



CMP9140M Research Project Report

Learning Outcome	Criterion	Pass	Merit	Distinction
LO1 - Design, plan and develop a non-trivial piece of software that represents a particular area of research interest	Contextualise the project through the provision of an appropriately written abstract, introduction and literature review that places the research within the body of current research in the problem domain. (25%)	The report contains a suitable abstract and introduction together with a review of a small sample of the relevant literature. Most of the review is descriptive, with only a minimal engagement with critical evaluation.	The report contains a suitable abstract and introduction together with a broadly descriptive review of appropriate academic literature. Some critical evaluation is evidenced.	The report contains a suitable abstract and introduction together with an in-depth review of the relevant literature in the domain of interest. A considerable degree of critical evaluation is evidenced. There is some linkage between the literature and the final outcomes of the project.
LO2 - Evaluate any contemporary legal, ethical, social, and professional issues relevant to that specific area of interest	Successfully achieve ethical approval for the project using standard University of Lincoln EA1 and EA2 paperwork as appropriate.	This is a pass/fail criterion and must be achieved in order for the final project submission to be graded.		
LO3 - Present a cogent rationale for a particular methodological approach or approaches to the work	Provide a methodological underpinning to a research project. (25%)	The methodical underpinning contains appropriate critical evaluation of the key method(s) adopted with a clear conclusion to the discussions. The suggested method(s) are appropriate to the project and indicate a clear understanding of the link between aims and objectives and the method(s)	The methodological underpinning is authoritative in its coverage of available methods and a clear, concise critique of the adopted method(s) is presented in context. The suggested method(s) are appropriate to the project and indicate a clear understanding of the link between aims and objectives and the method(s)	The methodological underpinning is authoritative in its coverage of available methods and a clear, concise critique of the adopted method(s) is presented. The suggested method(s) are appropriate to the project and indicates a clear understanding of the link between aims and objectives and the method(s). Epistemological and ontological aspects of research methods are considered in the work.
LO4 - Critically appraise, evaluate and apply appropriate research methods, tools and techniques to create an appropriately structured report	Present a research report that critically analyses an appropriate problem domain in support of the design and development of your artefact. (25%)	The research report is well presented, and the content is well argued. The design and development stages of the project are adequately detailed.	The research report is well presented and argued and reaches conclusions that are supported by a range of contemporary sources. There is clear engagement with a range of theoretical principles in the design and development stages of your project artefact.	The research report contains well-presented, authoritative engagement with a range of contemporary sources in the design and development of a non-trivial artefact. There is a fully justified use of theoretical principles in this section of the report that clearly support the toolsets used during the project.
	Present an evaluation of results from the project together with a reflective analysis of the project process. (25%)	Conclusions to the research conducted are well contextualised and appropriately supported. The reflection on the project processes is presented but likely to be brief.	There is a clear linkage between the project aims and final conclusions. Some reflection is presented and there is acknowledgement of potential areas for future research.	The research report is well presented and argued and reaches conclusions that are authoritatively supported by use of a wide range of contemporary sources. There is a clear linkage between the project aims and final conclusions. Appropriate reflection of the process is evidenced. Indications of the potential limitations of the work, and indications on where future work may be conducted is also presented.
	Successfully defend the project in a poster presentation.	This is a pass/fail criterion and must be achieved in order for the final project submission to be graded.		
Weighting	Weightings for each criterion are as shown above.			