Comprehensive Creative Technologies Project

Task 3: Report – Assessment Brief

Submission Deadline:	Before 14:00 on 25/04/24 (48 hour late submission window applies)
Vivas:	Week commencing 13/05/24
Marks and Feedback due:	No later than 20 working days after the last viva
Assessment type:	Written Assessment
Assessment weighting:	80% of total module mark
Word count:	7000 (+/- 10%)

Module teaching email: tom.mitchell@uwe.ac.uk

What am I required to do on this assessment?

The Comprehensive Creative Technologies Project is an individually executed, professional project that enables students to select and investigate a topic of interest beyond or even outside the normal level of treatment in the taught modules.

The project represents an intellectual, academic, and practical enquiry into a topic or issue relevant to their award. Students are expected to select and research the topic, devise and review methodological choices, and work within an ethical and professional framework of best practice relevant to their professional context. Having thoroughly researched the topic, students are expected to apply newly acquired knowledge in practice by developing a thorough and professional piece of work and disseminating project achievements.

A key aim of this project module is to provide students with opportunities to develop their research, planning and time management skills, as well as subject-based specialisation. By developing appropriate tools, techniques and practices that are necessary for the successful delivery of a comprehensive project, students complete their transition to being independent learners.

Successful completion of the comprehensive project module demonstrates students' ability to a) independently learn skills and techniques required to deliver a complex project,
b) creatively demonstrate their problem-solving abilities within the chosen context, as well as c) present their concepts and achievements to a wider audience using relevant professional formats.

The **artefact** is the completed practical project. The supervisor will advise students on how to submit this part of the work towards the end of the second semester. Please note, that the artefact must remain accessible to markers throughout the whole assessment period (April - August). Source code must remain accessible, and downloadable in text format from GitHub or a web server. Physical or non-digital artefacts also need to remain accessible.

The **final report** needs to provide a suitable introduction to the project, summarise methods and insights from research conducted, contain a more substantial discussion and evaluation of key elements of the practical implementation, as well as recommendations for future work. The final report is expected to be ~7,000 words long and may contain diagrams and illustrations where appropriate. A basic template outlining content, structure and format will be published on Blackboard.

Project management will be assessed via the **project log**. Project documentation materials that are bulkier (log sheets, design documents, user feedback documentation, etc) are to be included as appendices to the report and do not count towards the word count. Supervisors will advise their students regarding the expected type of documentation for each project.

A **video of the final work** must also be submitted and made accessible online (YouTube/Vimeo). This video should highlight the main project achievements to a professional audience. We ask students for video submissions as these show the project in its best light and prevent project accessibility issues when marking (software, plugin, or version issues, etc.). It also helps to make projects more visible to current 2nd year students and external examiners. Selected project videos may be showcased via our course websites or YouTube channels.
The purpose of the **viva** is to give each student an opportunity to reiterate the strengths and achievements of the project, and a chance to resolve any questions the first and second markers may still have. It is not assessed but impacts positively on the project mark.

Assessment of Final Stage:
Artefact 40%, Video 10%, Report (incl. project management) 30%

Artefact & Video will receive an overall mark out of 100 based on the following criteria:

ARTEFACT (40% of Module)	Weighting %
• Appropriateness of project in regards to course and ability level	25
• Quality of delivered objectives: level of functionality/detail	25
• Adherence to professional standards/frameworks for code/ outputs	25
• Demonstration of specific embedded qualities in regards to, user thinking, creative execution and/or technical innovation (if applicable)	25

REPORT (30% of Module)	Weighting %
• Clarity of report, quality of writing, use of diagrams, illustrations	7
• Academic/ professional context-setting for this project	10
• Research: range of relevant sources, reflective analysis, synthesis	27
• Appropriateness and rigor of methods applied	13
• Depth of critical thinking around specific practice-based user thinking processes, and/or creative design processes, and/or technical developments and innovation	27
• Project management: agile and proactive in implementation of feedback, methods or new findings, dealing with change	16

VIDEO (10% of Module)	Weighting %
Clarity and appropriateness of project dissemination video	100

A template report document will be published on blackboard with a full description of what should be included in the report.

Where should I start?

1. ***Plan***. Spend some time planning the project, and don't be afraid to adapt to new discoveries.
2. ***Research***. Read around your project to find relevant work and literature.
3. ***Implement***. Apply the knowledge from your research to create your artefact.
4. ***Reflect/Evaluate***. Reflect and evaluate the work using formal research methods and repeat steps 1 - 4 to improve your project.
5. ***Discuss***. Continuously discuss the project with your supervisor and other students.

How do I achieve high marks in this assessment?

Refer to the marking criteria below.

How does the learning and teaching relate to the assessment?

The lectures will cover all aspects of this assignment, you should discuss the project on a regular basis with your supervisor.

Marking Criteria

Artefact (40% of module):

1. **Appropriateness of completed project in regards to course and ability level (10%)**
   How successful is this project in representing year 3 work of its relevant undergraduate degree programme? Is the scope appropriate? Has the scope been proactively modified in

response to research and practical development issues? How ambitious is this project in its goals?

2. Quality of delivered objectives: level of functionality achieved/ detail implemented (10%)
   What is the quality standard of the final work? To what level has the intended functionality been completed? Barely covering the basics? Covering the essentials and providing some helpful features? Full range of functionality plus extras? How error-free and finished is the implementation? Are only the core features running error-free? Are there any critical issues with the system? Any major gaps in the design or development? Any minor implementation issues, perhaps in regards to top-level design or cross-browser compatibility?
3. Adherence to professional standards/ frameworks in regards to code/ outputs (10%)
   Does the work sit well within its relevant professional practice context? Does the project clearly distinguish between the students' own materials, the surrounding environment and external elements (assets/ libraries/ APIs)? Is there a clear, consistent application of practice-based techniques and methods (e.g. UCD, OO programming, frameworks, libraries…)? Is the code clearly commented and well laid out? Have content materials (text, images, video, audio etc) been well sourced, edited and referenced, or are content materials just used to 'bulk up' the work? Have ethical principles been adhered to? Have best design practice guidelines been adhered to? Is the finished project usable (as per usability guidelines)? Is it accessible (as per accessibility guidelines)? If interactive, have interaction design principles been adhered to? Is the project efficient and potentially expandable?
4. Demonstration of *specific* embedded qualities (10%) in regards to…
   a. Technical innovation (if applicable)
      How professional is the level of technical implementation? Have any innovative technical solutions been found? Is there scope for further innovation?
   b. Creative execution (if applicable)
      How professional is the level of creative execution? Does the work imitate/exceed existing good practice in its field? Does it find new ways for creative expression? Does it have a coherent aesthetic/audio-visual language?
   c. User thinking (if applicable)
      To what level have users been considered, as the core element, partially, or as an afterthought? How well does the content and planned method of use fit with the targeted users? How well does the interface communicate with the target audience? Does the user experience consist of customized processes, or just generic tools?

Video (10% of module)

1. Quality of project dissemination video: clarity and impact (10%)
   Overall, does the video communicate the core of the project well? How well has the video been prepared (e.g., sufficient contrast, right pace, clarity of sound). Is the project introduced well? Can a viewer understand both professional relevance and timeliness of this project? Is it easy to get an overview over scope and depth of the project? How successfully has the student summarized the most important *achievements* of the project? Is the video too crowded with technical details (e.g., scrolling walls of code) or too superficial (e.g. a sales pitch)? Are obvious project flaws/ problems being mentioned or ignored?

Final Report (incl. project management) (30% of module)

1. Overall clarity of report, quality of writing, use of diagrams/ illustrations (2%)
   Overall, does the report help the reader to a better understanding of the problems/challenges the student faced? Or is the material presented too confused/ vague/ off topic? Have any major problems/project stages been overlooked? Is the writing style too dense or too superficial? Have unexplained technical jargon or acronyms been used? Does the project lack in

use of appropriate technical terms? Are the included diagrams/images helpful in summarizing major points? Or do they just add needless bulk to the report? Would important project stages communicate better as a visualization/ diagram than text? Are sources correctly referenced in the correct style?

2. Quality of the academic and professional context-setting for this project (3%)
   Does the report evidence a deeper understanding of the relevant subject area, as and when the student contextualizes their practice (explains how the project sits within its relevant professional Digital Media or Games Technology field)? Can the student draw meaningful conclusions from this project and foresee how it might impact on/be affected by its wider professional/ societal context? Or is the work discussed in isolation, without considering outside influences and wider implications?
3. Quality of research: range of relevant sources, reflective analysis, synthesis (8%)
   Depending on the nature of the proposed project, 'research' could span over a range of contextual matters, technical matters, user-related matters etc. In any case, a relevant range of sources should have been consulted and their key points presented in a brief and logical manner (synthesis). These key points need to be analysed and evaluated, not merely repeated. The summary of the research findings presented should help to further the research questions and suitable conclusions should have been drawn.
4. Clarity and appropriateness of methods applied in the project (4%)
   The rationale for all methods chosen – whether for literature research or for applied practice - needs to be clear. Students should have selected and applied a small range of secondary and/or primary research methods, suitable to their project. If primary research took place, ethical and professional issues should have been well considered and if necessary, approval to perform the research been obtained. Thorough application of ethical and professional best practice needs to be discussed and documented.
5. Quality and depth of critical thinking (8%) around specific practice-based…
   a. User thinking processes (if applicable)
      Evidenced by correct application of UX/UI methods and processes and in-depth analysis and evaluation of user tests and results. To illustrate conclusions drawn, documentation of earlier prototypes and final prototypes needs to be included in appendixes. A discussion of next steps (how these findings would be carried forward technically/ professionally applied) needs to be included.
   b. Creative design processes (if applicable)
      Includes a concise summary of the self-selected creative brief, and a well-contextualized discussion about the creative constraints of this project. There will be a discussion of creative influences together with a brief analysis of how these have impacted on this project. A critical analysis and discussion of important stages in the creative process will follow, using well-chosen visual/interactive/audio examples to illustrate points made. There will be a discussion of the qualities of the final outcome and how this was/could be verified as relevant within its context. To illustrate the creative process and conclusions drawn, documentation of creative work should be included in appendixes.
   c. Technical developments and innovation (if applicable)
      The student demonstrates critical thinking and independence of thought by providing a thorough discussion on the validity and usefulness of technical developments undertaken. It should contain a concise summary of requirements/ technical specification, and a clear identification and description of the student's own contribution (e.g., code, algorithms etc). This should be followed by a detailed discussion of their usefulness, and evaluation of how well they solved the technical challenges of the project.

The student's choice of technical platform should be well argued for, within its relevant professional context. System diagrams, entity relationship diagrams, object model for code, Schemas, DTDs, or other XML descriptions should be included and discussed. There should be a well-argued rationale for and evaluation of any open source software/libraries, or open standards used/applied.

6. **Quality of project management: agile and proactive in implementation of feedback, methods or new findings, dealing with change** (5%)
   Can the student evidence good project management? Is it evident that time and resources have been independently managed? Has a log been included in the appendixes, and a project timeline? Does the log demonstrate that the student has tested out ideas and practices in reaction to research findings, and was not just following one existing method/tutorial? Can the student identify iterative project development/design stages in the log? Has the student applied important learning points arising from earlier project stages? Has the student attended supervisory sessions regularly and participated actively in the planning of his/her project development? Has the student discussed and taken on board feedback from supervisor, peers, and potential users? In case of problems, has the student been proactive in communicating these early on and in trying to seek solutions?

Marks will be awarded as follows:

Criterion	< 40	40 - 49	50-59	60-69	70+
Artefact	Artefact is non-existent, or inaccessible. Artefact is a completed tutorial.	Artefact barely extends beyond the basic tutorial stage. Inefficient means/ approach used.	Artefact suitable but may have problematic areas.	Well executed artefact, showing some innovative features. High quality of work achieved.	Industry standard artefact, showing innovative features. Excellent quality of work achieved.
Video	No video provided, or inaccessible. The video fails to summarise the project.	The video unstructured, not communicating main points well, significant AV issues.	The video summarises project but may miss some points. Minor AV issues or overly long.	The video structure is clear, content well delivered and within time. The project is well summarised.	The video is clear, captivating, and convincing.
Final Report	Report missing or unrelated to project. Evaluation of practice missing or not achieved. No references, no evidence of	Report seems incomplete. Practice insights limited. Little consideration of prof contexts. Evaluation of practice remains vague. Sparse references.	Report too long, main content overshadowed by bulk. Only some in depth evaluation. Discussion of outcomes limited. suitable	Report well prepared, analysis and discussion suitable, links to prof practice contexts made. Convincing evidence of project management.	Professional Report, analysis and discussion in good depth. Links to professional and practice contexts are insightful. Professional

	project management.	some evidence of project management.	evidence of project management.		level of project management shown.

Further Information

CCTP projects are not production projects…

Comprehensive Creative Technology Projects involve an investigation into an award-specific topic, which may or may not have been covered in depth on modules studied previously. However, the topic does not have to be radically unique, it can emerge from and contribute to current knowledge.

The project topic may stem from students' personal interests, perhaps developed from placement or other prior work experience, or from the research/practice interests of staff. Occasionally a project may be devised with the involvement of an external industry partner; in which case the supervisor and module leader will need to ascertain that the module's learning outcomes can be met before work on the project commences. Further guidance and ideas on topic selection are available on Blackboard.

In all cases, students are expected to identify the aims and scope of their investigation; undertake a survey of relevant academic/ professional literature; treat material critically and demonstrate their understanding of the relationship between material previously covered in taught modules and this specific topic studied. Students' literature searches are to be supplemented with examples from professional practice, so may include visual research or industry artefacts.

Supervisory sessions, Logs, Peer Support

After submitting the initial project proposal, students will be assigned to a supervisor and start attending weekly supervisory meetings as soon as term starts.

During these meetings, students will receive advice, direction, and progress will be reviewed. Dates and times for these meetings are to be mutually agreed. The duration of the meetings can vary to reflect the project's progress, i.e., longer meetings when more support is necessary.
As a guideline, supervisors may make up to 11 hours available for each student over the year for meetings, emailing and commenting on drafts, and spend up to 9 hours on marking work submitted for assessment.

To further their project management skills, students will keep a log with details on project activities completed, insights, emerging questions, time spent on each task and a project plan. Students should keep the plan up to date and refer to it often. Logs should be available at all meetings and should be used for note-taking. The completed log provides a useful resource at the end of the year, as students undertake a critical review of their project handling.

Students are also encouraged to meet up with peers without their supervisors, and to stay in close contact throughout the project stages. Peer support is a very helpful support mechanism for project completion and underutilised by most students.

What additional resources may help me complete this assessment?
For additional resources see:

- FAQs and other resources on the module's Blackboard page
- The module staff and your supervisor
- UWE library study skills pages i.e. https://www.uwe.ac.uk/study/study-support/study-skills

What do I do if I am concerned about completing this assessment?
UWE Bristol offer a range of Assessment Support Options that you can explore through this link, and both Academic Support and Wellbeing Support are available.
For further information, please see the Academic Survival Guide.

How do I avoid an Assessment Offence on this module?
Use the support above if you feel unable to submit your own work for this module.

1. In line with UWE Bristol's Assessment Content Limit Policy (formerly the Word Count Policy), word count includes all text, including (but not limited to): the main body of text (including headings), all citations (both in and out of brackets), text boxes, tables and graphs, figures and diagrams, quotes, lists.
2. UWE Bristol's UWE's Assessment Offences Policy requires that you submit work that is entirely your own and reflects your own learning, so it is important to:
    - Ensure you reference all sources used, using the UWE Harvard and the guidance available on UWE's Study Skills referencing pages.
    - Avoid copying and pasting any work into this assessment, including your own previous assessments, work from other students or internet sources
    - Develop your own style, arguments and wording, so avoid copying sources and changing individual words but keeping, essentially, the same sentences and/or structures from other sources
    - Never give your work to others who may copy it
    - If an individual assessment, develop your own work and preparation, and do not allow anyone to make amends on your work (including proof-readers, who may highlight issues but not edit the work) and

    When submitting your work, you will be required to confirm that the work is your own, and text-matching software and other methods are routinely used to check submissions against other submissions to the university and internet sources. Details of what constitutes plagiarism and how to avoid it can be found on UWE's Study Skills pages about avoiding plagiarism.

Module learning outcomes assessed by this task:

MO1: Independently research a comprehensive body of knowledge in a chosen subject and apply that to a professional practice context.

MO2: Demonstrate a professional understanding of ethical and professional best practice and apply this to the design of research and practice methodologies.

MO3: Demonstrate creative problem-solving in a complex project, involving iterative design, prototyping and risk management

MO4: Proactively control the scope of a complex and evolving project

MO5: Effectively manage their own time to deliver suitably ambitious projects

MO6: Critically synthesise information and discipline-specific techniques

MO7: Write up and present their research, conclusions and results in form of professional outputs