



COURSEWORK SPECIFICATION

COMM514, ECMM454, COMM424DA –

MSc Project

Module Leader: **Prof. Solomon S. Oyelere**

Academic Year: 2024/25

Title: **Presentation**

Submission deadline: **12 noon, 8th August 2025**

This assessment contributes **20%** of the total module mark and assesses the following **Intended Learning Outcomes**

- Demonstrate knowledge of a research topic relevant to your programme of study, acquired through a deep and self-motivated exploration of that topic
- Show familiarity with the background and context of a new application area
- Conduct independent study, including library and web-based research
- Reflect critically on processes and products
- Plan an extended project and manage time effectively
- Present work to a non-specialist audience

This is an **individual** work, and you are reminded of the University's Regulations on Plagiarism. You must avoid plagiarism, collusion and any academic misconduct behaviours. [See further resources about Academic Honesty and Plagiarism.](#)

Use of GenAI tools in COMM514, ECMM454, COMM424DA – MSc Project Presentation

The University of Exeter is committed to supporting the ethical and responsible use of Generative AI (GenAI) tools in teaching and learning. You can find [student resources on GenAI on the Study Skills pages](#).

Direct copying of content, including AI-generated content, without proper acknowledgement falls under plagiarism and misrepresentation. [See guidance on referencing AI work](#) and [TQA section 12.3](#).

To provide clarity on uses of AI, assessments can fall in three categories:

- AI-Integrated
- AI-Supported
- AI-Prohibited

This assessment falls under the category of **AI-supported** assessment, where ethical and responsible use of GenAI tools in the development of an assessment is supported. This may include using GenAI tools to summarise literature, improve the structure of your work or quality of English language. All use of GenAI tools should be acknowledged in a statement submitted with their assessment and referenced appropriately. Students are asked to keep a record of the tools, prompts and outputs used so they are able to produce these, if necessary, at a viva and demonstrate how they have built on this content to ensure the work is original.

Declaration of use (AI-supported or AI-integrated work only):

Include this declaration at the start of your work.

Select all that apply with an [X]:

----- Copy and fill in this declaration at the start of your work ----------

I acknowledge the following uses of GenAI tools in this assessment:

- [] I have used GenAI tools to:

- [] develop ideas.
- [] assist with research or gathering information.
- [] help me understand key theories and concepts.
- [] identify trends and themes as part of my data analysis
- [] suggest a plan or structure for my assessment.
- [] give me feedback on a draft.
- [] generate images, figures or diagrams.
- [] proofread and correct grammar or spelling errors.
- [] generate citations or references.
- [] Other: [please specify]

- [] I have not used any GenAI tools in preparing this assessment.

I declare that I have referenced all use of GenAI outputs within my assessment in line with the University referencing guidelines.

I certify that all material in this dissertation which is not my own has been identified.

----- End of declaration – Do not include ‘scissor’ lines ----------

If a declaration cannot be attached (e.g. video submission), by submitting your work, you confirm you have followed the assessment brief and guidelines on AI use.

Assessment 2: Presentation

Purpose

The purpose of this assessment is to focus on scientific communication. As a technical expert or scientist of any kind, your ability to communicate complex ideas to a variety of audiences will be essential. This assignment asks you to give a presentation about your research project, followed by questions/discussion. There is some guidance available online about how to give an effective presentation: <https://universityofexeteruk.sharepoint.com/sites/TheDigitalHub/SitePages/How-to-structure-a-digital-presentation.aspx>

Format

- All presentations should made as a pre-recorded video.
- The video should be stored on the University One Drive.
- Each presentation should last 10 minutes.
- The slides should be converted in PDF format.
- The last page of the slides should contain the link to the presentation video on One Drive.

Submission

- Slides (with link to available video file on OneDrive or available file on MS Stream or ON private link on YouTube) **must be submitted via ELE2 with deadline on the 8th of August 2025.**
- Video file must be uploaded on OneDrive by **the 8th of August 2025. (same if you use MS Stream platform or YouTube in private link)**
- Give permission to anyone in the university, whilst keeping the link private.
- **Please check that the link in the document you submit is working and it is possible to copy and paste it.**

Content

The presentation should clearly explain the main aims, methods and outcomes of your research project. Within this general guidance, you have freedom to choose the material you include.

Suggested aspects that you might cover include:

- Background & content
- Research question or hypothesis
- Aims & objectives
- Dataset, software platforms, or other significant technical background
- Methods, experiment design, software development approach, algorithms, or other technical methods
- Results (these can be preliminary or work-in-progress)
- Next steps / plans
- Discussion and/or conclusions

Please note that this assessment is intended to test your ability in scientific communication, not the methods or results of your project. So, it is not necessary to have finalised methods or good results at this stage, it is okay to talk about work in progress.

All content should be clearly explained in an appropriate level of detail. Visual aids (e.g. slides) should be useful and informative. The presentation should run to time (10 minutes).

Assume that your audience has some knowledge of computer/data science but is not an expert in the particular problem domain of your project. For example, imagine that you are giving the presentation to another student on your programme, who has studied similar modules but is doing a project in a different area.

Please see overleaf for marking criteria.

MARKING SCHEME

The final presentation assesses the student's ability to communicate their research project effectively. It focuses on the clarity, coherence, and professionalism of the presentation rather than the scientific depth of the research itself. The evaluation is based on **four key criteria**, each weighted **25%**.

Criteria:

- Background, & research aims (25%): This criterion assesses how effectively the student introduces and contextualises their project, ensuring that the audience understands its purpose and relevance.
- Clarity and communication of technical aspects (25%): This criterion evaluates how well the student explains the technical components of their project, including methods, tools, and datasets, in a way that is understandable to a non-expert audience.
- Results, interpretation & reflection (25%): This criterion assesses how well the student presents and interprets their research findings (including preliminary or work-in-progress results) and reflects on the study's progress and future steps.
- Presentation style, delivery & structure (25%): This criterion assesses the overall effectiveness of the presentation, including organisation, slide design, time management, and delivery confidence.

	Background, & research aims (25%)	Clarity & communication of technical aspects (25%)	Results, interpretation & reflection (25%)	Presentation style, delivery & structure (25%)
Distinction (70-100%)	The background, research question, and objectives are clearly defined and well-articulated. The presentation establishes strong context by linking the project to existing research or practical applications. The introduction is engaging, logically structured, and provides a strong foundation for the rest of the presentation.	Technical details are explained with precision and clarity, making complex concepts accessible. Explanations are logical and structured, with smooth transitions between technical aspects. Visual aids (e.g., diagrams, figures, flowcharts) are effectively integrated to support the technical explanations.	Findings are clearly presented and well-organised, with strong links to research aims. Critical interpretation of results, discussing key trends, patterns, and possible implications. Any unexpected or inconclusive findings are acknowledged and thoughtfully reflected upon. Future work and next steps are clearly outlined, demonstrating a strong grasp of the research direction.	The presentation is well-structured, engaging, and easy to follow. The student speaks clearly and confidently, using appropriate pacing and emphasis. Excellent visual aids (slides are well-designed, clear, and visually appealing). The presentation is well-timed (within the 10-minute limit) and flows logically from start to finish.
Merit (60-69%)	The background and aims are clearly presented, but some minor details may be lacking. The research question is stated but may lack some justification or depth. The structure is logical, but could be slightly more engaging or refined.	The technical content is clear and mostly well-structured, though some minor areas lack depth or precision. The explanation is engaging, with effective use of visual aids. Some areas may need further simplification or clarification for a non-specialist audience.	Results are well-explained and interpreted, but some minor areas lack depth. There is some connection between results and research aims, but more critical reflection could be included. Next steps are discussed but could be more detailed or insightful.	The presentation is clear and engaging, with only minor issues in pacing or organisation. The speaker is confident, but some areas could be delivered more fluently. Visual aids are effective but could be improved in design or integration. The presentation is mostly well-timed but may be slightly too fast or too slow.
Pass (50-59%)	The introduction provides a general overview, but lacks depth or clarity. The research problem is not fully articulated, and the relevance of the study may not be well established. The background is superficial or lacks a logical flow.	Technical content is presented, but explanations are somewhat unclear or difficult to follow. Minimal engagement with the audience; reliance on text-heavy slides or jargon. Visual aids are present but not well-integrated or difficult to interpret.	Results are presented, but interpretation is minimal or unclear. The connection between the results and research questions is not fully developed. Next steps are mentioned but lack clarity or depth.	The presentation has structure, but lacks clarity or engagement. The speaker relies too much on notes or slides, making the delivery less natural. Visual aids are too text-heavy or poorly designed. Time management is not well-controlled (e.g., too rushed or too slow).
Fail (0-49%)	The introduction is unclear or missing. The research problem is not defined, making it difficult to understand the project's purpose. The background provides little to no context, leaving the audience confused about the research's motivation.	The technical content is poorly explained, disorganised, or too complex for the intended audience. Minimal or no effort to make the explanation accessible. No use of visual aids, or the visual aids are irrelevant and do not contribute to understanding.	Results are poorly presented, unclear, or missing. No meaningful interpretation or reflection on findings. Next steps are not discussed, or the project appears to lack direction.	The presentation is disorganised, making it difficult to follow. The speaker lacks confidence, with unclear or incoherent delivery. Visual aids are missing or ineffective. Time management is poor, with the presentation being too short or excessively long.