

1st SIT COURSEWORK 2:

Autumn Semester 2019

Module Code: CU6051NA

Module Title: Artificial Intelligence

Module Leader: Sukrit Shakya (Islington College)

Coursework Type: Individual

Coursework Weight: This coursework accounts for 80% of your total module

grades.

Submission Date: Week 13

When Coursework is

given out:

Week 8

Submission Submit the following to Islington College RTE department

Instructions: before the due date:

Source code of the application

Report in PDF format

Presentation

Warning: London Metropolitan University and Islington College

takes Plagiarism seriously. Offenders will be dealt with

sternly.

© London Metropolitan University

Plagiarism Notice

You are reminded that there exist regulations concerning plagiarism.

Extracts from University Regulations on Cheating, Plagiarism and Collusion

Section 2.3: "The following broad types of offence can be identified and are provided as indicative examples

- (i) Cheating: including copying coursework.
- (ii) Falsifying data in experimental results.
- (iii) Personation, where a substitute takes an examination or test on behalf of the candidate. Both candidate and substitute may be guilty of an offence under these Regulations.
- (iv) Bribery or attempted bribery of a person thought to have some influence on the candidate's assessment.
- (v) Collusion to present joint work as the work solely of one individual.
- (vi) Plagiarism, where the work or ideas of another are presented as the candidate's own.
- (vii) Other conduct calculated to secure an advantage on assessment.
- (viii) Assisting in any of the above.

Some notes on what this means for students:

- (i) Copying another student's work is an offence, whether from a copy on paper or from a computer file, and in whatever form the intellectual property being copied takes, including text, mathematical notation and computer programs.
- (ii) Taking extracts from published sources without attribution is an offence. To quote ideas, sometimes using extracts, is generally to be encouraged. Quoting ideas is achieved by stating an author's argument and attributing it, perhaps by quoting, immediately in the text, his or her name and year of publication, e.g. " e = mc2 (Einstein 1905)". A reference section at the end of your work should then list all such references in alphabetical order of authors' surnames. (There are variations on this referencing system which your tutors may prefer you to use.) If you wish to quote a paragraph or so from published work then indent the quotation on both left and right margins, using an italic font where practicable, and introduce the quotation with an attribution.

Further information in relation to the existing London Metropolitan University regulations concerning plagiarism can be obtained from http://www.londonmet.ac.uk/academic-regulations

Coursework 2

In coursework 2 students are required to build upon the work done in the 1st coursework and develop a working prototype of an AI application using available tools and technologies. Students can use any programming language of their choice and can use open source libraries to develop the application.

Submission needs to include:

Application

 Developed application that runs (pre – compiled if required) including source code and any other required files

• Report with the following inclusion:

- Introduction
 - Explanation of the topic/Al concepts used
 - Explanation/introduction of the chosen problem domain/topic
- Background
 - Research work done in coursework 1
- Solution
 - Explanation of the solution/used Al algorithm
 - Pseudocode of the solution
 - Diagrammatical representations of the solution (flowcharts/state transition diagrams)
 - Explanation of the development process (with explanation of the used tools and technologies/libraries)
 - Achieved results (screenshots of the application/screenshots of the results attained)
- Conclusion
 - Analysis of the work done
 - How the application/solution addresses real world problems
 - Further work

• Presentation with the following inclusion:

- Topic
 - Explanation of the Al concepts used
 - Research evidences
 - Reason for selection of the topic
- Solution
 - Explanation of the solution and developed application (how it works)
 - Achieved results
 - How it solves real world problems?
- Synthesis of information

^{*}Students must continue with the topic selected in coursework 1 for this assessment.

- Pseudo code for the solution
- Diagrammatical representations of the solution (flowcharts/state transition diagrams)

Note:

The technicality of the project will be judged during the viva/presentation and marked accordingly. If any individual student is not able to justify his/her project, then the project will be kept under plagiarism.

Artificial Intelligence: CW2: Marking Scheme

University Grading Scheme for Undergraduate Programmes: 2019/20			
	Marking criteria	Letter grade	Mark recorded
C1 – V	Vork Showing Evidence:		
1.	The introduction explains the topic perfectly and the problem domain has been discussed very clearly. An exceptional level of understanding of the topic material has been shown.	A+	95
2.	Exceptional research work has been done with proper explanations using proper sources and referencing. An exceptional level of understanding has been shown.		
3.	The solution/development process has been described perfectly using necessary diagrams and clear pseudocode. An exceptional level of understanding of the solution is displayed.		
4.	The developed application is flawless and works perfectly. Outstanding results have been achieved.		
5.	The report is well-structured, written in good English, free from spelling and grammatical errors and is written in a professional style of a technical article and presented at a high standard.		
6.	The student's performance in the VIVA was perfect in every respect.		
C2 – V	Vork Showing Evidence:		
1.	The introduction explains the topic at an outstanding level and the problem domain has been discussed very clearly. An outstanding level of understanding of the topic material has been shown.	А	85

	Outstanding research work has been done with proper explanations using proper sources and referencing. An outstanding level of understanding has been shown.		
3.	The solution/development process has been described perfectly using necessary diagrams and clear pseudocode. An outstanding level of understanding of the solution is displayed.		
4.	The developed application is flawless and works perfectly. Excellent results have been achieved.		
5.	The report is well structured, written well, and free from spelling and grammatical errors and is written at a very good quality standard.		
6.	In the viva the student showed a level of understanding and insight very much beyond what is expected at this level.		
C3 – M	Vork Showing Evidence:		
1.	The introduction explains the topic at an excellent level and the problem domain has been discussed clearly. An excellent level of understanding of the topic material has been shown.	A-	75
2.	Excellent research work has been done with proper explanations using proper sources and referencing. An excellent level of understanding has been shown.		
3.	The solution/development has been described perfectly using necessary diagrams and clear pseudocode. An excellent level of understanding of the solution is displayed.		
4.	The developed application is flawless and works perfectly. Very good results have been achieved.		
5.	The report has a good structure, written well, free from spelling and grammatical errors and is at a good quality standard.		
6.	In the viva the student showed a level of understanding and insight beyond what is expected at this level.		
C4 – W	Vork Showing Evidence:		
	The introduction explains the topic at a very good level and the problem domain has been discussed well. A very good level of understanding of the topic material has been shown.	B+	67
2.	Very good research work has been done with		

3. 4. 5.	suitable explanations using proper sources and referencing. A very good level of understanding has been shown. The solution/development process has been described well using necessary diagrams and clear pseudocode. A very good level of understanding of the solution is displayed. The developed application is very good and works well. Very good results have been achieved. The report is a structured one, written reasonably well but may contain only minor typos and grammatical errors but on the whole is a good report.		
6.	In the viva the student displayed a better than average level of understanding. The student was able to answer most questions clearly and with insight.		
C5 – W	Vork Showing Evidence:		
1.	The introduction explains the topic at a good level and the problem domain has been discussed fairly well. A good level of understanding of the topic material has been shown.	В	63
2.	Good research work has been done with suitable explanations using proper sources and referencing. A good level of understanding has been shown.		
3.			
4.	The developed application is good and works well. Good results have been achieved.		
5.	The report is written well but may contain some spelling and grammatical mistakes but on the whole is a reasonable report.		
6.	In the viva the student displayed a level of understanding which is about what would be expected.		
C6 – W	Vork Showing Evidence:		
1.	The introduction explains the topic at a reasonable level and the problem domain has been discussed fairly well. A reasonable level of understanding of the topic material has been shown.	C+	57

		1	
2.	Research work has been done at a reasonable level with suitable explanations using proper sources and referencing. A reasonable level of understanding has been shown.		
3.	The solution/development process has been described fairly well using necessary diagrams and pseudocode. A reasonable level of understanding of the solution is displayed.		
4.	The developed application is good but with minor errors. The results achieved are satisfactory.		
5.	The report is written with a satisfactory standard that may contain spelling and grammatical errors.		
6.	In the viva the student displayed a level of understanding which is considered to be the minimum acceptable at this level. The student was able to answer some questions.		
C7 – W	Ork Showing Evidence:		
	The introduction explains the topic at a satisfactory level and the problem domain has been discussed reasonably. A satisfactory level of understanding of the topic material has been shown.	С	53
2.	Research work has been done at a reasonable level with suitable explanations using proper sources and referencing. A satisfactory level of understanding has been shown.		
3.	The solution/development process has been described at a satisfactory level using necessary diagrams and pseudocode. A satisfactory level of understanding of the solution is displayed.		
4.	The developed application is good but with minor errors and shortcomings. The results achieved are satisfactory.		
5.	The report is written at a satisfactory level that contains spelling and grammatical errors.		
6.	In the viva the student displayed a level of understanding which is considered to be the minimum acceptable at this level. The student was able to answer some questions.		
C8 – W	/ork Showing Evidence:		
1.	The introduction explains the topic only at a basic level and the problem domain has been discussed only at a basic minimum level. Only a basic level of	D+	47

	with short explanations. Only a basic level of understanding has been shown.		
3.	The solution/development process has been described at only a basic level using necessary diagrams and pseudocode. Only a basic level of understanding of the solution is displayed.		
4.	The developed application is acceptable but with errors and shortcomings. The results achieved are at a minimum acceptable level.		
5.	The report is written at a satisfactory level, which may lack structure and/or contain spelling and grammatical errors.		
6.	In the viva the student showed a little understanding and was only able to answer the most basic questions.		
C9 – W	Vork Showing Evidence:		
1.	The introduction explains the topic at a very basic level and the problem domain has been discussed only at a basic minimum level. A very basic level of understanding of the topic material has been shown.	D	43
2.	Research work has been done only at a basic level with short. A very basic level of understanding has been shown.		
3.	The solution/development has been described only at a very basic level using diagrams and pseudocode. A very basic level of understanding of the solution is displayed.		
4.	The developed application is at a minimum acceptable level with errors and shortcomings. The results achieved are at a minimum acceptable level.		
5.	The report lacks structure and/or contains spelling and grammatical errors but on the whole just reaches a minimum acceptable level.		
i .			
6.	In the viva the student showed a little understanding and was only able to answer only the most basic questions.		
	understanding and was only able to answer only the		

	1 . 1 . 1 . 1 . 1 . 1 . 1		a =
	a basic level and the problem domain has been	F1	37
	discussed very weakly. A weak level of		
	understanding of the topic material has been		
	shown.		
2.	Evidence of research work is poor. A weak level of		
	understanding has been shown.		
3.	The solution/development process has not been		
	described properly and is unclear. A poor level of		
	understanding of the solution is displayed.		
4.	The developed application is not at an acceptable		
	level. The results achieved are poor.		
5.	The report lacks structure presented poorly and		
	contains spelling and grammatical errors, which on		
	the whole is at an unacceptable standard.		
6.	In the viva the student showed almost no		
	understanding of the technical content of the		
	project and was unable to answer even the most		
	basic questions.		
C11 -	Work Showing Evidence:		
1.	The introduction does not explain the topic even at	F2	23
	a basic level and the problem domain has been		
	discussed very weakly. A very weak level of		
	understanding of the topic material has been		
	shown.		
2.	Evidence of research work is very poor. A very weak		
	level of understanding has been shown.		
3.	The solution/development process has not been		
	described properly and is unclear. A very poor level		
	of understanding of the solution is displayed.		
4.	The developed application is not at an acceptable		
	level. The results achieved are very poor.		
5.	The report is very poorly presented with no level of		
	structure and cohesion, which contains spelling, and		
	grammatical errors that make it considerably lower		
	than just an acceptable technical report expected at		
	this level.		
6.			
	understanding of the technical content of the		
	project and was unable to answer even the most		
	basic questions.		
	,		
Fail (no	on-submission or submission of work which cannot		
(111		<u> </u>	

be given any credit (e.g., blank submission, incorrect	F3	0
assignment)		

-END-