Assessment Brief: Coursework 2023-24

Assessment Details

Course Title:	Artificial Intelligence Dissertation Project
Course Code:	LDSCI7237
Course Leader:	Mark Martin
Level:	7
Assessment Title:	Dissertation
Assessment Number:	AE2
Assessment Type:	Dissertation
Restrictions on Time/Length:	Up to 10,000 words
Individual/Group:	Individual
Assessment Weighting:	60%
Issue Date:	13 May 2024
Hand in Deadline:	13 December 2024
Planned Feedback Deadline:	Within 28 calendar days of hand in deadline
Mode of Submission:	Online
Anonymous Marking:	No

Assessment Task

Complete a dissertation on an approved topic. You may consider the following indicative layout for your report.

- **Abstract.** (This is no more than one side - which summarises the content of the report. It must be comprehensible to someone who has not read the rest of the report.)
- **Introduction.** (The scope or hypothesis of the project and terms of reference, setting the scene for the remainder of the report.)
- **Background.** (A review chapter, describing the background work or research undertaken at the beginning of the project period.)

- **Work undertaken.** Several chapters describing the work that has been undertaken.
- **Outputs.** A chapter describing the outputs, deliverables or artefacts that have been produced as a result of the project.
- **Further work.** (A chapter describing possible ways in which the work could be continued or developed.)
- **Conclusion**. (A chapter relating to the work done, and outputs produced to the initial hypothesis and terms of reference.)
- **References.** (A list of references used in your report.)
- **Appendices.** (Any appendices that are required.)

Assessment Criteria

Projects will be assessed according to the following five criteria: background research, project management, achievement, report, and artefact.

Background research

This criterion assesses the background research undertaken and the manner in which the approach and programme of work fits in with the current state of the art:

a. Are the students aware of existing work in the area?
b. Have students made it clear how prior work informs their project?
c. Do students cite relevant projects (e.g., papers, reports, books, web sites, source code repositories, etc)?
d. Do students know why they are doing the work, and do they know their target audience or user?

Project management

This criterion assesses the overall approach to the project and the students' ability to overcome the inevitable complications which arise. Specific areas of assessment are management and organisation, including time and risk management:

a. Did they manage their time well?
b. Did they make steady progress throughout the project?
c. Did they use the right tools for the job?
d. Did they identify potential risks, and did they establish appropriate contingency plans to mitigate those risks?
e. Did they show the ability to work independently and without significant technical assistance?
f. Did they attend regular meetings?
g. Did the ideas come from them?

Achievement

The achievement criterion of the project should reflect its technical difficulty. Projects with low levels of risk, e.g., straightforward implementation projects, cannot be expected to score very highly in this category.

a. What were the challenges and risks involved?
b. Is the approach taken technically sound? Is the output fully functional and correct?
c. Is it properly evaluated, e.g., with respect to functionality/performance testing and is this backed up with detailed tables, graphs, subjective/objective comparisons, user feedback, reflection etc.?
d. Does the work break any new ground?
e. Can the ideas and/or deliverables be published in some form?
f. Has the student made exceptional progress, e.g. by achieving something that may have flummoxed other students?

Report

The report has to be good enough to be at the level the project is finally assessed at. For example, if the project is a first-class project, then the report should ideally be a first-class report:

a. Was it handed in on time?
b. Does it contain the main components one would expect?
c. Is it well-structured and well laid out?
d. Is it well written?
e. Is it largely free of typos, spelling mistakes and grammatical errors?
f. Are the contributions clear?
g. Does it describe the motivation for the work?
h. Does it set the scene well in terms of introduction, background, and motivation?
i. Can you follow what they have done, how and why by reading the main body?
j. Are any results well explained and easy to interpret?
k. Are the strengths and weaknesses presented appropriately?
l. Are there meaningful conclusions and is there a sensible programme of future work?
m. Does it have an appropriate level of detail and is it of an appropriate size?
n. Does the report cite the relevant literature and are the sources cited correctly in the bibliography?

Artefact

As above. The source code of any artefact produced for the project should be well organised, well written, and well structured.

Marking

The University uses two common assessment marking schemes – one for undergraduate and one for postgraduate – to mark all taught programmes leading to an award of the University.

More detailed information on the common assessment marking scheme and the criteria can be found in the Course Syllabus, available on the University's VLE.

Learning Outcomes

This assessment will enable students to demonstrate in full or in part the learning outcomes identified in the Course Descriptor.

On successful completion of this assessment, students should be able to:

Knowledge and Understanding

K1d Identify, analyse, and interpret requirements to solve a problem rigorously (e.g., formulate a thesis statement, identify steps to prove it, and substantiate your findings with data).

K2d Demonstrate detailed critical engagement with methods, tools and technologies required to solve a problem (e.g., philosophical devices or software libraries).

K3d Demonstrate a sophisticated understanding of (qualitative or quantitative) data analysis principles, tools and techniques.

K4d Critical review of related work, identifying key developments in a particular area, opportunities for integration, limitations and avenues for further development and innovation.

Subject-Specific Skills

S1d Ability to engage in a peer review process that involves critical review of ideas, arguments, software and related documentation, coupled with positive actions, advice for improvement and innovation.

S2d Ability to recognise the individual components required to solve a problem or answer a question and combine them into a coherent argument or solution.

S3d Develop original arguments based on solid background work and coupled with positive actions for improvement and innovation.

S4d Familiarity with codes of ethics and codes of practice that underpin the development of high quality, high integrity research projects.

Transferable Skills

T1d Project leadership skills, from understanding a problem to proposing a solution based on sound insights, to encouraging others to share that vision.

T2d Consistently display an excellent level of technical proficiency in written English and command of scholarly terminology, so as to be able to deal with complex issues in a sophisticated and systematic way.

T3d Research and analytical skills with a range of up-to-date, well-proven tools and resources.

T4d Communicate effectively the intellectual merit and broader impacts of the project to specialist and non-specialist audiences.

Accessing Feedback

Students can expect to receive feedback on all summative coursework within 28 calendar days of the submission deadline. The 28 calendar day deadline does not apply to work submitted late. Feedback can be accessed through the Turnitin assessment link on the course page. Further instructions on submitting an assessment and accessing feedback can be found on the University's VLE.

Late Submissions

Students are reminded to submit their assessment in the correct format and ahead of the published deadline. Deadlines are strict and Canvas uploads made remotely might not be immediate, we therefore strongly recommend that students upload their work to Canvas in good time before the deadline. If assessments are submitted late without approved Extenuating Circumstances, there are penalties:

- For assessments submitted up to two days late: any mark of 40% or higher will be capped at 40% for undergraduate students. Any mark of 50% or higher will be capped at 50% for postgraduate students. Any mark below 40% for undergraduate students and below 50% for postgraduate students, will stand.

- Students who do not submit their assessment within two days, and have no approved extenuating circumstances, are deemed not to have submitted and to have failed that assessment element. The mark recorded will be 0%.
- Late penalties are calculated differently for some types of portfolios. Please read the Assessment Brief of your portfolio carefully.

For further information, please refer to AQF7 Part C in the Academic Handbook.

Extenuating Circumstances

The University's Extenuating Circumstances (ECs) procedure is in place if there are genuine circumstances that may prevent a student submitting an assessment. If the EC application is successful, there will be no academic penalty for missing the published submission deadline.

Students are normally expected to apply for ECs in advance of the assessment deadline. Students may apply for consideration of ECs retrospectively if they can provide evidence that they could not have done so in advance of the deadline. All applications for ECs must be supported by independent evidence.

Students are reminded that the ECs procedure covers only short-term issues (within 21 days leading to the submission deadline) and that if they experience longer-term matters that impact on learning then they must contact Student Support and Development for advice.

Under the Extenuating Circumstances Policy, students may defer an assessed element on only one occasion and may request an extension on a maximum of two occasions.

For further information, please refer to the Extenuating Circumstances Policy in the Academic Handbook.

Academic Misconduct

Any submission must be a student's own work and, where facts or ideas have been used from other sources, these sources must be appropriately referenced. The Academic Misconduct Policy includes the definitions of all practices that will be deemed to constitute academic misconduct. This includes the use of artificial intelligence (AI) where not expressly permitted within the assessment brief, or in a manner other than specified. Students should check this policy before submitting their work. Students suspected of committing Academic Misconduct will face action under the Policy. Where students are found to have committed an offence they will be subject to sanction, which may include failing an assessment, failing a course or being dismissed from the University depending upon the severity of the offence

committed. For further information, please refer to the Academic Misconduct Policy in the Academic Handbook.

Version History

Title: Assessment Brief Template **Approved by: The Quality Team**					
Version number	**Date approved**	**Date published**	**Owner**	**Location**	**Proposed next review date**
3.0	August 2022	August 2022	Registrar	VLE, Faculty Resources Page	July 2023
2.3	December 2021	December 2021	Registrar	VLE	August 2022
2.2	August 2021	August 2021	Registrar	VLE	August 2022
2.1	September 2020	September 2020	Registrar	VLE	August 2021
2.0	September 2020	September 2020	Registrar	VLE	August 2021
1.0	August 2019	August 2019	Registrar	VLE	August 2020
Referenced documents	AQF7 Academic Regulations for Taught Awards; Extenuating Circumstances Policy; Academic Misconduct Policy; Course Syllabus				
External Reference Point(s)	UK Quality Code Theme: Assessment				