**ASSESSMENT PROFORMA**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Module Convenor to tick, as appropriate: | | | | | | | | | |  | | **Assessment Deadline:**  All work should be submitted by 1.00pm on the day of submission | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | |
| **Formative:** |  | | **Summative:** | | | |  | |  |  | | Friday 1 March 2024 | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |  | |  | | | |  | |  |  | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Module Code:** | | | | |  | **Module Title:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SOCI44115 | | | | | Computational Social Science | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Title of Assessment**  (e.g. Essay One, Critical Essay, Data Analysis, Reflection,  Individual Poster Commentary with Bibliography) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | **Length / Duration** | | |  | **Component Weighting** | | |
| Approach for Summative (OPTIONAL) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | 500 words | | |  | n/a | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **The Marking Criteria for this piece of assessment is:**  Module Convenor to tick in appropriate box and affix criteria to the last page of this document. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | |  | |  | | | |  | | |  | |  |  | | |  |  | | |  |  |
| General: | |  | | Other: (attached) | | | |  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
|  | |  | |  | | | |  | | |  | |  |  | | |  |  | | |  |  |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Assessment Specifics**  (e.g. Assessment Titles / Narrative / Instructions / Guidance) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **TITLE**: Application outline  **NARRATIVE**: While the formative assessment is optional (it does not contribute to your final mark), doing the formative will make the summative easier. There are two options for the summative, and therefore two options for this formative. You should first decide which summative you will submit and then select the option for the formative that matches that of the summative.  The feedback you receive on your formative is intended to help you with the summative. Nevertheless, submitting a formative does not commit you to using the proposed approach for your summative.  **INSTRUCTIONS**: Read the summative instructions and decide which option you intend to pursue.  **Option 1**: Compare two methods. Submit a 500 word outline that includes:   * The topic that your summative will discuss * The two methods that you intend to discuss * The complexity aspects of the topic that each method addresses * What data would be required for your methods   **Option 2**: Example analysis. Submit a 500 word outline that includes:   * The topic that your summative will discuss * The method that you have chosen to use, together with the dataset or NetLogo model that will be applied to the topic * Analysis plan (for clustering, QCA, SNA): software, steps, relevant attributes in the dataset * Analysis plan (for ABM): model, change to implement, characteristics of scenarios, summary statistics you will calculate.   **GUIDANCE**: Students are encouraged to use office hours to discuss potential approaches before deciding what to submit for the assessment. This is particularly important for those pursuing option 2 to make sure the analysis is viable and of suitable size. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

**POSTGRADUATE TAUGHT MARKING CRITERIA**

|  | **Classification** | | | | **Fail (below 50%)** | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Distinction** | | **Merit** | **Pass** |
| 80+ | 70 - 79 | 60 - 69 | 50-59 | 40 - 49 | 39 or less |
| **Structure**  **and Argument** | Highly cohesive, clearly focused and structured in a logical manner that makes the work both easy to follow and highly persuasive. Of professional quality. | Very cohesive, clearly focused and structured in a logical manner that makes it both persuasive and easy to follow. There are only minor elements which would benefit from further refinement. | Largely cohesive, focused and convincing but may occasionally be distracted from the core focus of the work or lack persuasiveness. Mostly well-structured, but some elements may not fit as well together as they could. | Generally cohesive but  may sometimes lack clarity of focus or persuasiveness and some points may lack clear relevance. Typically well-structured but some elements may be confusing or not fit well together. | Somewhat cohesive but  often lacking focus. Points are frequently tangential or lack clear relevance. The structure is often confusing with points that do not fit well together or which contradict and the main argument being made. | Cohesion is limited. The central focus is unclear and points often lack relevance. Some structure but generally confusing and hard to follow. Points may exhibit significant contradictions that undermine the overall argument. |
| **Depth of Knowledge** | Comprehensive and consistently accurate, with a level of detail comparable to professional academic work. Clear evidence of extensive knowledge beyond directly-taught content that entirely fulfils the requirements of Masters level work. | Extensive knowledge of  the topic which is consistently accurate and very detailed. Evidence of substantial knowledge beyond directly-taught content appropriate  to Masters level work. | Significant knowledge of the topic appropriate to Master’s level work which is accurate and generally well-detailed. Knowledge beyond directly-taught content is present but may not be extensive. Some elements may be superficial or lack nuance. | Clear and largely accurate knowledge appropriate to Masters level work but may be limited or lack detail. Gaps in knowledge and/or minor inaccuracies may be evident. Knowledge beyond directly-taught content may be limited. | Clear knowledge of the  basics but with significant inaccuracies, gaps and/or limitations in knowledge. Concepts and issues are outlined in a superficial or partial manner insufficient  for Master’s level work. | Some awareness of the basics have been expressed, but there are major gaps in knowledge and/or significant inaccuracies, demonstrating a clearly-insufficient depth of knowledge for Masters level work. |
| **Application**  **and Analysis** | Very effective application  and integration of knowledge and evidence. Discussion is consistently insightful and grounded in independent critical thought which may include aspects of originality. Content may be approaching publishable standard. | Effective application and integration of knowledge  and evidence to produce. The discussion is clearly informed and often insightful, demonstrating independent critical thought. | Generally good application and integration of knowledge and evidence, demonstrating strong comprehension of relevant concepts and ideas. There is some evidence of independent critical thought but depths of insight may have occasional limitations. | Reasonable application and integration of knowledge and evidence, but there may be inconsistencies or occasional limitations. Discussion may be largely reliant on others’ ideas, with sufficient but limited signs of independent thought. | Application and integration of knowledge and evidence is limited and insufficient for Masters level work. The work may be largely descriptive and discussion limited to others’ arguments and ideas, with little or no sign of independent thought. | Application and integration of knowledge and evidence is minimal. The work is more  or less entirely descriptive and does not meaningfully engage in critical discussion or analysis. |
| **Use of Sources** | Draws on an extensive  range of appropriate sources to inform and substantiate the work that is fully appropriate for Master’s level study, which includes substantial evidence of independent study. | Draws on a substantial  range of appropriate sources to inform and substantiate the work that is appropriate to Master’s level study. There is clear evidence of independent study but occasionally scope for evidence to be refined or developed further. | Draws on a good range  of appropriate sources to inform and substantiate the work that is appropriate to Master’s level study. There are signs of independent study but some elements lack good evidence. | Draws on a fair range  of appropriate sources to inform and substantiate the work that is appropriate to Master’s level study but evidence is sometimes weak or lacking. There are some signs of independent study but this is limited. | Draws on some appropriate sources to inform and substantiate the work but the range and quality is not fully sufficient for Master’s level. Evidence is often weak or absent and there are minimal signs of independent study | Draws on no or very few appropriate sources to inform and substantiate the work and so wholly inadequate Master’s level work. Evidence is largely weak/absent throughout and there are no meaningful signs of independent study. |
| **Presentation and Style** | Work is clear, accurate, appropriately presented/styled and highly engaging.  References are formatted accurately throughout. | Work is clear, accurate  and appropriately presented/ styled.  References are formatted accurately throughout. | Work is predominantly clear, accurate and appropriately presented/styled.  References are formatted accurately throughout. | Work is generally clear, accurate and appropriately presented/styled.  References are largely correct but there may be some minor mistakes in details or format. | Work is typically clear and accurate but presentation/ style is not fully appropriate.  There is evidence of referencing but with frequent mistakes and/or limitations. | Work is often unclear owing to inaccuracies and/or poor presentation/style.  Referencing may be attempted but with frequent mistakes and/or limitations. |