

UFCFWQ-45-M Interdisciplinary Group Project

Assignment Specification – Viva

Mark Allocation: **40%**

Vivas Date: **14th August 2025**

Description

Your 30 minute viva will consist of a group presentation and then questions from the tutors. The presentation should take between 15 and 20 minutes. Each member of the team should be prepared to answer at least one question on an aspect of their project.

Your presentation should cover the main areas evidenced in your portfolio, including :

- Your **background research** on the topic area and your technical approach;
- Team **coordination, delegation and project management**;
- Your **technical implementation** (phases, stages and final deliverables), including **challenges encountered** and how you addressed them;
- Your **conclusions, recommendations, and reflections** as to further work that could be done.

Slides may be used but are not essential if the team prefers to present their work in another way.

All members of the team should contribute to the presentation

Each member of the team should be able to summarise their contribution and how they developed their skills and knowledge during the project.

Assessment

This is a controlled exam and any team members not present at the allotted time will be classed as non-submissions.

For teams deemed to have reasonably fair and even collaboration, a single mark will be awarded to all members. In the case of significantly uneven quality and/or quantity of contribution, individual team members will have marks adjusted up or down as appropriate*

Criterion	Poor/Fail (<50)	Good (50-59)	Very Good / Merit (60-69)	Excellent / Distinction (70+)
Research depth and knowledge of the problem space	Research wholly lacking, poor quality/ quantity or largely disconnected from the project focus.	Reasonable knowledge of topic. Some research, though patchy in places or not based on good/current sources.	A clear grasp of the topic area, though perhaps unevenly distributed in team, supported by generally good depth and breadth of research	Excellent team knowledge of the problem area, shared throughout the team. Contemporary and quality evidence reviewed and actively/effectively harnessed.

Technical or analytical work and quality / originality of the team's deliverables	Technical/analytical work not evident, or wholly derivative (e.g taken wholly from existing work without team innovation)	Technical/analytical work evident, though limited, unfinished or lacking iteration and development stages.	Strong technical/analytical work and good quality deliverables, perhaps with some gaps or evident minor issues	Highly professional, innovative and well-presented deliverables completed to a strong technical standard. Very significant work evident.
Team Project Management	No clear team process or project control. Variation of effort and distinct lack of focus in task choice and prioritisation.	Some evidence of project management or control, but perhaps retrospectively justified or lacking in productivity gains overall	Team approach generally structured, though perhaps without particularly strong testing / adoption of methodology	Very well documented and organised with reference to PM tools and techniques. Team reflection on the pros and cons of their approach.
Team Learning	No evidence of team learning. Tasks presented did not require team to extend themselves in any way	Some evidence of team learning. Tasks presented did not always require significant growth and development of skills.	Generally good evidence of team learning. Some strong skills and knowledge development around the project topic and tools.	Team learning evident on several fronts and clear evidence of individuals pushing themselves to raise levels of technical or team-working performance
Viva Performance	Poor, unrehearsed, significantly over / under time. Project unclear. Approach and presentation of project timeline and extent haphazard or very poorly described. Questions not answered well.	Fair if a little confusing or under-prepared in presentation style and flow. Questions attempted, with some good answers	Well presented, with a coherent narrative thread. Questions mostly well fielded, perhaps with minor gaps or oversights evident.	Polished, well-rehearsed and ran to time. Project clearly described and a strong narrative around research and development. Questions answered satisfactorily.

**Tutors will take a rounded view of individual contribution and evidence will come not just from the viva, but also the portfolio contents and the tutors' own supervision records and observations*