##### Uoh_Jubilee_P375

##### School of Computer of Science

##### ASSIGNMENT BRIEFING SHEET (2018/19 Academic Year) – ANONYMOUS MARKING

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Assignment Title** | Group Project | **Date Submitted** | 11/04/2019 |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Module Title** | Investigative Methods – Emotion Detection Analysis | **Module**  **Code** | 7COM1071 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Tutor** | **Steve Bennett** | **GROUP or INDIVIDUAL Assignment** | ***GROUP*** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FOR INDIVIDUAL ASSIGNMENTS – *STUDENT TO COMPLETE***   |  | | --- | | By completing **BOX A** below, I certify that thesubmitted work is entirely mine and that any material derived or quoted from the published or unpublished work of other persons has been duly acknowledged. **[ref. UPR AS12, section 7 and UPR AS14 (Appendix III)].**  *Please* ***ONLY*** *provide your ID (srn) number as this assignment will be anonymously marked* |   **BOX A**   |  | | --- | | **Student ID Number (SRN)** | | **18022208** | |

|  |
| --- |
|  |



**This sheet must be submitted with the assignment, and either BOX A or B filled in.**

**LATE SUBMISSION WILL ATTRACT A STANDARD LATENESS PENALTY.**

1. For undergraduate modules, a score of 40% or above represents a pass mark.
2. For postgraduate modules, a score of 50% or above represents a pass mark.
3. For work submitted up to 5 working days late marked is capped to a bare pass (40% for undergraduate and 50% for postgraduate).
4. For work submitted more than 5 working days a mark of zero will be awarded for the assignment.

##### School of Computer of Science

##### ASSIGNMENT BRIEFING SHEET (2017/18 Academic Year) – ANONYMOUS MARKING

|  |
| --- |
| **MODULE LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSED BY THIS ASSIGNMENT:**   1. have a knowledge and understanding of a set of research methods for the investigation of a problem in a given domain of computer science, and the principal advantages and limitations of those methods. 2. have a knowledge and understanding of different roles within a team and different ways of organising teams 3. be able to work effectively in a team, including where appropriate to lead and to manage that team. 4. be able to communicate effectively and professionally, both orally and in writing.   **THE ASSIGNMENT TASK: Redevelop a Previous Student Project**  You will join a group of between 3 and 4 people. In this group you will share one visualstudio.com repository GIT project (all must become team members of the project). You will be asked to look at a previous student project and redevelop the code that was associated with it. Having redeveloped the code, you will be required to re-run some of the experiments, trials or tests originally conducted on that project and collect data on them. Having done these things your group will then prepare a group presentation of your work (lasting up to 10 minutes) showing   * New features, functionality, refactored code, or any other enhancement added to the original software used in the project * Experiments, trials or tests conducted with your redeveloped software * Make conclusions from this and state to what extent they agree with the conclusions from the original project * Think of future work that could be based on this, potentially supported by a new literature search   The presentation will take place in front of the other students on the course. After each presentation, the whole class will grade the project and the mark awarded by the class as a whole will constitute 20% of the overall score for the group presentation. The artefacts and evidence of activity in the repository logs will be marked by the tutors alone.  All work (absolutely all work) must be checked in to the repository (this includes documentation, and presentation slides). For the presentation you may only use Tex. Any other presentation software (MS Office, Libre Office, Keynote) are expressly forbidden. This is in order that which person in the team contributed which lines in the presentation are clear to the tutor.  Nothing may be included in the presentation which has not been included in your GIT repository.  For this assignment you should submit:   1. The url and project name for your GIT repository 2. A zipped file of all the work done on the project (upload this to studynet) 3. A separate \*individual\* reflective document (max 500 words). In this you should describe your experience of group working. In it, you should also say, in percentages, how much each person in your team did, and what their major area of work was. You may, as a team, confer and agree on the percentages for each person, and their major area of work, but the reflective paragraphs should be entirely your own work.   Team working is very variable, but it is clear that the following roles will be necessary to complete this assignment:   * Team Chair (the person who does whatever organizing is necessary) * Lead Programmer (the person who leads the programming – you may wish to share this) * Secondary Programmer (a person who contributes but does not lead programming) * Experiment Coordinator and Designer (a person who conceives what experiments will be run) * Data Gatherer (a person who collects the data) * Presentation Author/Choreographer (a person who organizes who does what in the presentation) * Lead Presenter (the person who leads the presentation in the event at the end)   One person may do more than one role. Roles may change. You may wish to share roles rather than establishing an explicit hierarchy. You should do whatever contributes most to the group’s success. In the event of conflicts within teams – attempt to resolve them yourselves. If this proves impossible then you may speak to the module leader in confidence. Interventions will only be made with the agreement of the person who raises the issue. |
| **MARKING SCHEME (Group)**  **GROUP PRESENTATION (80%) (Marked by Tutor (80%) and Class (20%))**   |  | | --- | | **Quality of Presentation (20%)**  (An excellent presentation should be characterized by confident delivery, logical sequencing of slides, well rehearsed demonstration of software features, clear setting out of significant results)  **Quality of Code and Features (20%)**  (Excellent code should be characterized by original new features, elegance and simplicity of interface, ability to parametrize easily, running new experiments, trials, tests with different conditions)  **Quality of Experimental Design and Description (20%)**  **(**Excellent experimental design would include isolation of variables, running experiments sufficiently to create explicit levels of confidence)  **Quality of Data Visualization (20%)**  **(**Excellent data visualization will involve the use of novel chart types to characterize any experimental results) |   **GROUP (Marked by Tutor Only) (10%)**   |  | | --- | | **Level of Richness of Repository Activity**  **(**Excellent repositories should demonstrate lots of code commits, evidence of discussion between team members, minuting of meetings and level of shared participation by all members of the team)  If there is not sufficient evidence of repository use – the tutor may require the team to do a separate demo (see scaling below) |   **This 90% of the marks will be regarded as GS (Group Score)**  **INDIVIDUAL (Marked by Tutor Only) (10%)**   |  | | --- | | **Expressiveness of Reflective Text and Reliability of Peer Marking**  **(**An excellent reflective paragraph should be a personal response to the process of group working characterized by direct reference to specific events, incidents, coding sprints etc etc undertaken by the team and what the individual learnt about group work as a result. Peer Marking should be comparable but not identical to the tutor’s marking. Any student marking characterized by: indiscriminate scoring (everyone getting the same mark), reciprocation (giving others high marks in return for your giving them high marks), or general oddness (very low correlation with tutor’s marking pattern) will result in a very low mark for this part of the assignment. |   **SCALING (Marked by Tutor Only)**  The group score will be calculated from the group parts of the marksheet above, however this will be mediated by the tutor. The tutor will look at the percentages suggested by each team member and if there is unanimity and the github log broadly accords with this then these figures will be used. (If not, discussion may be needed between tutor and group). The tutor will then decide what proportion of the overall marks will be mediated by these proportions. For instance, should a group of three, decide the proportions of work are 30,30,40 – and the overall score for the group was 70% - and the amount of the mark decided by the tutor as being thus proportioned was 60% - then the overall score would be  40% shared equally (13.3% for each person) – and 60% shared proportionately (18%,18%,24%) – add those together for each person as a percentage of the overall score multiplied by the number of team members (making 31.3%,31.3%,37.4%) and calculate these percentages of 210 (70%x3). Making the overall score 65.7%, 65.7% and 78.5%.  Where   * ip = individual proportion (amount the group agrees each person contributed) * dp = divisible proportion (the amount of the group score subject to apportioning through individual participation) – set by the tutor * gs– group score * Gn – group number (number of people in the group) * **The maximum any individual mark can be raised by is 10%**   The reason for the dp (divisible proportion) is to make sure that less active members of group are not over penalized because one person decides they want to do all the work themselves, leaving little opportunity for others to contribute. If you are lucky enough to have a very brilliant colleague who does everything – then it is clear he should have a higher mark, but you should not get a low mark just because he decided to do everything without consulting you. Equally however, if there is clear evidence of “loafing” – you will not score a high mark.  In cases where there has not been sufficient repository evidence, the tutor may require an extra demo where they may ask detailed questions of team members. If answers are unsatisfactory in that demo, the tutor may specify new Ip (individual proportions) to represent the level of activity of individual participants.  The group score thus mediated will be added to the individual score in the proportion 90% group score, 10% individual score to get each individual’s score for this assignment.  If you feel uncomfortable giving a presentation, you may instead produce a video presentation which will be demonstrated on the day. |

### DEADLINES AND ASSIGNMENT WEIGHTINGS

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | This assignment is worth | | *60%* | | of the **overall assessment** for this module. | | | |
|  |  | |  | |  | | | |
| 2 | You are expected to spend about | | | *80* | | Hours to complete this assignment to a satisfactory standard | | |
|  |  | | |  | |  | | |
| 3 | Date assignment set | 21.01.2018 | | | | Date completed assignment to be handed in | 11.04.2019 | |
|  |  |  | | | |  |  | |
| 4 | Target date for return of marked assignment | | | | | 07.05.2018 |  |  |

**INTERNAL MODERATION**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| This assignment has been internally moderated. I confirm that the assignment set, meets the requirements of the module and that the brief provides appropriate content for students to successfully complete the assignment. | ***Moderator name, signature and date*** |