

CASA mark scheme for Remotely Sensing Cities and Environments, CASA0023

This mark scheme applicable to all students enrolled on the module. To gain a pass you must score at least 50% for the module as a final overall grade. You are not required to pass each component or criterion.

Component 1: Group presentation

Group code:

It is a requirement that all students in each group are active group members, respect each other, make appropriate and valid contributions, provide timely responses to their group and do not place unnecessary pressure or expectations on each other (e.g. working unsociable hours). In rare circumstances where these requirements are not met or there is mistreatment (e.g. bullying) students should contact the module leader. If a student completely fails to engage with the component they can be awarded 0. The expectation is all students engage with the component and this process is not needed.

Criterion	80-100% (A*)	70-79% (A)	60-69% (B)	50-59% (C)	40-49% (D)	1-39% (E)
Problem definition	The research problem is globally or highly pertinent or topical to a social, environmental, political or other context and has been framed at the optimal spatial scale. There is extensive background research evaluating multiple forms of credible sources to produce a compelling and coherent framing of the research question, presented in	The research problem is highly pertinent or topical to a social, environmental, political or other context and has been framed at an appropriate spatial scale, based upon logical reasoning. There is a broad range of background research evaluating multiple forms of credible sources to produce a convincing	The research problem is pertinent or topical to a social, environmental, political or other context and has been framed at an appropriate spatial scale but with some assumptions and limited reasoning. There is a range of background research evaluating multiple forms of credible sources to produce a legitimate framing of	The research problem is somewhat pertinent or topical to a social, environmental, political or other context. However a more appropriate variation of the research problem to the specific discipline could have been proposed, possibly at an alternative spatial scale. The background research considers several credible sources to produce a	The research problem is vaguely pertinent or topical to a social, environmental, political or other context. The research problem and spatial scale should be completely reconsidered. There is limited background research considering few credible sources, producing an unreasonable and illogical framing of the research question.	The research problem is completely impertinent and/or untopical, having no relevance to any social, environmental, political or other context. The selected spatial scale is highly unsuitable. There is no evidence of background research to support the research question.

	a concise and informative manner.	framing of the research question.	the research question.	plausible framing of the research question.		
Approach	Selected data and presented analytical methodology are able to perfectly solve the presented research question or the limitations are evidently understood and expertly expressed. The analysis is entirely appropriate to the problem. It demonstrates creativity, a comprehensive understanding of appropriate sophisticated techniques, exemplary technical proficiency and skills which are indicative of significant additional independent learning.	Selected data and presented analytical methodology are highly relevant to the presented research question. Limitations and presented and well expressed. The analysis is appropriate to the problem, demonstrating excellent understanding of appropriate sophisticated techniques, broad technical proficiency and skills which are indicative of additional independent learning.	Selected data and presented analytical methodology are relevant to the presented research question. There might be several limitations that have been discussed. The analysis is appropriate to the problem, demonstrating a sound technical knowledge with some additional learning that could be built upon.	Selected data and presented analytical methodology are adequate to the presented research question but better alternatives could have been sought. Limitations might have been only listed. The analysis might not be as efficient, creative and challenging as it could be. It demonstrates technical knowledge but may be limited to skills learned during the course.	Selected data and presented analytical methodology are not sensible to answer the presented research question and have major flaws. Limitations are present but have little relevance to the datasets and/or analysis. An attempt at appropriate analysis is made but does not address the problem effectively and demonstrates that the material covered in class has not been understood correctly.	Selected data and presented analytical methodology are completely inappropriate to answer the presented research question. There is no consideration of any limitations. The analysis is absent or entirely inappropriate for the problem and lacks scientific integrity and quality.
Project plan, risks and value for money	The project presents an exemplary plan. It is robust, logical, appropriate, and well informed, containing no ambiguity. It is	The project presents a coherent and appropriate plan. It is evident how deliverables will be useful to the city.	The project presents a logical plan. The deliverables are of interest to the city. Project risks have been determined and some	The project presents a plausible plan. The deliverables are acceptable but overly simplistic, not immediately of current	The project has an illogical but present plan. Deliverables and risks are specified but they may not be of use/interest or are	The project plan is inappropriate. Deliverables are completely unsuitable and irrelevant to the topic, analysis or city,

evident how the deliverables will be useful to the city and could be incorporated into business as usual operations, this may include future areas of work or city challenges. All likely risks to the project have been identified and appropriate mitigative actions devised. Value for money in all aspects of the project is achieved, whilst producing tangible and actionable outputs.	Appropriate project risks have been identified and mitigative suggestions devised. Value for money is apparent with practical outputs.	mitigative actions rationalised. There is value for money with outputs that the city may find of interest*.	interest or use and may ignore the wider context in which the city operates. Project risks are identified and have basic mitigative actions. A more appropriate project plan and risk strategy could have been devised. There may be value for money as the topic is of interest but the ambiguity raises questions.	misguided and inappropriate with little relevance to the topic, analysis or city. There is no value for money.	or absent entirely. Project risks are irrelevant or missing. There is no value for money.
		* interest here differs to useful in the A descriptor.			

This section outlines the percentages assignment to each of the marking criteria per part of the assessment:

- Problem definition: 40%
- Approach: 40%
- Project risks and value for money: 20%

Component 2: Online individual learning diary

In relation to the matrix below, expressed terms are relative to the medium that has been used. For example an *extensive narrative* in a mind map would include the summary of the approach followed by other arrows or links to other papers that implement the same or different approaches and a final discussion box comparing and contrasting the various studies.

Criterion	80-100% (A*)	70-79% (A)	60-69% (B)	50-59% (C)	40-49% (D)	1-39% (E)
Content summary	A well-defined summary / introduction that expertly demonstrates clear, unambiguous and extensive comprehension of the data, methods and tools/policies*, their benefits, limitations and possible future developments.	A refined summary / introduction that demonstrates a convincing comprehension of the data, methods and tools/ policies*, their benefits and limitations in a clear manner.	A summary / introduction that demonstrates a legitimate comprehension of the data, methods and tools/ policies*, their benefits and limitations, in a mostly clear manner.	A plausible summary / introduction that touches on parts of the taught content /policies* and demonstrates some comprehension. However, a more appropriate / relevant summary / introduction could have been provided.	A limited and implausible summary / introduction that only considers a few elements of the taught content /policies* that may be poorly explained or somewhat ambiguous.	An inappropriate summary / introduction that fails to consider the taught material or any policies*. It may be misrepresented, poorly explained, ambiguous or absent entirely.
	*policies where appropriate					
Applications of the content	Discussed applications of the taught content are systematic, extensive and evaluate several credible sources using an in-depth and thorough narrative. It seamlessly guides the reader through both how and	A range of applications of the taught content from several sources are considered with an excellent narrative providing extensive and relevant criticality of the discussed literature.	Multiple applications of the taught content are considered with an adequate narrative and present critical reflections.	An attempt at comparing applications of the taught content might be considered. There may be a limited narrative between studies with short and basic reflection.	The applications of the taught content presented are somewhat inappropriate, irrelevant or have a tenuous link to the material.	There is a completely inappropriate or missing application of the taught content. It might misrepresent the taught material, the literature or be absent entirely. The material discussed may have no relevance

	<p>why the methods / data/ tools have been applied whilst providing exemplary critical reflection on the approaches with reference to future literature advancements.</p>				<p>to the material covered in class.</p>	
Personal reflection	<p>An in depth and extensive personal reflection that demonstrates why the content may (or may not) be interesting, and presents an inquisitive dialogue to a wider application of the content. The skills, content, data and tools and placed within the broader discipline and it is evident how they could be used in future or may (or may not) lead to other avenues of analysis / work that could involve different datasets.</p>	<p>The personal reflection explores why the content may (or may not) be interesting. The skills are placed within the broader context and it is clear what the student has learnt and why it is (or is not) useful in relation to the presented data / content. Parts of the response provide suggestions for future exploration.</p>	<p>The personal reflection reviews the content and provides some appropriate reflections. The skills are placed within the broader context and it is clear what the student has learnt and why it is (or is not) useful in relation to the presented data / content.</p>	<p>The personal reflection reviews the content. Reflections are present but may be somewhat ambiguous and vague. The student has demonstrated what they learnt, but might may not have articulated the use of the content.</p>	<p>An attempt at a personal reflection is made but it is not sensible or relevant for the content. Ambiguity surrounds explanations of what the student learnt and the use of content is not presented.</p>	<p>The personal reflection is completely inappropriate either incorrectly reflecting on the taught content or being absent entirely.</p>

Distribution of marks for component 2

This section outlines the percentages assignment to each of the marking criteria per part of the assessment:

- Content summary: 40%
- Applications of the content: 40%
- Personal reflection: 20%

Please note, poor academic practice or academic misconduct will be reported to the Module Convenor in the first instance who will follow the relevant policies outlined in the UCL academic manual, [Chapter 6, section 9](#).

Late submission of assessments will be subject to the [standard penalties according to the UCL regulations](#)