**Faculty of Engineering, Environment and Computing**

**Individual Project**

**Assignment Brief**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Module Title  AI and Human Factors Research Project | Individual | | Cohort  MayAug | Module Code |
| Coursework Title (e.g. CWK1)  CW1 Project Brief | | | | Hand out date:  15/05/2023 |
| Lecturer:  Dr Mark Elshaw | | | | Due date and time:  19/06/2023  Aula: 18:00:00 |
| Estimated Time (hrs): 55 Estimated  Wordlength: 1000 words | | Coursework type:  Report | | Credit value assessed: 10 |
| File types and method of recording: PDF document Mark and Feedback date (DD/MM/YY): 08/07/2023  Mark and Feedback method: Aula | | | |  |
| Module Learning Outcomes Assessed:   1. **Propose and construct innovative solutions to the research problems by applying appropriate methodology, tools and techniques within a chosen specialism and critically evaluate problem solving processes.** 2. **Critically review current information resources relevant to a particular problem domain and justify the proposed solutions.** 3. Apply appropriate research strategies, analyse research findings to draw conclusions and communicate effectively in verbal and written presentation. 4. Apply project management techniques to undertaking a significant piece of individual work. 5. Critically evaluate any professional, legal, social and ethical issues relating to the project. | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Task and Mark distribution:**  **Section A – Ethics Application**  Include the following table to indicate Progress of your Ethics Application. Tick the relevant box.   |  |  | | --- | --- | |  | I submitted my ethics application and my application has been approved. I include my ethics certificate in the appendix as evidence. | |  | I submitted my ethics application and my application is currently under review. | |  | I have not submitted my ethics application. |   **Section B – Project Proposal**  Produce a project proposal (suggested length 1000 words) that encapsulates your project idea and which provides a detailed research plan of the steps you will undertake to address your research question.  You can if you wish carry out the project you decided on in 7000CEM. However, you should submit an updated/enhanced proposal for 7156CEM that includes refined research questions and objectives, ethical challenges and analysis, detailed project plan and milestones and an focused mini literature review that provided the background of the project.  Your proposal should include the following sections:   1. **Research Question, Problem Statement or Topic for Investigation**   Provide a clear outline of the research question, practical problem or primary investigation that you will be undertaking for your project. Useful questions to address would be: what is the question or problem you are addressing, what evidence is there that this is a real problem, what approach or method are you going to take to address the problem.   1. **Intended user or group of users and their requirements**   In this section you should address who will benefit from your findings and how they will benefit. (note: ‘greater knowledge about’ is defined as a benefit – even if your audience is mainly other academic researchers, new data, if collected using scientific principles, adds to the body of knowledge about the topic). Who are the intended user or group users? Why you think there is need for this project? What are the needs of the intended user that your product should satisfy?] **3. Systems requirements, project deliverables and final project outcome**  In this section you should address what the characteristics/properties that the final product should possess? What are the process stages and the corresponding deliverables that will enable you to create the final product? Describe, as clearly as possible, what outcome your project aims to produce in relation to the original question, investigation or problem statement.  **4. Primary Research Plan**  This is the plan as to how you will go about answering your detailed research question or approach your practical problem - It must include a primary research method (an extended literature review is not an acceptable primary method). Think and plan logically. Primary methods may include experiments, applications or software demonstrators, process models, simulations, surveys, analysis of existing or generated data … you may wish to suggest a timeline or simply set out a sequence of tasks. Where you intend to collect data think about how much data you need and how long the collection process will take. Make reasonable assumptions about the amount of work you can do and try not to ‘over-promise’ on results – most scientific research is small scale and time limited, this is even more the case with student projects where you also have competing modules.   1. **Initial/Mini Literature Review**   Using the University Library e-journal database, the ACM portal database or Google Scholar, identify and select between three and five research papers relating to your topic. Try and identify papers that are relatively current (within the last three years). A literature review is a select analysis of existing research, which is relevant to your topic. It should offer the background of the project you have chosen. It explains and justifies how your investigation may help answer some of the questions or gaps in this area of research. A literature review is not a straightforward summary of everything you have read on the topic and it is not a chronological description of what was discovered in your field. Use your literature review to:   * + Show how your project will relate to previous studies.   + Compare and contrast different authors' views on an issue - note areas in which authors are in disagreement.   + Highlight current exemplary studies   + Highlight any gaps in research that may provide you with a starting point for your project   + Highlight any good approaches that may allow you to develop a project idea further   The key to the mini-literature review is your critical and evaluative perspective on the literature  reviewed. **Use the review to make a case/argument as to why your own research**  **project is necessary/important.**   1. **Bibliography (key texts for your literature review)**   Please provide references, in correct referencing style, for the research papers that have informed your literature review. The references should be recent and sufficiently technical or academic. Your markers will be looking for you to identify technical reports, conference papers, journal papers, and recent text books. Avoid Wikipedia entries, newspaper reports that do not cite sources, and general or introductory texts. |

|  |
| --- |
| Notes:   1. You are expected to use the [Coventry University APA s](https://libguides.coventry.ac.uk/apa)tyle for referencing. For support and advice on this students can contact [Centre for Academic Writing (CAW).](http://www.coventry.ac.uk/study-at-coventry/student-support/academic-support/centre-for-academic-writing/?theme=main) 2. Please notify your registry course support team and module leader for disability support. 3. Any student requiring an extension or deferral should follow the university process as outline[d here.](https://share.coventry.ac.uk/students/Registry/Pages/Deferrals-and-Extension.aspx) 4. The University cannot take responsibility for any coursework lost or corrupted on disks, laptops or personal computer. Students should therefore regularly back-up any work and are advised to save it on the University system. 5. If there are technical or performance issues that prevent students submitting coursework through the online coursework submission system on the day of a coursework deadline, an appropriate extension to the coursework submission deadline will be agreed. This extension will normally be 24 hours or the next working day if the deadline falls on a Friday or over the weekend period. This will be communicated via your Module Leader. 6. Assignments that are more than 10% over the word limit will result in a deduction of 10% of the mark i.e. a mark of 60% will lead to a reduction of 6% to 54%. The word limit includes quotations, but excludes the bibliography, reference list and tables. 7. You are encouraged to check the originality of your work by using the draft Turnitin links on Aula. 8. Collusion between students (where sections of your work are similar to the work submitted by other students in this or previous module cohorts) is taken extremely seriously and will be reported to the academic conduct panel. This applies to both courseworks and exam answers. 9. A marked difference between your writing style, knowledge and skill level demonstrated in class discussion, any test conditions and that demonstrated in a coursework assignment may result in you having to undertake a Viva Voce in order to prove the coursework assignment is entirely your own work. 10. If you make use of the services of a proof reader in your work you must keep your original version and make it available as a demonstration of your written efforts. 11. You must not submit work for assessment that you have already submitted (partially or in full), either for your current course or for another qualification of this university, with the exception of resits, where for the coursework, you maybe asked to rework and improve a previous attempt. This requirement will be specifically detailed in your assignment brief or specific course or module information. Where earlier work by you is citable, i.e. it has already been published/submitted, you must reference it clearly. Identical pieces of work submitted concurrently may also be considered to be self-plagiarism. |

**7151CEM Project Brief**

**Report Grading and Feedback**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Student name: |  |
| 1st Supervisor/2nd Marker:  *Delete as appropriate* |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Strengths of the project:** |
| **Weaknesses of the project:** |
| **Areas in need of improvement:** |

The proposal is marked out of 100 divided into 50 marks for **the quality, achievability and level of challenge demonstrated by the student's research question and proposed primary method of solution generation** and 50 marks for the **clarity and thoroughness of the proposal.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Research question and primary research method** |  |
| In awarding a grade please consider:   * That the research question is well formed and achievable **OR**  That the practical problem is well specified. * That the question is specific and free from untestable generalisation **OR** * The practical problem is defined specifically enough that a generic solution will not suffice * That the proposed project represents an appropriate level of challenge to a masters project * That the primary method(s) proposed are appropriate and achievable and demonstrate application of a sound methodology | **/50** |
| **Thoroughness of the proposal.** |  |
| In awarding a grade please consider:   * That the student has thought through the potential impact and audience for the project * That initial references are appropriate, up to date and academic * That the student has a clear idea of how time and activities will be managed. * That, taken as a whole, the proposal is clear and complete. | **/50** |
| **Total** | **/100** |

**Assessor’s Feedback:**

This document is for Coventry University students for their own use in completing their assessed work for this module and should not be passed to third parties or posted on any website. Any infringements of this rule should be reported to **facultyregistry.eec@coventry.ac.uk**.

**Marking Rubric**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **GRADE** | **ANSWER RELEVANCE** |  | **ARGUMENT & COHERENCE** |  | **EVIDENCE** |  | **SUMMARY** |  |
| **First**  **≥70** | Innovative response, answers the question fully, addressing the learning objectives of the assessment task.  Evidence of critical analysis, synthesis and evaluation. |  | A clear, consistent in-depth critical and evaluative argument, displaying the ability  to develop original ideas from a range of sources. Engagement with theoretical and conceptual analysis. |  | Wide range of appropriately supporting evidence provided, going beyond the recommended texts. Correctly referenced. |  | An outstanding, well-structured and appropriately referenced answer, demonstrating a high degree of  understanding and critical analytic skills. |  |
| **Upper Second**  **60-69** | A very good attempt to address the objectives of the assessment task with an emphasis on those elements requiring critical review. |  | A generally clear line of critical and evaluative argument is presented.  Relationships between statements and sections are easy to follow, and there is a sound, coherent structure. |  | A very good range of relevant sources is used in a largely consistent way as  supporting evidence. There is use of some sources beyond recommended texts. Correctly referenced in the main. |  | The answer demonstrates a very good understanding of theories, concepts and  issues, with evidence of reading beyond the recommended minimum. Well organised and clearly written. |  |
| **Lower Second**  **50-59** | Competently addresses objectives, but may contain errors or omissions and critical discussion of issues may be superficial or limited in places. |  | Some critical discussion, but the argument is not always convincing, and the work is descriptive in places, with over-reliance on the work of others. |  | A range of relevant sources is used, but the critical evaluation aspect is not fully  presented. There is limited use of sources beyond the standard recommended  materials. Referencing is not always correctly presented. |  | The answer demonstrates a good understanding of some relevant  theories, concepts and issues, but there are some errors and irrelevant material included. The structure lacks clarity. |  |
| **Third**  **40-49** | Addresses most objectives of the assessment task, with some notable  omissions. The structure is unclear in parts, and there is limited analysis. |  | The work is descriptive with minimal critical discussion and limited theoretical engagement. |  | A limited range of relevant sources used without appropriate presentation as  supporting or conflicting evidence coupled with very limited critical analysis.  Referencing has some errors. |  | Some understanding is demonstrated but is incomplete, and there is evidence of limited research on the topic. Poor  structure and presentation, with few and/or poorly presented references. |  |
| **Fail**  **<40** | Some deviation from the objectives of the assessment task. May not consistently address the assignment brief. At the  lower end fails to answer the question set or address the learning outcomes. There is minimal evidence of analysis or evaluation. |  | Descriptive with no evidence of theoretical engagement, critical discussion or  theoretical engagement. At the lower end displays a minimal level of understanding. |  | Very limited use and application of relevant sources as supporting evidence.  At the lower end demonstrates a lack of real understanding. Poor presentation of references. |  | Whilst some relevant material is present, the level of understanding is poor with  limited evidence of wider reading. Poor  structure and poor presentation, including referencing. At the lower end there is  evidence of a lack of comprehension, resulting in an assignment that is well below the required standard. |  |
| **Late submission** | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |