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# CI7820 Media Specialist Practice

# Module Assessment Details

**Overview of the assessment in CI7820 Media Specialist Practice**

Assessment in the Media Specialist Practice module (module code CI7820) consists of a piece of coursework worth 90% and an informal presentation that is worth 10%. The assignment will be described in detail (along with an opportunity to ask questions) at the start of the module.

The summary table below gives the key assessment points and dates and the following pages of the booklet contain the coursework and presentation assessment brief.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessment:** | **Weighting** | **Set date** | **Due date** | **Return date** |
| Presentation | 10% | Tues 21st January 2020 | Slides to be uploaded on Monday 23rd March 2020. Presentation to take place on  Tues 24th March 2020 | Weds 8th April 2020 |
| Coursework | 90 % | Tues 21st January 2020 | Mon 4th May 2020 | Tues 16th June 2020 |

All Module Learning Outcomes are assessed in the coursework and individual feedback throughout the module as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| LEARNING OUTCOME | ASSESSMENT STRATEGY |
| Demonstrate a professional level media specialist practice through the further development of an online portfolio. | Formative assessment, particularly following interim presentation will guide student progress. |
| Demonstrate a thorough understanding of technical, practical and professional constraints in the execution of all works | Summative assessment by academic team with input from specialist staff throughout the module will guide student progress |
| Use appropriate tools and processes from their own specialist practice to a professional level | Summative and formative assessment of individual works |
| Take personal responsibility for completion of executed tasks to a professional standard | Formative and summative assessment of online portfolio/website |
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## Summary of Assessment details

## Module: CI7820 Media Specialist Practice Setter: Sarah Barman + Module Team

**Title of Assignment:** **MSP Individual coursework**

**Deadlines:** The presentation of your assignment will be held on Tues 24th March 2020 (the slides for your presentation should be uploaded to Canvas by Mon 23rd March 2020. The deadline for submission of the other elements of the assignment (artefacts, website and report) is Mon 4th May 2020

**Submission details**

The coursework will commence at the start of the module and you will be guided by your stream leaders and supervisors to select a suitable topic for your own individual piece of work. An interim presentation on the project will occur approximately half way through the module (this does not count towards your final module mark), with a final presentation taking place during the last teaching week (this counts 10% towards your final module mark). The final deliverables, which count 90% towards your final module mark, will be submitted some weeks after the final presentation has taken place

**Module Learning Outcomes assessed in this piece of coursework**

All module learning outcomes will be assessed within this single piece of coursework

1. Assignment Brief and assessment criteria
   1. Introduction and overview

The coursework for Media Specialist Practice is an individual endeavour. In early sessions the course team will discuss possible themes and their specialist expertise with a view to helping you choose a project and subject area. You will be required to research your specialist topic and then to use your new understanding to complete a small project. The project deliverables, such as UX prototypes, game designs, video clips, evaluation reports, will be defined in association with your supervisor. You will present your project in class and publish the findings and the answers to the assignment in the form of a web site. The underlying technology for this is entirely up to you; you might use an off-the-shelf blogging or content management system e.g. Wordpress, or “roll your own”.

Please note that even within one topic area, you are required to **individualise** your take on the topic by choosing a unique application domain, or sector to which the topic applies. In this way, each submission will be a unique, distinguishable piece of work.

The key to the success of these projects is to start with a sound research stage. Initial reading will be guided, and its progress monitored.

* 1. Details of the different elements of the coursework

**2.2.1 Interim presentation** (this presentation does not count towards your final module mark)

This section gives an outline of what you will need to prepare for the Interim Presentation which will be held to be held on **Tues 25th February 2020 (10.00-13.00 & 14.00-17.00)**. Feedback on the presentations will be given verbally. Your performance in the presentation does not count towards the final module mark. We hope that you find the interim presentation a supportive environment to discuss your MSP project and hear about what other students are doing.

Your presentation will only be short – certainly less than ten minutes; precise timings will be discussed in class. You should prepare a **maximum of five PowerPoint slides (to be submitted before the date of the presentation)**. The slides should cover:

1. What is the title of your MSP coursework project and what are the aims and objectives of the work?
2. How has far has work progressed?
3. What is your plan for completing the work?

You are encouraged to attend all presentations.

* + 1. Final presentations (worth 10% of the final module mark)

The presentations will be held on **Tues 24th March 2020** (the slides for your presentation should be uploaded to Canvas by **Monday 23rd March 2020.** The final presentation is worth 10% of the module mark.

The presentation should concentrate on what the essence of your project is and what has been achieved. It can typically take a form of up to 7 slides with an embedded (or separately run, if it is easier) artefact such as a video of a journey through one use case scenario, or a prototype of an application, or a video showing an animation (or key part of it), or sketches supporting a game design, or a prototype made in Unity, for example - or whatever other form your deliverables may have taken. You do NOT need to present a complete 'product'. However, some essential deliverables that will represent what your project is about is mandatory. The slides should not be wordy and comprehensive, but concise and to the point, and they should convey the key aims, objectives and some achievements of the project.

By the date of your presentation, you will have finished or nearly finished the development of your artefacts for your project. At least, sufficiently to demonstrate to your assessors that you do have a well-articulated idea and a prototype or similar to demonstrate the viability, and the quality, of your idea.

The presentation's aim, pedagogically, is to help you articulate your own work, extract the important points from it and practice how to present it to the external world in a clear and appealing fashion. It is worth only 10% of your overall mark but this is not the key benefit from this exercise - it is the experience and a progress towards effective conveying of your ideas and results. It is advisable that you stay on and listen to your colleagues' presentations as much as you can -this has proven very informative, but it also provides for a great audience. There will be an opportunity to ask questions after every 5 presentations, approximately, to enhance the experience of all.

Your presentations should be submitted to Canvas, as a PDF (or other, appropriate format) file so they are visible to the External Examiners. The deadline for the submission of the presentations is the day before the presentations take place (please see the deadlines in the first paragraph of this section).

* + 1. Report (worth 25% of the module mark)
* The report should be submitted to submission facility on Canvas (details to be released)
* The report MUST contain (on its cover page) a publicly accessible URL to your website and the video where the audiences, including your assessors, will be able to enjoy the concepts and the deliverables from the project. The deliverables include access/links to prototypes wireframes, walk-through videos etc. to give potential employers/interested parties a sufficient insight into your project
* The report should be a brief document that summarises the aims and objectives of the project and the achievements and deliverables of the project. There is not a strict word count for this report, but we would expect it to be in the region of approximately 10 pages (including diagrams). There is not a defined structure for the report and you might want to choose a structure that best presents the work that you have done. However, a suggested structure could be based on the following:
  + Motivation
  + Aims and Objectives
  + Method (this section should describe the steps followed to achieve the deliverables)
  + Deliverables (this section should describe and explain the deliverables)
  + Discussion
    1. Website (also referred to as on-line portfolio) hosting the project (worth 25% of the module mark)
* The website is an opportunity for you to develop an on-line area that allows you to showcase the work that you have done for your project. Along the lines of an on-line portfolio, it may be a helpful way for you to exhibit the work that you have done on your MSP project to future employers.
* Your website will allow audiences to view the concepts and the deliverables from the project. The deliverables include access/links to prototypes wireframes, walk-through videos etc. to give potential buyers/employers/interested parties a sufficient insight into your project
* Blogs can be included in your portfolio. This can be a useful way to report on the development of your project. Keeping a blog is an ideal way to get practice in using social media to show the world that you are actively practicing your skillsets. Studios or companies are often keen to recruit candidates for a role who are making posts of their work and progress often.
  + 1. Deliverables pertinent to your project (worth 40% of the module mark)
* The deliverables other than the report - e.g. prototypes themselves, various animation files, video clips etc. and possibly evaluation reports, personas, storyboards, literature reviews etc. should be submitted to box.com (details to be released). You will need to zip up all your artefact files deliverables into one or two zipped folders in order to submit them. You must (if you are developing a game, animation sequence, or interactive prototype) please make a video that can be viewed online by staff marking the assignment to demonstrate your project deliverables in addition to submitting the actual files. The link to the video should be provided in the report and the website. Failure to submit a video may result in the work being assigned a zero mark!
  + 1. Marking Scheme and Marking Criteria

The marking scheme is shown in Table 1 and the marking criteria is shown in Table 2

**Table 1: Marking scheme**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **MSP Coursework** | **Weightings** |
| **Deliverables pertinent to the project (e.g. artefacts such as UX re-design, game re-design, product re-design etc)**  These are the fundamental artefacts that you produce for your project, i.e. the way you addressed the brief. This section includes your video, and other artefacts will depend on your discipline. For example, it might include an interactive prototype, an interface or game redesign, implementations of these, scenes and/or animated objects etc. The criteria for assessment include the process used to arrive at the proposed design; the justification of the choices made based on the knowledge of the underlying principles, best practice and available tools. | 40% |
| **Web site hosting the project (also referred to as the online portfolio)**  This aspect of your work will be assessed for the quality of content, the layout, narrative, look and feel, user experience and information architecture. The choice of information should be governed by the targeted audience and the nature of your brand. Remember that you are address a professional audience; a spectrum of users from professionals in the field to potential employers and professional bodies. You may choose to use a ready-made content management environment to minimise the effort required to implement the web site. This website may be part of your existing web presence, online CV or portfolio, or you may choose to keep it completely separate. | 25% |
| **Report**  This is a concise account of the process you followed and the choices you have made, with clear, well founded justifications of the decisions you have taken on this journey, following established practices in your field; it should be well illustrated by e.g. screenshots, diagrams, wireframes etc, as appropriate; it should include a light-touch evaluation of your proposed redesigns using standard procedures; in the conclusion, it must include a self-critique of the achievements and reflective comments on the lessons learnt | 25% |
| **Final Presentation**  The final presentation is a brief, to-the-point, visual and oral presentation of the aims of the project, its unique identity and the pitch you would have made to a potential investor in your idea; you will be using visual aids to get your points across – starting from e.g. a PowerPoint slides to short video-clips and/or animations to promote your concepts; the effectiveness of promoting your project will be at the core of the assessment of this component; the low weighting is deliberate – respecting the development time constraints – but the exercise is considered highly relevant in preparing you for the demands you will be, typically, facing in a work place | 10% |
| **Total** | **100%** |

**Table 2: Marking Criteria**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **GRADE BANDS** | | | | |
| **COMPONENTS** | **80%-100%** | **70%-79%** | **60%-69%** | **50%-59%** | **Fail**  **< 50%** |
| **Deliverable: artefacts/prototype**  Against meeting the requirements formulated in the project brief (as confirmed in week 5)  Note: the criteria for assessment include the **process** used to arrive at the proposed re-design; the justification of the choices made; demonstration of knowledge of the underlying concepts, best practice and available tools | Excellent work; a degree of originality demonstrated; an original and rich answer to the requirements ; near-professional approach to design; clear demonstration of excellent knowledge of principles and concepts that govern the design in the chosen field; exceptionally well executed artefact using relevant technology; immediately publishable work | Very good work; some degree of originality demonstrated; a comprehensive, distinct answer to the requirements; very good approach to design; clear demonstration of very good knowledge of principles and concepts that govern the design in the chosen field; very well executed artefact using relevant technology; publishable work, with some further interventions | Good workl; some innovative ideas; a solid answer to the requirements; good approach to design; demonstration of good knowledge of principles and concepts that govern the design in the chosen field; well executed artefact using relevant technology | Adequate work; an adequate answer to the requirements; adequate approach to design; adequate demonstration of knowledge of principles and concepts that govern the design in the chosen field; adequately executed artefact using relevant technology | Some or all of the following:  inadequate/poor answer to the requirements; inadequate approach to design; insufficient demonstration of knowledge of principles and concepts that govern the design in the chosen field; poorly executed artefact, possibly using inadequate technology |
| **Web site hosting the project**  It is the content, the choice of a layout to suit the nature of the project, the narrative, the architecture of information, the choice of artefacts to present, the context information and real-time feeds to keep it up to date – that this component will be assessed on | Excellent choice of information to support the project, e.g. the justification for the re-design; excellent information architecture (the classification of information, the categories etc); excellent site map and effective use of links; smooth, methodical narrative to describe the origins and the execution of the project; excellent choice of interface design template to promote the project; a full set of real-time feeds/objects to connect the project with current professional practices and make effective use of social media to disseminate the results | Very good choice of information to support the project, e.g. the justification for the re-design; very good classification of information, the categories etc; very good site map and effective use of links; smooth narrative to describe the origins and the execution of the project; very good choice of interface design template to promote the project; very good use of real-time feeds and objects to connect the project with current professional practices and make effective use of social media to disseminate the results | Good choice of information to support the project, e.g. the justification for the re-design; good classification of information, good web site structure; smooth narrative to describe the origins and the execution of the project; good choice of interface design template to promote the project; good use of real-time feeds and objects to connect the project with current professional practices and make effective use of social media to disseminate the results | Adequate choice of information to support the project, e.g. the justification for the re-design; adequate classification of information, adequate web site structure; reasonably good narrative to describe the origins and the execution of the project; adequate choice of interface design template to promote the project; some use of real-time feeds and objects to connect the project with current professional practices and make some use of social media to disseminate the results | Some or all of the following applies: Poor choice/insufficient information to support the project, e.g. the justification for the re-design; poor classification of information, poor web site structure; poor narrative to describe the origins and the execution of the project; poor choice of interface design template to promote the project; poor use of real-time feeds and objects to connect the project with current professional practices and poor use of social media to disseminate the results |
| **Report**  Report Structure; Aims and Objectives; Re-design Rationale; Evaluation of redesign; Critique of the process and achievements; Referencing | Excellent, coherent report on the project, with aims and objectives clearly stated, followed by an articulate narrative connecting research findings with the re-design and the artefacts; redesign rationale exceptionally well explained; excellent critique of the overall process and of the achievements; excellent referencing throughout; publishable work | Very good, coherent report on the project, with aims and objectives clearly stated, followed by a very good narrative connecting research findings with the re-design and the artefacts; redesign rationale very well explained; very good critique of the overall process and of the achievements; very good referencing throughout | Good, coherent report on the project, with aims and objectives clearly stated, followed by a good narrative connecting research findings with the re-design and the artefacts; redesign rationale well explained; good critique of the overall process and of the achievements; good referencing throughout | Adequate report on the project, with aims and objectives clearly stated, followed by an adequate narrative connecting research findings with the re-design and the artefacts; redesign rationale adequately explained; some critique of the overall process and of the achievements; adequate referencing throughout | Some or all of the following apply:  Poor report on the project, with aims and objectives not clearly stated, poor narrative connecting research findings with the re-design and the artefacts; redesign rationale poorly explained; no or poor critique of the overall process and of the achievements; inadequate referencing |
| **Final Presentation**  Effectiveness in conveying the project idea and the findings/demonstration; quality of answers to questions from the audience | Excellent extraction of points to present; excellent choice of diagrams, graphics, artefacts to illustrate the points made; excellent timing; supported by excellent documentation, e.g. slides with appropriate proportion of text and graphics; effective demonstration of a prototype/artefact; ready to be publicly presented to a professional audience | Very good extraction of points to present; very good choice of diagrams, graphics, artefacts to illustrate the points made; good timing; very good text/graphics proportion in e.g. slides; demonstration of prototype; ready to be publicly presented to a professional audience with small improvements; | Good extraction of points to present; very good choice of diagrams, graphics, artefacts to illustrate the points made; good timing; good text/graphics proportion in e.g. slides; some degree of demonstration of a prototype; | Basic extraction of points to present; adequate choice of diagrams, graphics, artefacts to illustrate the points made; basic demonstration of a prototype | Some or all of the following apply:  Poor extraction of points to present; incoherent narrative; inadequate or deficient choice of diagrams, graphics to illustrate the points made; possibly failing to demonstrate a functional prototype |

## Feedback

You will receive verbal feedback at your interim presentation from your supervisor. You will receive written feedback within three weeks of submission via your Kingston email from with respect to the final presentation and other deliverables of the artefact files, website and report.

## Further guidance

## Getting Help

Further information on submission processes will be released in due course, but in the meantime if you have any questions at all about the coursework, please either discuss with your individual supervisors or contact me (s.barman@kingston.ac.uk).

**4.2 Important Regulations Reminder**

You must meet all deadlines set.  Failure to do so will result in a penalty. Work submitted late but within a week of the deadline will be capped at 50% and receive a grade of LP (Late Pass) unless it is not of a passing standard in which case it will receive a grade of LF (Late Fail).  Work submitted beyond a week of the deadline without approval will get 0% with a grade of F0. If, however, you have a serious problem which prevents you from meeting the deadline you may be able to negotiate an extension in advance.  In the first instance you should contact one of the Student Liaison Officers for advice.  However any extension will need to be formally agreed by your Module Leader who will liaise with student support to confirm and agree a new hand in date.  Your work will then be marked without penalty.

**4.3 Plagiarism and Academic Misconduct**

For detailed information see the following document

ACADEMIC REGULATIONS 7: Academic Misconduct Cheating in Assessment Taught Courses 2014-15

<https://mykingston.kingston.ac.uk/myuni/academicregulations/Pages/misconduct.aspx>