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### INTRODUCTION

This module provides students with the opportunity to undertake a major, in-depth, individual study in an aspect of their course. The project involves the student in researching and investigating aspects of their area of study and then producing a major deliverable.

The student also critically evaluates their major deliverable, including obtaining third party evaluation where appropriate.

Assessment is through an ICA 100%.  The major deliverable(s) will be presented via a poster display, and via a product demonstration / interactive pitch. The research, project process and evaluation will be reported via an accompanying written narrative which contextualises the creative output. The written report, the major deliverable and the student’s presentation of the product are assessed.

#### MODULE AIMS

* Develop subject specialism in an area of individual interest relating to design and / or development.
* Provide the opportunity to develop and exercise research skills and skills in critical evaluation appropriate to the specific field of study.
* Provide an opportunity to exercise skills learnt in the taught phase of the course on a major project.
* Encourage self-managed learning, reflection, planning and professional competence.

### DELIVERABLES

#### Reflective Report 30% – 1500 WORDS (+/- 10%)

* The Report – (1500 words)
* Identify a research question or hypothesis that identifies a challenge specific to their field of study and provide a sound justification based on the evidence identified.
* Investigate previous work (literature review and/or market research) and apply an appropriate methodological approach to address the identified problem.
* Critically evaluate of the product recognising the strengths and limitations of the work.
* Communicate work professionally in the required academic format/style including discussion of legal, ethical and professional issues.

#### The Product 60%

* The Product
* Deliverable relates to the specific field of study, demonstrates some originality and is robust in its development
* Addresses the research question/ hypothesis using appropriate techniques
* Demonstrates a significant solution to the specialised area of research or practice under investigation
* Produce high quality output that demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of techniques and some originality in the application of knowledge.
* Demonstrate an ability for independent learning.

#### Poster Presentation 10%

* The Presentation
* Effectively communicate and present complex and specialised concepts in the chosen domain in a constructive and reflective manner.
* This presentation can be in PDF or PowerPoint format and should not exceed 5 slides/pages.

### SUBMISSION GUIDELINES

You are required to hand in your work in the following way.

* Reflective report to be submitted as a PDF file to blackboard
* Poster Presentation report to be submitted as a PDF file to blackboard
* Final product and all the required components to recreate it submitted to blackboard or if the files are too large to post a link to an online location like OneDrive, google drive or dropbox where the files can be located. You will also submit a gameplay/demonstration video of your product in action. Please ensure your video is a minimum of 2-3 minutes long.

NOTES

*Any feedback given during this module is for the purposes of advice and guidance and to assist your learning and development in this module. References to standards or marks are entirely provisional and subject to confirmation following university procedures. Only University Assessment Boards are able to issue confirmed, definite marks.*

### SCHEDULE

DATE YOU CAN EXPECT TO RECEIVE YOUR FINAL MARK AND FEEDBACK

You can expect to receive your feedback by within 20 working days (weekends and holidays are not counted as working days) of the date of submission. Your marks and feedback will be available via Blackboard. You are welcome to make an appointment to discuss your feedback after the marks have been released should you wish to do so.

#### **8 – MARKING CRITERIA**

**ICA 1 – REPORT**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Excellent**  **80%+** | **Very Good**  **70%+** | **Good**  **60%+** | **Satisfactory**  **50%+** | **Unsatisfactory less than 50%** |
| **Grade 30%** | The format of the report is appropriate and in keeping with equivalent examples in the field. A strong academic writing tone is maintained throughout.  It has a highly focused and relevant title using appropriate specialist terminology. This is presented on a clear title page with the student name, university name and year.  An abstract quickly and succinctly summarises most sections of the report.  The aims are clear and focused around manageable questions.  The literature review demonstrates a focused, | The format of the report is appropriate and in keeping with equivalent examples in the field. A strong academic writing tone is maintained throughout.  It has a focused and relevant title using specialist  terminology. This is presented on a clear title card with the student name, university name and year.  An abstract summarises most sections of the research sections.  The aims are focused around meaningful questions.  Your literature review demonstrates a relevant analysis of some of the | The format of the report is internally consistent.  It has a broadly relevant title. This is presented on a clear title page with the student name, university name and year.  An abstract summarises the project and its aims as opposed to aspects of its findings.  Some aims and questions are defined but could do with further focus.  Your literature review touches upon some broadly relevant sources but a greater quantity and relevancy are needed to meaningfully inform your methodology. Some recent | The format of the report is good but would benefit with a redraft to improve structure and presentation.  It has a broad title that lacks relevancy. Title page misses some key information.  An abstract is introductory.  Some aims and questions are too broad, general or numerous to be addressed in a focussed way.  Your literature review is lacking in comparable sources, citations or images/ videos to illustrate their findings.  The development work is presented but more depth would be insightful. | The format of the report is unprofessional, unstructured or incoherent. It may fall well short of the recommended word count.  It has a broad title that lacks relevancy. Title page misses key information.  An abstract is introductory or missing.  Aims and questions are far too broad, general or numerous to be addressed in a meaningful way.  Your literature review is lacking in comparable sources, citations or images/ videos to illustrate their findings. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | insightful analysis of the closest creative/ technical examples in your field and how it informs your development. A selection of highly relevant and recent sources are cited in the  Teesside Harvard format. Images/ videos are used/ edited and cited to support your analysis.  The development work is clearly documented, annotated and visually communicated.  The results are visually and fully presented with clear accompanying annotations describing the end product.  You reflect upon what your results mean , how well your product addresses your topic/ question, what areas worked vs failed, what areas that need further addressing and where you might take the project in | competing examples in your field and how it informs your methodology. A selection of relevant and recent sources are cited in the Teesside Harvard format. Images/ videos are used/ edited and cited to support your analysis.  The development work is well documented with some annotations.  The results are visually presented with clear accompanying annotations describing the end product.  You reflect upon what your results mean, how well your artefact addresses your topic/ question and what areas need future improvement with insight and honest reflection  References have more than 7 relevant sources including academic journal papers that are accurately formatted in | sources are cited somewhat adhering to the Teesside Harvard format. Some images/ videos are used/ edited and cited to support your analysis but more would be useful.  The development work is documented with annotations.  The results are presented but a greater quantity, depth and level of detail would be informative.  You reflect upon the project’s successes and failures but more depth would be beneficial.  References have 5 or more decent quality sources that are largely web based and have an inconsistent formatting. | Your reflections are somewhat light and rushed.  References have 4 or less sources that are largely web based and fail to adhere to the Teesside Harvard style. | The development work is underdeveloped and poorly presented.  Your reflections are light and rushed.  References have 3 or less sources that are largely web based and fail to adhere to the Teesside Harvard style. |
|  | future with insight and honest reflection  References have more than 10 relevant sources including academic journal papers that are accurately formatted in Teesside Harvard style and listed alphabetically. | Teesside Harvard style and listed alphabetically. |  |  |  |

**ICA 2 – PRODUCT**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Excellent**  **80%+** | **Very Good**  **70%+** | **Good**  **60%+** | **Satisfactory**  **50%+** | **Unsatisfactory less than 50%** |
| **Grade 60%** | Selection and usage of tools is appropriate and ambitious in the pursuit of creating an exceptional professional quality creative piece.  The product is highly appropriate for the intended audience and field pushing the expected bar of creative and technical quality.  It is presented in a beautiful, clear, professional and high fidelity manner. | Selection and usage of tools is appropriate in the pursuit of creating a high quality professional creative piece.  The product is highly appropriate for the intended audience and field.  It is presented in a clear, professional and high fidelity manner. | Selection and usage of tools is appropriate in the pursuit of creating a good quality professional creative piece.  The product is largely appropriate for the intended audience and field.  It is presented in a clear, professional or high fidelity manner. | Selection and usage of tools is appropriate and expected in fulfilling a typical product.  The product is somewhat appropriate for the intended audience and field.  It is presented in a clear, manner but there is room for improvement in presentation. | No product was submitted or use of tools is inappropriate for the workflow.  The product is an unsatisfactory level of creative and technical development for the Masters level.  It is presented in an unclear or unprofessional manner. |

**ICA 3 – VIVA**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Excellent**  **80%+** | **Very Good**  **70%+** | **Good**  **60%+** | **Satisfactory**  **50%+** | **Unsatisfactory less than 50%** |
| **Grade 10%** | Indepth yet succinct and fully visual presentation exploring the workflow, challenges, accomplishments and creative or technical innovation with relevant references to leaders in the field. Questions answered confidently and fully, demonstrating a mastery of knowledge and skill. | Indepth yet succinct and fully visual presentation exploring the workflow, challenges, accomplishments and creative or technical innovation. Questions answered confidently. | Clear and visual  presentation exploring the workflow, challenges and accomplishments but lacking in creative or technical innovation.  Questions answered well. | Satisfactory presentation with basic explanation of the workflow and accomplishments but lacking in insight. Questions answered satisfactorily. | VIVA was missed or it was poorly explained and presented. Audience questions were shallow or unanswered. |