The MSc Project

What does it involve?

- A significant piece of independent work
  - 100% of the CSPM40 module; 60 credits of your MSc
- Supervised by expert researchers
  - Supervisory team – domain experts; stakeholders
- Close fit with the themes of the CDT
  - Challenging real-world contexts
  - Human-centred
  - Responsible innovation

Deadlines

- Dissertation submission
  - 11am, 30th September 2021
- Project showcase
  - Presentation to the group, supervisors, stakeholders and others
  - Mid-October 2021

Supervision

- Typically at least one meeting per fortnight
  - Varies per team, but not normally less than this
  - Speak to your supervisor regularly
- All supervisors come to each meeting
- Stakeholders will attend as much as possible

Marking scheme

- Marked by one supervisor and one non-supervisory expert
  - Allocations to be confirmed closer to the deadline
  - Marking scheme: people-first.best/msc-marking-scheme
- Reviewed and monitored by an external examiner

	0-24%	25-49%	50–59% (Pass)	60–69% (Merit)	70–100% (Distinction)
Human-Centred	No evidence of human-centred work	Limited engagement with human-centred theme, but primarily driven by technology.	Clear evidence that the project has been led by human needs in collaboration with the external stakeholder.	A people-first approach throughout that starts with challenging contexts and addresses clear and challenging human needs.	Project is entirely underpinned by innovations that prioritise human values, experience and capabilities.
Responsible Innovation	No evidence of responsible innovation. Negligible work completed.	Minimal innovation and engagement, but primarily recycling existing work.	Some evidence of innovation, with limited evidence of understanding around responsible innovation.	Good project demonstrating original work. Ethically sound, engaging with core responsible innovation themes.	Substantial work completed, with clear evidence of original thinking contributing to final project. Clear evidence of responsible innovation throughout.
Design and Planning	Project area not clearly defined. Little to no analysis of problem / design.	Inadequate planning. Minimal evidence of design decisions.	Sensible design and plan with some evidence of alternatives considered.	Clear introduction / definition of project. Evidence of coherent planning strategy with design alternatives considered.	Excellent understanding of the problem and context. Clear design and specification. Detailed analysis / methodical design
Background / Literature Review	Virtually no evidence of understanding of relevant background. Inadequate review of literature. No evaluation of previous work	Inadequate grasp of relevant background. Limited review of relevant literature with basic critical evaluation of material reviewed.	Adequate grasp of relevant background and review of literature. Some evaluation of material reviewed.	Good understanding of background. Comprehensive literature review, critically evaluated in a sensible and coherent way, but with some identifiable omissions.	In-depth understanding of background and ability to apply it in a constructive fashion. Extensive independent research. Familiarity with all relevant literature. Thorough critical evaluation of previous work.
Technical Competence / Implementation	Evidence of some development work, but minimal progress.	Little more than a basic combination of existing results or software. Development clearly incomplete.	Design and development of a relatively straightforward project, involving some creativity from the student. Deliverables may not be sufficiently complete to use, or with fairly obvious flaws rendering them unfit for use.	A substantial, solid and convincing project, which works and shows a clear level of competence and some level of creativity, but with some obvious identifiable ways in which it could be improved. There may be some questionable design decisions or clear weaknesses.	An impressive, substantial project which could be the core of a publication. Considerable creativity, independence, and originality went into this project: the result is impressive. Full awareness of the research context and relation to similar projects.
Evaluation	Little to no valid evaluation of work done. Poor focus / shallow conclusion	Limited, basic evaluation.	Adequate evaluation against minimal obvious criteria.	Thorough evaluation against a range of clear criteria.	Rigorous critical evaluation. Clear, insightful conclusions.
Documentation	Poorly organised dissertation. Inadequate style / grammar. Poor referencing / tables / figures.	Inadequate presentation of work done with obvious expected material omitted. Barely reproduces existing literature.	Diligent presentation of work done with few flaws, but lacking in critical appreciation of the subject.	Well organised report with a high standard of grammar, referencing, etc. Relevant, clearly presented, valid material. A highly satisfactory piece of work, but some identifiable unfulfilled potential.	Dissertation written to a professional standard which could lead to a publishable conference or journal paper with appropriate editing and minor revisions.

Essential elements

- Human-Centred
- Responsible Innovation
- Background research; literature review
- Design, planning, implementation and evaluation
- Writeup

Support

- Your supervisory team
  - These should now be updated on your intranet record – please check
- The CDT team
  - You know who we are! (people-first.best/team)
- Canvas module CSPM40
  - Check that you have access (from tomorrow)
- University resources and training
  - myuni.swansea.ac.uk/academic-success

Resources

- **Computational Foundry**
  - Workspaces, labs, public areas (e.g., Crucible, meeting rooms)
- **Examples and templates**
  - Projects from last year: people-first.best/msc-projects
  - Document template: people-first.best/thesis-template
- **Libraries (both campuses)**
  - Study spaces; physical and digital resources