

# Research Skills and Professional Issues (M3i323074)

## Coursework One Assessment

### 1. Introduction

Coursework One Assessment includes two parts:

#### A. Tutor assessment

Tutors will give each group a **group\_mark**. This assessment has been broken down into a set of more detailed criteria/questions under each of the basic headings given in the Assessment Criteria table.

#### B. Peer assessment

Each student should complete a “Peer Assessment and Feedback Form” and submit it to the module tutor at the beginning of the group presentation. The peer assessment marks will be used to calculate your individual **contribution\_proportion**.

There are four different marks for contribution:

*3 = Maximum contribution*

*2 = Good contribution*

*1 = Minimum contribution*

*0 = No contribution*

If all the members in a group receive the same mark for their contribution, then all the members will have the same *contribution\_proportion*, which is 100%.

If members in a group have different marks for their contribution, then:

- the member(s) with the highest mark will receive 100% for their *contribution\_proportion*;
- the member(s) with the second highest mark will receive 95% for their *contribution\_proportion*;
- all the other members will receive 90% for their *contribution\_proportion*.

If member(s) are marked as 0 for contribution, then they will receive 0% for their *contribution\_proportion*.

Each group member's individual **final\_mark** is calculated using formula (1) and presented in a table (as listed below):

$$\text{final\_mark} = \text{group\_mark} \times \text{contribution\_proportion} \quad (1)$$

<b>Student Name:</b>	
<b>Student ID:</b>	
<b>Group_Mark (out of 100):</b>	
<b>Contribution_Proportion:</b>	
<b>Final_Mark</b>	

## 2. Assessment Criteria/Guidance Table for Group Paper

<p><b>Group:</b></p> <p><b>Students:</b></p> <p><b>Presentation time:</b></p>	
	<b>Mark</b>
<p><b>Handout and Slides Quality and Content (50%)</b></p> <p>Identification and coverage of key issues in the topic area (10%):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there a short introduction which sets out the objectives, content and structure of the paper?</li> <li>• Does the introduction give the context/reasons within the “wider” computing/design topic/ stress its importance in any way?</li> <li>• Does this introduction give a justification of the content/structure they have decided to take?</li> </ul> <p>Presentation and construction of argument (20%):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the main body of the slides actually follow the structure as set out in its introduction?</li> <li>• Can the handout be “read” as a single coherent “piece” of writing?</li> <li>• Does the presentation seem to cover a reasonable set of issues?</li> <li>• Does the presentation make interesting/informative reading?</li> <li>• Does the presentation follow a reasonable “sequence” and “story line”?</li> <li>• Do the sub-points made in the main report “follow” on from the arguments presented?</li> </ul> <p>Interesting main “angle” presented/reasonable conclusions at the end (10%):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do the handout and slides present any “interesting” angle on the topic?</li> <li>• Is that angle consistent with their specifically chosen title?</li> <li>• Does the report have a separate conclusions section?</li> <li>• Does this section “draw” together the main points which have already been made in the main body?</li> <li>• Is there an explicit “professional perspective” given about the topic and evident in the paper</li> </ul> <p>General format (10%):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there a proper use of supporting references?</li> <li>• Is there an appropriate balance of text and diagrams/tables/pictures?</li> <li>• Is an appropriate format followed throughout?</li> <li>• No grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors?</li> </ul> <p>Comments:</p>	

<p><b>Presentation Quality (Content and Delivery) (25%)</b></p> <p>Physical Delivery (10%):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Speaks in confident manner?</li> <li>• Did the presentation seem stilted?</li> <li>• Was there good "eye contact"/ "body language"?</li> <li>• Speaks / Refers to slides?</li> <li>• Did the presentation stay within the strict time boundaries?</li> </ul> <p>Content of talk (15%):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Had a clear beginning, middle and end?</li> <li>• Presentation had a clear “story line”/sequence?</li> <li>• Identified aims/outline of talk structure at the start?</li> <li>• Covered all presentation aims by the end?</li> <li>• Did the presenter seem "knowledgeable" in relation to the topic being presented?</li> <li>• Did the presenter demonstrate any "wider" appreciation/context of the topic area?</li> </ul> <p>Comments:</p>	
<p><b>Questions and Answers (Subject Awareness) (25%)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were the answers given confidently?</li> <li>• Were the answers given with accompanying justification/reasoning?</li> <li>• Did the answers demonstrate underlying understanding of topic?</li> <li>• Did any answers suggest critical analysis of the topic?</li> <li>• Were the answers consistent with the material in the handout/slides?</li> </ul> <p>Comments:</p>	
<p style="text-align: right;"><b>Group_mark:</b></p>	

### 3. Peer Assessment

#### Peer Assessment and Feedback Form

Name:
Group:

Please give each group member, ***including yourself***, a mark out of 3 for contribution. Contribution should take account of attitude, attendance and work delivered.

*3 = Maximum contribution*

*2 = Good contribution*

*1 = Minimum contribution*

*0 = No contribution*

Student Group member	Mark

#### Feedback:

*Please use this space to provide any comment to support your peer marking or to provide feedback on your experience of this project.*