

School of Computer Science – Coursework 2 Issue Sheet

Session	2025/2026	Semester	Autumn
Module Name	Symbolic Artificial Intelligence	Code	COMP3070
Module Convenor	Doreen Ying Ying Sim		

Coursework Name	Coursework project 2	Weight: 30%
Coursework Overview	The Workflow Satisfiability Problem is an important problem in access control (information security). It is about organising a workflow in an organisation in such a way that certain security-related constraints are satisfied	
Coursework Details	More detail is available in Appendix 1.	
Deliverable (a brief description of what is to be handed in; e.g. 'software', 'report')	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A report (include problem formulations, code explanation and the like) ▪ The solver's code in Python 	
Format	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The report should be submitted in .pdf format. ▪ The solver code in a respected programming language file extension. For example, to submit a .py file if the solver was implemented in Python. 	

Issue Date	4 November 2025 (Tuesday)
Submission Date(s) and Time	Report and solver code: 26 December 2025 (Friday) at 6:00pm
Submission Mechanism	Both the report and code should be submitted as pdf files via Moodle, while MP file should be submitted via Moodle or Teams to the module convenor. For the code, please try your best to wrap all the functionalities in a single file. For example, if you are using Python to complete the coursework, you can store all the functions/classes within a single .py file. If this is not possible, kindly zip all the solver file extensions when attaching it in Moodle.
Late Policy	A late penalty of 5% per calendar day (excluding weekends) will be applied.
Feedback Date (default of 21 days of the published submission date will apply, if blank)	Report and solver code: The feedback will be provided during the oral interview

Instructions	Coursework 2 is explained in the general coursework guide uploaded to Moodle. A FAQ will be maintained in Moodle. If you have questions, talk to the module convenor; answers to new questions will be added to the FAQ.
Assessment Criteria	<p>Part 1: Completeness and correctness of the solution methods (30%)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The proposed solution should terminate with a solution when one exists. ▪ The proposed should behave according to the predetermined goals and specifications. Set at least SIX main constraints for problem formulations. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The proposed based solver for workflow will be evaluated against unseen instances (i.e., instances other than the example provided) <p>(Students may add extraordinary solution method(s), alternative formulations and the like, more explanation and additional constraints to earn more marks)</p> <p>Part 2: Quality and elegance of the solution methods and code (20%)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The code quality encompasses code clarity, maintainability, documentation, refactoring, well-tested, and efficiency.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The course also challenges the student to develop a compact, elegant mathematical description for checking the satisfiability of the problem. <p>Part 3 Report (50%)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The report should consist of the following elements and must be in the following order. <p>a) Report Contents:</p> <p>You may consider introducing the solver and language that you use for this coursework, whether you know of any functionality that does not (always) work, etc. While this is optional, for the student who may want to include previous research on the timetabling satisfiability literature, novelties, uniqueness and extra constraints should be discussed, elaborated meticulously and highlighted in this subsection.</p> <p>b) Formulations and Alternative Formulations of the problems:</p> <p>For starters, it is advisable to consider all formulations and alternative formulations of problems (full-fledged) covered in all lab sessions. While the mathematical formulation is usually more abstract than the actual implementation, it must be detailed enough to explain how it can be implemented with OR-Tools.</p> <p>Should there is an introduction of new notations, be clear about them.</p> <p>The formulation can be split into several parts: e.g., the part that is unrelated to the constraints and then the formulation for each constraint type. Unless obvious, explain why each formulation is correct/suitable for each constraint type and the selected API functions. Formulations and alternative formulations should be full-fledged while elaborating on each constraint type.</p> <p>c) Alternative Formulation(s) and Alternative Solution(s):</p> <p>Refer to section Assessment Criteria part 3 (b)</p> <p>d) Implementation:</p> <p>This section can explain the steps taken to compile/execute the solver. Also, explain the logic of the work of your solver; specifically, how does it establish if there exist multiple solutions to the problem? Discuss any known bugs. If the implementation is straightforward, this section will likely be concise.</p> <p>e) Evaluation:</p> <p>For each sample instance, report if the solver tackles it correctly.</p> <p>While to be more unique, analysis such as how long it takes to evaluate each sample instance, is recommended. Should there is more performance analysis; then it should be reported in this section. Please elaborate thoroughly in this section.</p>
--	--

	<p>f) Discussions</p> <p>A thorough discussion on the solutions and alternative solutions of the experimental results. Meticulous analysis and comparisons on the solution(s) and alternative solutions are mandatory.</p> <p>g) Conclusion</p> <p>This is the report section for giving a clear summary of the main points of the work, reflecting on its successes and limitations, and briefly discussing how to extend the current works, approaches and evaluations if more time is allocated to complete the coursework.</p> <p>h) References</p> <p>List of references used in the report. While this is optional, it is recommended to apply the APA style of reference citation. See the APA documentation for more details https://apastyle.apa.org/</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The report will be evaluated according to its correctness and quality. The student is encouraged to produce and discuss two or more than two solution approaches and at least two alternative formulations to score extra marks. Formulations and alternative formulations must be full-fledged. ▪ There is no minimum number of words stipulated. <p>Oral Interview (0%)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The interview does not affect the mark; however, it is a compulsory part of the coursework. ▪ Failing to attend the interview will result in a mark of ZERO (0) for the coursework. ▪ The module convener will set a time slot for the interview, and you may pick the preferred time at your convenience. More detail about the slot opening will be issued around the submission deadline. ▪ The interview will take around 8~10 minutes and will be via Microsoft Teams. ▪ During the interview, the agenda involved a demonstration of the solver, followed by Q&A related to the code and report.
<p>Grading Guidelines</p>	<p>Band: 90-100</p> <p>Marks in this range are reserved for a superb all-around performance. Work done in all aspects of the project go beyond even high expectations. The student has shown a thorough understanding of the problem. All expected tasks have been successfully completed, the project shows depth and engagement with research ideas, and everything has been completed to a high standard. The report could form the basis of a publishable conference/workshop paper.</p> <p>Band: 80-89</p> <p>Excellent contributions to all areas of the project. The program and the report exceed expectations; for example, extra functionality is implemented, interesting analysis is performed, et cetera. Exceeded expectations in some areas. Demonstrates knowledge and understanding of the project beyond standard resources covered in the module. A clear appreciation of the project as a whole, its adequacies, limitations and possibilities for future development. The project</p>

	<p>demonstrates insight and depth beyond that usually expected in undergraduate work.</p> <p>Band: 70-79 Very good contributions to all areas of the project. All the requirements are met: the solver performs as expected, and the report adequately reflects the work. Able to reflect accurately on the adequacy and limitations of the project's achievements.</p> <p>Band: 60-69 Good appreciation of background. A good attempt at applying this to the task, with demonstrated ability to cope with difficulties. Good technical skills in several areas. While most of the requirements are met, the solver mainly performs as expected, and the report adequately reflects the work. It might come a little short in some areas—good reflective understanding of the project.</p> <p>Band: 50-59 The core task is met, albeit with minor weaknesses: satisfactory background reading and a competent attempt at their tasks. Reasonable technical competence demonstrated. Able to reflect satisfactorily on the project.</p> <p>Band: 40-49 Pass level. Competent background reading and appreciation of the project area. Basic technological competence. Some core areas are met, but a decent attempt has been made at them, albeit with significant weaknesses. Able to reflect in a limited way on the project.</p> <p>Band: 30-39 Unsatisfactory. Some attempt has been made at the background reading but clearly, only a partial understanding of the project topic. An incomplete attempt at the core tasks. Weak technical competence. Little ability to reflect adequately on the project.</p> <p>Band: 20-29 Inadequate background reading but shows some limited understanding of how ideas can be linked to the task. A minimal attempt at the core tasks, showing poor understanding. A substantial amount of work is still needed to achieve the core tasks. Minimal reflection on the project.</p> <p>Band: 10-19 A minimal attempt at background reading, inappropriate use of material, and almost no attempt at core tasks. Very poor understanding of the problem. Minimal or no reflection on the project.</p> <p>Band: 0-9 No or almost no significant attempt</p>
Remarks	<p>There are no restrictions for using publicly available code and/or formulations (subject to correct referencing); however, grading is still subject to your own contributions. Nevertheless, this should not discourage you from utilizing the advanced techniques from the literature as long as you can demonstrate a sufficient understanding of the relevant scientific literature.</p>

	<p>If in doubt, talk to the module convenor. If you struggle with the implementation, you may still achieve a reasonable mark for the report explaining your solution method.</p>
Academic misconduct	<p>This is an individual assessment that should consist of your own unaided work. While it is good practice to use your own word when explaining something from a primary source, if you are unable to paraphrase the statement, then you should quote the statements and cite the source accordingly.</p> <p>If you are building on someone else's code (e.g. our code from the classes, open-source projects, etc.), please make it clear which aspects of the code are your work through the use of comments. The University has detailed advice about academic integrity, and submissions that demonstrate a lack of that integrity will be treated under appropriate disciplinary procedures. The academic misconduct policy document can be accessed via: https://www.nottingham.ac.uk/qualitymanual/assessment-awards-and-deg-classification/pol-academic-misconduct.aspx</p>