Non-submission**.

*If the word count is above the specified word limit by more than 10% or the submission contains an excessive use of text within tables, the grade for the submission will be reduced to the next lowest grade.

** Attendance at the Viva Voce demonstration is mandatory - non-attendance will result in an automatic NS (non-submission) for the module.

Feedback grid *Coursework received late, will be regarded as a non-submission (NS) and one of your assessment opportunities will be lost.*

GRADE		A	B	C	D	E	F
DEFINITION / CRITERIA (WEIGHTING)		EXCELLENT Outstanding Performance	COMMENDABLE/ VERY GOOD Meritorious Performance	GOOD Highly Competent Performance	SATISFACTORY Competent Performance	BORDERLINE FAIL Need Improvement	UNSATISFACTORY Fail
Problem Definition, Literature Review and Research Methodology (1 Subgrade)	Research gap	Clearly identifies a significant research gap in the field of AI & DS, supported by current literature and real-world relevance.	Identifies a relevant research gap with a clear explanation. Shows a good understanding of the field and provides some evidence to support the identified gap.	Identifies a research gap that is relevant but lacks depth in explanation. Shows an understanding of the field but provides limited evidence to support the gap.	Identifies a research gap, but the significance or originality is less clear. Shows an adequate understanding of the field with limited evidence to support the gap.	Identifies a research gap that is unclear or not well-supported. Shows minimal understanding of the field and lacks evidence.	Fails to identify a clear research gap. Demonstrates little to no understanding of the field and provides no supporting evidence.
	Research question(s)	Formulates clear, focused, and original research question(s) that logically lead to the project aim and objectives. Demonstrates a strong connection between the research question(s), aim, and objectives.	Formulates clear and relevant research question(s) that lead to the project aim and objectives. Shows a good connection between the research question(s), aim, and objectives.	Formulates research question(s) that are clear and relevant but with minor gaps in connection to the project aim and objectives.	Formulates research question(s) that are somewhat clear and relevant, but the connection to the project aim and objectives is less strong.	Formulates research question(s) that are unclear or not fully relevant. Shows a weak connection between the research question(s), aim, and objectives.	Fails to formulate clear research question(s) or does not link them to the project aim and objectives.
	Project aim and objectives	Conducts an exhaustive and critical review of the literature. Demonstrates deep understanding of the topic and effectively synthesises information from multiple sources.	Conducts a thorough review of the literature. Shows good understanding of the topic and synthesises information from various sources.	Conducts a reasonably thorough review of the literature with minor gaps. Shows a good understanding of the topic but with limited synthesis.	Conducts an adequate review of the literature. Shows a reasonable understanding of the topic but synthesis of information is limited.	Conducts a limited review of the literature. Shows minimal understanding of the topic and lacks synthesis of information.	Fails to conduct a meaningful review of the literature. Demonstrates little to no understanding of the topic.
	Literature review	Provides a comprehensive and accurately formatted bibliography. Sources are highly relevant and credible.	Provides a well-formatted bibliography with relevant and credible sources. Minor formatting errors may be present.	Provides a reasonably well-formatted bibliography with relevant and credible sources. Some formatting errors are present.	Provides a bibliography with some relevant and credible sources. Several formatting errors are present.	Provides a bibliography that is unclear or partially justified, based on methodologies for AI & DS research.	Fails to provide a meaningful bibliography. Sources are irrelevant or missing, and formatting is poor.
	Research plan	Develops a detailed and well-justified research plan based on appropriate methodologies for AI & DS research.	Develops a clear and well-justified research plan based on appropriate methodologies for AI & DS research.	Develops a reasonably clear research plan based on appropriate methodologies for AI & DS research.	Develops an adequate research plan based on appropriate methodologies for AI & DS research.	Numerous formatting errors are present. Develops a research plan that is unclear or partially justified, based on methodologies for AI & DS research.	Sources are irrelevant or missing, and formatting is poor. Fails to develop a coherent research plan or uses inappropriate methodologies for AI & DS research.
		Thoroughly addresses social, legal, ethical, and professional considerations with clear evidence of understanding.	Addresses social, legal, ethical, and professional considerations with good understanding.	Addresses social, legal, ethical, and professional considerations with minor gaps.	Addresses some social, legal, ethical, and professional considerations, but with limited depth.	Minimally addresses social, legal, ethical, and professional considerations.	Neglects social, legal, ethical, and professional considerations.

GRADE		A	B	C	D	E	F
DEFINITION / CRITERIA (WEIGHTING)		EXCELLENT Outstanding Performance	COMMENDABLE/ VERY GOOD Meritorious Performance	GOOD Highly Competent Performance	SATISFACTORY Competent Performance	BORDERLINE FAIL Need Improvement	UNSATISFACTORY Fail
Data Collection Exploration and Preprocessing (1 Subgrade)	Source(s) of data Data collection methodology Data Storage and Persistence Plan Justification of suitability of secondary data Description of the raw data	<p>Clearly identifies all relevant data sources with comprehensive details. Demonstrates an excellent understanding of the data sources.</p> <p>Provides a detailed and well-justified data collection methodology. Demonstrates excellent understanding and appropriateness of Data Storage and Persistence Plan.</p> <p>Provides a thorough and well-supported justification for the suitability of secondary data. Demonstrates excellent understanding of data relevance and reliability.</p> <p>Provides a comprehensive and clear description of the raw data, including all relevant attributes and data types.</p>	<p>Identifies most relevant data sources with good details. Demonstrates a good understanding of the data sources.</p> <p>Provides a clear and justified data collection methodology. Demonstrates good understanding and appropriateness of Data Storage and Persistence Plan.</p> <p>Provides a clear and supported justification for the suitability of secondary data. Demonstrates good understanding of data relevance and reliability.</p> <p>Provides a clear description of the raw data, including most relevant attributes and data types.</p> <p>Provides a clear description of</p>	<p>Identifies some relevant data sources with adequate details. Demonstrates a reasonable understanding of the data sources.</p> <p>Provides an adequate data collection methodology with some justification. Demonstrates reasonable understanding and appropriateness of Data Storage and Persistence Plan.</p> <p>Provides an adequate justification for the suitability of secondary data with some support. Demonstrates reasonable understanding of data relevance and reliability.</p> <p>Provides an adequate description of the raw data, including some relevant attributes and data types.</p> <p>Provides an adequate description of preprocessing steps and</p>	<p>Identifies a few relevant data sources with minimal details. Demonstrates a limited understanding of the data sources.</p> <p>Provides a minimal data collection methodology with little justification. Demonstrates limited understanding and appropriateness of Data Storage and Persistence Plan.</p> <p>Provides minimal justification for the suitability of secondary data with little support. Demonstrates limited understanding of data relevance and reliability.</p> <p>Provides a minimal description of the raw data with few relevant attributes and data types. Provides a minimal description of preprocessing steps and final dataset dimensions. Demonstrates limited</p>	<p>Identifies data sources that are not relevant or with very minimal details. Demonstrates a poor understanding of the data sources.</p> <p>Provides an inadequate data collection methodology with poor justification. Demonstrates poor understanding and appropriateness of Data Storage and Persistence Plan.</p> <p>Provides poor justification for the suitability of secondary data with weak support. Demonstrates poor understanding of data relevance and reliability.</p> <p>Provides a poor description of the raw data with very few relevant attributes and data types. Provides a poor description of</p>	<p>Fails to identify relevant data sources or provides no details. Demonstrates no understanding of the data sources.</p> <p>Fails to provide a data collection methodology or provides an irrelevant one. Demonstrates no understanding of Data Storage and Persistence Plan.</p> <p>Fails to justify the suitability of secondary data or provides irrelevant justification. Demonstrates no understanding of data relevance and reliability.</p> <p>Fails to describe the raw data or provides an irrelevant description. Fails to describe preprocessing steps and final dataset dimensions or provides irrelevant description. Demonstrates no understanding of</p>

GRADE		A	B	C	D	E	F
DEFINITION / CRITERIA (WEIGHTING)		EXCELLENT Outstanding Performance	COMMENDABLE/ VERY GOOD Meritorious Performance	GOOD Highly Competent Performance	SATISFACTORY Competent Performance	BORDERLINE FAIL Need Improvement	UNSATISFACTORY Fail
	<p>Description of preprocessing and final dataset dimensions</p> <p>Exploratory data analysis including visualisation</p> <p>Address potential class imbalance issues</p>	<p>Provides a detailed and clear description of preprocessing steps and final dataset dimensions. Demonstrates excellent understanding of preprocessing techniques.</p> <p>Conducts a comprehensive and insightful exploratory data analysis with high-quality visualisations. Demonstrates excellent understanding and interpretation of the data.</p> <p>Identifies potential class imbalance issues thoroughly and employs multiple appropriate techniques. Provides clear justification and analysis of impact.</p>	<p>preprocessing steps and final dataset dimensions. Demonstrates good understanding of preprocessing techniques. Conducts a thorough exploratory data analysis with good visualisations. Demonstrates good understanding and interpretation of the data.</p> <p>Identifies class imbalance issues and employs appropriate techniques. Provides good justification and some analysis of impact.</p>	<p>final dataset dimensions. Demonstrates reasonable understanding of preprocessing techniques. Conducts an adequate exploratory data analysis with reasonable visualisations. Demonstrates reasonable understanding and interpretation of the data.</p> <p>Identifies class imbalance issues and employs some techniques with limited justification and minimal analysis of impact.</p>	<p>understanding of preprocessing techniques. Conducts minimal exploratory data analysis with poor visualisations. Demonstrates limited understanding and interpretation of the data. Identifies class imbalance issues but employs minimal techniques with little justification and no analysis of impact.</p>	<p>preprocessing steps and final dataset dimensions. Demonstrates poor understanding of preprocessing techniques. Conducts poor exploratory data analysis with very poor visualisations. Demonstrates poor understanding and interpretation of the data. Poorly identifies class imbalance issues and employs inadequate techniques with poor justification.</p>	<p>preprocessing techniques. Fails to conduct exploratory data analysis or provides irrelevant analysis. Demonstrates no understanding and interpretation of the data. Fails to identify class imbalance issues or employ any appropriate techniques.</p>
<p>Model/Framework Development and Refinement</p> <p>(1 Subgrade)</p>	<p>Feature/Data Engineering</p> <p>Algorithm Selection and Justification</p>	<p>Considers a wide range of feature extraction and selection options. Employs and justifies the best options with detailed reasoning and analysis of impact.</p> <p>Provides a thorough and well-supported justification for the choice of algorithms used for modelling, including detailed analysis of their suitability for the</p>	<p>Considers multiple feature extraction and selection options. Employs and justifies the chosen options with good reasoning and some analysis of impact.</p> <p>Provides a clear and supported justification for the choice of algorithms used for modelling, including analysis of their</p>	<p>Considers some feature extraction and selection options. Employs and justifies the chosen options with adequate reasoning and limited analysis of impact.</p> <p>Provides an adequate justification for the choice of algorithms used for modelling, with some analysis of their suitability for the data and problem.</p>	<p>Considers few feature extraction and selection options. Employs chosen options with minimal justification and no analysis of impact.</p> <p>Provides minimal justification for the choice of algorithms used for modelling, with little analysis of their suitability for the data and problem.</p>	<p>Considers very few feature extraction and selection options. Poor justification for chosen options.</p> <p>Provides poor justification for the choice of algorithms used for modelling, with weak analysis of their suitability for the data and problem.</p> <p>Provides a poor model/framework</p>	<p>Fails to consider or justify feature extraction and selection options.</p> <p>Fails to justify the choice of algorithms used for modelling or provides irrelevant justification.</p> <p>Fails to provide a meaningful mode/framework architecture and refinement process, data preprocessing,</p>

GRADE		A	B	C	D	E	F
DEFINITION / CRITERIA (WEIGHTING)		EXCELLENT Outstanding Performance	COMMENDABLE/ VERY GOOD Meritorious Performance	GOOD Highly Competent Performance	SATISFACTORY Competent Performance	BORDERLINE FAIL Need Improvement	UNSATISFACTORY Fail
	<p>Implementation and Coding Quality</p> <p>Model/ Framework Architecture</p> <p>Model/ Framework Refinement</p> <p>Utilisation of insights from the literature review to improve the model/ framework.</p>	<p>data and problem. Well defined model/frame architecture, and extensive hyperparameter tuning, etc,. Provides a comprehensive and detailed model/framework refinement process. Demonstrates excellent understanding and application. Identifies risks (overfitting, etc) thoroughly and employs multiple appropriate techniques. Provides clear justification and analysis of impact. Excellently utilise the requirements/ research gaps found in the Literature review to further enhance or develop the model / framework.</p>	<p>suitability for the data and problem. Provides a clear model/frame architecture, and detailed hyperparameter tuning, etc,. Provides a very good and detailed model/framework refinement process. Demonstrates good understanding and application. Identifies risks (overfitting, etc) and employs appropriate techniques. Provides good justification and some analysis of impact. A good utilisation of the requirements/ research gaps found in the Literature review to further enhance or develop the model / framework.</p>	<p>Provides an adequate model/framework architecture and refinement process including reasonable data preprocessing, hyperparameter tuning, etc. Demonstrates reasonable understanding and application. Identifies risks (overfitting, etc) and employs some techniques with limited justification and minimal analysis of impact. A satisfactory utilisation of the requirements/ research gaps found in the Literature review to further enhance or develop the model / framework.</p>	<p>Provides a minimal model/framework architecture and refinement process with some data preprocessing, minimal hyperparameter tuning, etc. Demonstrates limited understanding and application. Identifies risks (overfitting, etc) but employs minimal techniques with little justification and no analysis of impact. An adequate utilisation of the requirements/ research gaps found in the Literature review to further enhance or develop the model / framework.</p>	<p>architecture and refinement process with inadequate data preprocessing, poor hyperparameter tuning, etc. Demonstrates poor understanding and application. Poorly Identifies risks (overfitting, etc) and employs inadequate techniques with poor justification. Poor utilisation of the requirements/ research gaps found in the Literature review to further enhance or develop the model / framework.</p>	<p>hyperparameter tuning, etc. Demonstrates no understanding and application. Fails to Identify risks (overfitting, etc) or employ any appropriate techniques. No utilisation of the requirements/ research gaps found in the Literature review to further enhance or develop the model / framework.</p>

GRADE		A	B	C	D	E	F
DEFINITION / CRITERIA (WEIGHTING)		EXCELLENT Outstanding Performance	COMMENDABLE/ VERY GOOD Meritorious Performance	GOOD Highly Competent Performance	SATISFACTORY Competent Performance	BORDERLINE FAIL Need Improvement	UNSATISFACTORY Fail
Model/Framework Evaluation and Validation (1 Subgrade)	<p>Model evaluation and validation approaches</p> <p>Justification of approach(es) adopted</p> <p>Results of approach used</p> <p>Interpretation and explainability of results</p> <p>Benchmarking against comparable work (on similar datasets)</p>	<p>Clearly identifies multiple appropriate model evaluation and validation approaches. Demonstrates excellent understanding and relevance to the model and data.</p> <p>Clearly identifies multiple appropriate model evaluation and validation approaches. Demonstrates excellent understanding and relevance to the model and data.</p> <p>Presents results clearly and comprehensively. Results are highly relevant and well-organised, demonstrating excellent application of the chosen approaches.</p> <p>Provides insightful and thorough interpretation of the results. Clearly explains the significance and implications of the findings with excellent depth.</p> <p>Thoroughly benchmarks results against comparable work on similar datasets. Provides detailed analysis and clear comparisons, demonstrating excellent understanding of the relative performance.</p>	<p>Identifies several appropriate model evaluation and validation approaches. Demonstrates good understanding and relevance to the model and data.</p> <p>Provides a clear and supported justification for the chosen evaluation and validation approaches. Explains why the approaches are suitable for the model and data.</p> <p>Presents results clearly and thoroughly. Results are relevant and well-organised, demonstrating good application of the chosen approaches.</p> <p>Provides clear and thorough interpretation of the results. Explains the significance and implications of the findings with good depth.</p> <p>Clearly benchmarks results against comparable work on similar datasets. Provides good analysis and comparisons, demonstrating good understanding of the relative performance.</p>	<p>Identifies some model evaluation and validation approaches with reasonable relevance to the model and data. Demonstrates adequate understanding.</p> <p>Provides an adequate justification for the chosen evaluation and validation approaches. Offers some explanation of suitability for the model and data.</p> <p>Presents results adequately. Results are somewhat relevant and organised, demonstrating reasonable application of the chosen approaches.</p> <p>Provides adequate interpretation of the results. Explains the significance and implications of the findings with reasonable depth.</p> <p>Adequately benchmarks results against comparable work on similar datasets. Provides reasonable analysis and comparisons, demonstrating adequate understanding of the relative performance.</p>	<p>Identifies few model evaluation and validation approaches with limited relevance to the model and data. Demonstrates limited understanding.</p> <p>Provides minimal justification for the chosen evaluation and validation approaches. Offers limited explanation of suitability for the model and data.</p> <p>Presents results minimally. Results are of limited relevance and organisation, demonstrating limited application of the chosen approaches.</p> <p>Provides minimal interpretation of the results. Explains the significance and implications of the findings with limited depth.</p> <p>Minimally benchmarks results against comparable work on similar datasets. Provides limited analysis and comparisons, demonstrating limited understanding of the relative performance.</p>	<p>Identifies minimal model evaluation and validation approaches with poor relevance to the model and data. Demonstrates poor understanding.</p> <p>Provides poor justification for the chosen evaluation and validation approaches. Offers weak explanations of suitability for the model and data.</p> <p>Presents results poorly. Results are of poor relevance and organisation, demonstrating weak application of the chosen approaches.</p> <p>Provides poor interpretation of the results. Explains the significance and implications of the findings with poor depth.</p> <p>Poorly benchmarks results against comparable work on similar datasets. Provides weak analysis and comparisons, demonstrating poor understanding of the relative performance.</p>	<p>Fails to identify appropriate model evaluation and validation approaches. Demonstrates no understanding.</p> <p>Fails to justify the chosen evaluation and validation approaches. Offers no explanation of suitability. Fails to present relevant results. Demonstrates no application of the chosen approaches.</p> <p>Fails to provide interpretation of the results. Does not explain the significance or implications of the findings.</p> <p>Fails to benchmark results against comparable work on similar datasets. Provides no analysis or comparisons, demonstrating no understanding of the relative performance.</p>

GRADE		A	B	C	D	E	F
DEFINITION / CRITERIA (WEIGHTING)		EXCELLENT Outstanding Performance	COMMENDABLE/ VERY GOOD Meritorious Performance	GOOD Highly Competent Performance	SATISFACTORY Competent Performance	BORDERLINE FAIL Need Improvement	UNSATISFACTORY Fail
Documentation and Reflection (1 Subgrade)	<p>Comprehensive thesis document including introduction, literature review, methodology, results, discussion, conclusion, bibliography and any relevant appendices</p> <p>Reflective report</p> <p>Draft conference paper/journal manuscript</p>	<p>Provides a comprehensive and well-organised thesis document. Each section is thorough, coherent, and demonstrates deep understanding and analysis. The document includes detailed findings, contributions, limitations, and future work.</p> <p>The bibliography is extensive and correctly formatted. Appendices are relevant and well-structured.</p> <p>Provides a comprehensive and insightful reflective report. Demonstrates deep reflection on the work carried out, including challenges faced, lessons learned, and personal growth. The report is well-structured and articulated.</p> <p>Provides a well-written and well-structured draft conference paper or journal manuscript. Demonstrates a high level of academic writing, clarity, and coherence. Includes significant findings, thorough analysis, and appropriate citations.</p>	<p>Provides a thorough and well-organised thesis document. Each section is detailed and demonstrates good understanding and analysis. The document includes findings, contributions, limitations, and future work.</p> <p>The bibliography is extensive and mostly correctly formatted. Appendices are relevant and structured.</p> <p>Provides a thorough and insightful reflective report. Demonstrates good reflection on the work carried out, including challenges faced, lessons learned, and personal growth. The report is well-structured.</p> <p>Provides a well-written and structured draft conference paper or journal manuscript. Demonstrates good academic writing, clarity, and coherence. The paper includes significant findings, analysis, and appropriate citations.</p>	<p>Provides an adequate and reasonably organised thesis document. Each section contains necessary information and demonstrates reasonable understanding and analysis. The document includes findings, contributions, limitations, and future work.</p> <p>The bibliography is adequate and mostly correctly formatted. Appendices are included but may lack structure.</p> <p>Provides an adequate reflective report. Demonstrates reasonable reflection on the work carried out, including some challenges faced and lessons learned. The report is reasonably structured.</p> <p>Provides an adequately written and structured draft conference paper or journal manuscript. Demonstrates reasonable academic writing and coherence. The paper includes findings, analysis, and appropriate citations.</p>	<p>Provides a minimally organised thesis document. Some sections may lack necessary detail or coherence. The document includes basic findings, contributions, limitations, and future work.</p> <p>The bibliography is limited and contains formatting errors. Appendices are included but may be incomplete.</p> <p>Provides a minimal reflective report. Demonstrates limited reflection on the work carried out, with few challenges faced and lessons learned. The report lacks structure.</p> <p>Provides a minimally written and structured draft conference paper or journal manuscript. Demonstrates limited academic writing and coherence. The paper includes basic findings and analysis but lacks appropriate citations.</p>	<p>Provides a poorly organised thesis document. Many sections lack necessary detail and coherence. The document includes few findings, contributions, limitations, and future work.</p> <p>The bibliography is very limited and poorly formatted. Appendices are missing or irrelevant.</p> <p>Provides a poor reflective report. Demonstrates weak reflection on the work carried out, with very few challenges faced and lessons learned. The report is poorly structured.</p> <p>Provides a poorly written and structured draft conference paper or journal manuscript. Demonstrates weak academic writing and coherence. The paper includes few findings and analysis and lacks appropriate citations.</p>	<p>Fails to provide a coherent thesis document. Most sections are missing or incomplete. The document includes no significant findings, contributions, limitations, or future work.</p> <p>The bibliography is missing or irrelevant. Appendices are not included.</p> <p>Fails to provide a reflective report. Demonstrates no reflection on the work carried out. The report lacks structure and coherence.</p> <p>Fails to provide a coherent draft conference paper or journal manuscript. Demonstrates no academic writing skills. The paper lacks findings, analysis, and appropriate citations.</p>

GRADE		A	B	C	D	E	F
DEFINITION / CRITERIA (WEIGHTING)		EXCELLENT Outstanding Performance	COMMENDABLE/ VERY GOOD Meritorious Performance	GOOD Highly Competent Performance	SATISFACTORY Competent Performance	BORDERLINE FAIL Need Improvement	UNSATISFACTORY Fail
Presentation and Viva (2 Subgrades)	Engaging and Coherent Presentation	<p>Delivers an exceptionally engaging and well-structured presentation, using analogies and examples effectively.</p> <p>Communicates all aspects of the project with clarity, covering problem definition, research questions addressed, methodology adopted, implementation details, results, discussion, limitations, and future work thoroughly. Uses visual aids effectively and maintains excellent clarity and pace. Demonstrates thorough preparation and confidence.</p> <p>Provides an effective demonstration of the key components of the solution in the form of a working prototype (UI and hosting not essential) that clearly highlights the main contributions.</p> <p>Handles questions exceptionally well, with confidence, accuracy, and thoughtful justification.</p>	<p>Delivers a highly engaging and well-structured presentation, using analogies and examples appropriately.</p> <p>Communicates all aspects of the project clearly, covering problem definition, research questions addressed, methodology adopted, implementation details, results, discussion, limitations, and future work comprehensively. Uses visual aids effectively and maintains good clarity and pace. Demonstrates good preparation and confidence.</p> <p>Provides a clear demonstration of the key components of the solution in the form of a working prototype (UI and hosting not essential) that highlights the main contributions.</p> <p>Handles questions confidently, accurately, and thoughtfully with good justification.</p>	<p>Delivers an engaging and reasonably structured presentation, using analogies and examples where appropriate.</p> <p>Communicates most aspects of the project clearly, covering problem definition, research questions addressed, methodology adopted, implementation details, results, discussion, limitations, and future work adequately. Uses visual aids appropriately and maintains reasonable clarity and pace. Demonstrates adequate preparation and confidence.</p> <p>Provides a reasonable demonstration of the key components of the solution in the form of a working prototype (UI and hosting not essential) that highlights some contributions.</p> <p>Handles questions adequately, with reasonable confidence and accuracy, providing some justification.</p>	<p>Delivers a minimally engaging and structured presentation, with limited use of analogies and examples.</p> <p>Communicates some aspects of the project clearly, but may lack depth in problem definition, research questions addressed, methodology adopted, implementation details, results, discussion, limitations, and future work. Uses visual aids with limited effectiveness and may struggle with clarity and pace. Demonstrates limited preparation and confidence.</p> <p>Provides a minimal demonstration of the key components of the solution in the form of a working prototype (UI and hosting not essential) that highlights very few contributions.</p> <p>Handles questions with limited confidence and accuracy, providing minimal justification.</p>	<p>Delivers a poorly engaging and structured presentation, with poor or irrelevant use of analogies and examples.</p> <p>Fails to communicate most aspects of the project clearly, lacking depth in problem definition, research questions addressed, methodology adopted, implementation details, results, discussion, limitations, and future work. Uses visual aids poorly and struggles with clarity and pace. Demonstrates poor preparation and confidence.</p> <p>Provides a poor demonstration of the key components of the solution in the form of a working prototype (UI and hosting not essential) that highlights very few contributions.</p> <p>Handles questions poorly, with weak confidence and accuracy, providing poor justification.</p>	<p>Fails to deliver an engaging and structured presentation, with no effective use of analogies or examples.</p> <p>Does not communicate any aspects of the project clearly, lacking depth in problem definition, research questions addressed, methodology adopted, implementation details, results, discussion, limitations, and future work. Uses no or ineffective visual aids and fails to maintain clarity and pace. Demonstrates no preparation or confidence.</p> <p>Fails to provide a demonstration of the key components of the solution in the form of a working prototype (UI and hosting not essential) that highlights contributions.</p> <p>Handles questions with no confidence, accuracy, or thoughtful justification.</p>
	Clarity, Pace and Confidence in Delivery Demonstration of the Project Solution Handling of Questions						

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

GRADE		A	B	C	D	E	F
DEFINITION / CRITERIA (WEIGHTING)		EXCELLENT Outstanding Performance	COMMENDABLE/ VERY GOOD Meritorious Performance	GOOD Highly Competent Performance	SATISFACTORY Competent Performance	BORDERLINE FAIL Need Improvement	UNSATISFACTORY Fail
Planning, consultation and engagement (1 Subgrade)	Student Commitment and engagement Frequency of meetings Formative submissions Class attendance and Participation	Exceptional commitment, goes beyond expectations, and is highly proactive. Attended all scheduled meetings, proactive in scheduling extra meetings. Submitted all work on time, high quality, and exceeded expectations. Excellent attendance, consistently engaged in discussions.	Strong commitment, consistent effort, actively engaged. Attended most meetings, occasionally initiated additional meetings. Submitted most work on time, good quality. Regular attendance, actively participates in most classes.	Satisfactory effort, meets the requirements, fair engagement. Attended required meetings with few delays. Submitted most work, satisfactory quality. Satisfactory attendance, participates occasionally.	Adequate commitment, meets basic requirements, some engagement. Attended a few meetings, occasionally absent or delayed. Missed some deadlines, work of inconsistent quality. Irregular attendance, minimal participation.	Very little commitment, rarely engaged. Rarely attended meetings, minimal communication. Frequently missed deadlines, poor quality work. Rare attendance, little to no participation.	No commitment or engagement. Did not attend meetings. No submissions or consistently late with poor quality. No attendance or participation.

What else is important to my assessment?

What is the Assessment Word Limit Statement?

It is important that you adhere to the Word Limit specified above. The Assessment Word Limit Statement can be found in Appendix 3 of the [RGU Assessment Policy](#). It provides detail on the purpose, setting and implementation of wordage limits; lists what is included and excluded from the word count; and the penalty for exceeding the word count.

What's included in the word count?

The table below lists the constituent parts which are included and excluded from the word limit of a Coursework; more detail can be found in the full Assessment Word Limit Statement. Images will not be allowed as a mechanism to circumvent the word count.

Excluded	Included
Cover or Title Page	Main Text e.g. Introduction, Literature Review, Methodology, Results, Discussion, Analysis, Conclusions, and Recommendations
Executive Summary (Reports) or Abstract	Headings and subheadings
Contents Page	In-text citations
List of Abbreviations and/or List of Acronyms	Footnotes (relating to in-text footnote numbers)
List of Tables and/or List of Figures	Quotes and quotations written within "..."
Tables – mainly numeric content	Tables – mainly text content
Figures	
Reference List and/or Bibliography	
Appendices	
Glossary	

What are the penalties?

The grade for the submission will be reduced to the next lowest grade if:

- The word count of submitted work is above the specified word limit by more or less than 10%.
- The submission contains an excessive use of text within Tables or Footnotes.

What else is important to my assessment?

What is plagiarism?

Plagiarism is “the practice of presenting the thoughts, writings or other output of another or others as original, without acknowledgement of their source(s) at the point of their use in the student’s work. All materials including text, data, diagrams or other illustrations used to support a piece of work, whether from a printed publication or from electronic media, should be appropriately identified and referenced and should not normally be copied directly unless as an acknowledged quotation. Text, opinions or ideas translated into the words of the individual student should in all cases acknowledge the original source” ([RGU 2022](#)).

What is collusion?

“Collusion is defined as two or more people working together with the intention of deceiving another. Within the academic environment this can occur when students work with others on an assignment, or part of an assignment, that is intended to be completed separately” ([RGU 2022](#)). For further information please see [Academic Integrity](#).

What if I’m unable to submit?

- The University operates a [Fit to Sit Policy](#) which means that if you undertake an assessment then you are declaring yourself well enough to do so.
- If you require an extension, you should complete and submit a [Coursework Extension Form](#). This form is available on the RGU [Student and Applicant Forms](#) page.
- Further support is available from your Course Leader.

What additional support is available?

- [RGU Study Skills](#) provide advice and guidance on academic writing, study skills, maths and statistics and basic IT.
- [RGU Library guidance on referencing and citing](#).
- [The Inclusion Centre: Disability & Dyslexia](#).
- Your Module Coordinator, Course Leader and designated Personal Tutor can also provide support.

What are the University rules on assessment?

The University Regulation ‘[A4: Assessment and Recommendations of Assessment Boards](#)’ sets out important information about assessment and how it is conducted across the University.