

Informatics Project Proposal: Coursework 2

22 February 2021

1 Overview

In this coursework you will develop the Informatics Project Proposal that provides the detailed definition and plan of the project you intend to carry out to create your MSc dissertation. In this process you will be guided by your IPP tutor who can provide guidance on the generic and structural aspects of the IPP and your project supervisor who can provide guidance on the content of your project since the supervisor is the expert in this area.

You will develop your Informatics Project proposal in cooperation with your IPP tutor and your project supervisor. Your IPP tutorial meetings are COMPULSORY and you should raise as many questions there as you can. The IPP Piazza is also a useful resource and your supervisor can guide you in developing your IPP.

Template: You should use the provided [Template](#) for your submission. The template contains information on how to use it. You are permitted to change aspects of the structure by adding or removing sections if this is appropriate for your proposal. You are NOT permitted to change the template to increase the number of words contained in a page (e.g. you must not make the font size smaller, change margins, etc etc)

Length: Your Informatics Project proposal should comprise at most 8 pages, excluding the cover page and references.

Deadline: The deadline for submission is 11:59 on Monday 10 May 2021.

Submission: You should submit a PDF of your Informatics Project Proposal to the Turnitin submission in the Assessment section of the learn page.

Marking: Your IPP will be marked according to the attached rubric. This is identical to the rubric attached to the Turnitin submission. Please read the rubric carefully. This provides an explanation of the criteria on which your Informatics Project proposal will be marked. The template mentioned above also contains guidance on the main components of your IPP.

2 Rubric

This is a copy of the rubric that will be used to assess your final IPP submissions. The first three criteria will be graded by your tutor. This contributes 20% of the non-exceptional part of the grading. The last 5 criteria will be graded by your supervisor since they require knowledge of your topic to grade. This contributes 80% of the non-exceptional part of the grading. The **Exceptional** criterion will also be graded by your supervisor.

Criterion	Unacceptable	Fair	Good	Excellent
Comprehensibility (5%): The introduction and motivation should be comprehensible to a non-expert. It should be clear what the student intends to investigate, what the question is and why it is significant.	The IPP makes very little attempt to communicate the work to a non-expert. Typically to be unacceptable the introductory material will anticipate substantial expertise in the area and render it incomprehensible to the non-expert reader.	It is clear that the author has attempted to communicate the project to a non-expert but this attempt is unsuccessful in significant respects. For example, failure to explain specialist terms; poorly structured explanation that is difficult to understand; omissions; no clear statement of purpose, question or significance of the project; ...	It is clear that the author has attempted to communicate the project to a non-expert and this attempt is successful but there are some more minor issues in the quality of explanation or in expectation of background of the reader. The non-expert reader gains a reasonably clear idea of the project from this description but may have some remaining questions that need clarification.	The introductory material avoids extensive use of specialised technical material and explains all the key concepts clearly; explains the question to be investigated and its significance to the area. The non-expert reader can gain a clear idea of the proposed project from this description.
Structure (6%): The paper should make consistent use of citation, have clear captioning for diagrams and have clear reference in the text. The necessary information should be included: Motivation and introduction; clear problem statement; background; approach; Plan and Risk assessment; Bibliography.	The IPP has many significant issues. For example, missing sections; failure to cite sources; no clearly structured plan and risk assessment ...	The IPP has some coherent structure but there remain some significant issues. For example, missing sections; failure to cite sources; no clearly structured plan and risk assessment ...	The IPP has coherent structure and there are no major issues or omissions but there are some minor problems such as occasional omissions of citations, omitted references, ...	The IPP has coherent structure and there are no major issues or omissions there are very few minor problems with the structure.

Coherence (5%): The plan includes all the activities mentioned in the proposal. The sequence of actions seems credible and will generate sufficient material to construct an acceptable dissertation.	It is not clear that there is a coherent project and plan that could be implemented at the start of the MSc dissertation.	There is evidence of design and planning for the MSc dissertation but there are significant problems such as: significant omissions from the plan; unrealistic estimates of work; mismatch between the proposed activities and the purpose of the project; ...	The quality of design and planning of the project is clear and it appears that the plan is credible and will enable the author to complete a dissertation in the required time frame. There are some issues with the IPP that may need repair but these are minor.	The quality of design and planning of the project is clear and it appears that the plan is credible and will enable the author to complete a dissertation in the required time frame. There are very few issues with the IPP and it provides a good starting point for the project without further modification.
Exceptional (20%):	Give this grade if the evaluation of the sample IPP is NOT out of the ordinary. There are no exceptional criteria in evidence.	Give this grade if there is some evidence of using wider resources than those of the course.	Give this grade if there is good evidence of using wider resources than those of the course and there is novelty in their application to the evaluation task.	Give this grade if the evaluation of the IRR is strikingly novel and surprises you and has high relevance to the evaluation task.
Accuracy (13%): This criterion deals with the technical accuracy of the IPP.	The IPP contains egregious technical errors indicating fundamental misunderstanding of the technical details of the proposed project.	The IPP indicates some understanding of the technical details of the proposed project but there are significant errors that require repair if the project is to proceed successfully.	The IPP contains minor slips indicating some minor misunderstandings that should not impede the successful completion of the proposed project.	The IPP demonstrates mastery of the technical material required for the proposed project.
Methodology (13%): This criterion deals with the soundness of the proposed approach to the project. For example, is the experimental design likely to be adequate to allow the student to draw conclusions pertinent to the goals of the project.	There is no systematically presented approach to the project in the IPP.	There is an outline of a coherent approach to the project but it lacks detail and it is difficult to understand what the student proposes to do.	The approach is described in a coherent manner at an appropriate level of detail. There are some minor issues e.g. some omissions or occasional lack of clarity.	The approach to the project is described at an appropriate level of detail and provides an excellent basis for the proposed project. Any flaws are negligible.

Feasibility (13%): This criterion covers whether the project is feasible within the available time and other resource available. The task is to do enough work to allow the production of a satisfactory dissertation in the available time.	The proposed project is clearly infeasible in the available time and other resources and it is difficult to see how to repair the IPP to ensure feasibility.	The proposed project is clearly infeasible in the available time and other resources but it is possible to repair the IPP to ensure feasibility.	The proposed project is clearly feasible in the available time and other resources apart from minor defects. The IPP makes a good attempt at justifying the feasibility of the proposed project.	The proposed project is clearly feasible in the available time and other resources and the IPP makes an excellent job of justifying the feasibility of the proposed project.
Quality (13%): This is to assess the quality of the explanation of the purpose of the project and what the student proposes to do in the proposed project.	The quality of the IPP is low. It is difficult to understand what is being proposed and to discern how the student proposes to carry out the project.	The quality of the IPP is fair. In outline, it is possible to understand what is being proposed and how the student proposes to carry out the project but there are important parts that remain quite unclear and require significant work to gain clarity.	The quality of the IPP is good. There is an understandable description of what is being proposed and how the student proposes to carry out the project. There may be minor slips and errors but they do not detract significantly from the description.	The quality of the IPP is excellent. The explanation of what is proposed and the activities of the project are completely clear. There may be some minor infelicities but these are insignificant.
Independence (12%): The supervisor has worked with the student on the proposal this is a gauge of how independent the student was in creating the IPP.	The student required almost continuous guidance and the resulting IPP is mainly a result of detailed input from the supervisor.	The student made a fair contribution to the work of creating the IPP but the final shape of the IPP is mainly the result of supervisor input and the student did not make significant conceptual contributions to the IPP.	The student made significant conceptual contributions to the final IPP and the IPP demonstrates significant input from the student to its final form.	The student made many significant contributions to the final form of the IPP and throughout the development of the IPP demonstrated the capacity to bring useful and interesting ideas to the development of the IPP.