

Assessment Specification

Module Details

Module Code	UFCF9Y-60-M
Module Title	CSCT Masters Project
Module Leader	Dr Rachel Long
Year	2024-25
Module Run	24Jan/1
Task	Artefact and Report
Total number of assessments for this module	3
Weighting	40%

Dates

Date issued to students	13 February 2025
Submission date	8 January 2026
Submission place	Via Blackboard
Submission time	14:00:00 (UK time)
Date to be returned to students	13 February 2026

Feedback

Feedback provision will be	Formative feedback prior to submission will be provided by the supervisor. Written feedback on the final submission from two markers will be collated and emailed following the marking period. This will usually be within 6 weeks of submission.
-----------------------------------	--

Contents

Module Details.....	1
Dates.....	1
Feedback	1
Contents	2
Section 1: Overview of Assessment.....	3
Section 2: Task Specification	4
Section 3: Deliverables.....	4
Section 4: Marking Criteria	5
Section 5: Feedback mechanisms.....	6
Section 6: Appendices	6
6.1 Completing your assessment.....	6
6.2 Assessment Content.....	6
6.3 Assessment Offences.....	7
6.4 Use of Generative AI (ChatGPT or similar).....	7
6.5 Guidance on Referencing:	8

Section 1: Overview of Assessment

This assignment assesses the following module learning outcomes:

- MO1 Identify a research problem and scope research to suitably investigate it
- MO2 Synthesise and critically evaluate recent research having a direct bearing on the problem space
- MO3 Design and implement a technology solution or practical/analytical investigation to a high standard, with aspects of novelty and personal innovation.
- MO4 Select and apply appropriate and contemporary best-of-breed tools, techniques and theoretical models
- MO5 Critically and reflexively evaluate the outcome and personal performance to standards of research quality (validity, reliability) and professional competence.
- MO6 Embody an ethical approach to research conduct in a specialist area in computer science
- MO7 Communicate research outcomes and learning effectively to specialist and non-specialist audiences

The assignment is worth **40%** of the overall mark for the module.

Broadly speaking, the assignment requires you to create an artefact, and then submit a report which describes the process of creating and evaluating your artefact.

The assignment is described in more detail in section 2.

This is an individual assignment.

Working on this assignment will help you to apply the learning from your MSc programme by creating an artefact which addresses a research question, and then communicating the reasoning behind the choices you made while creating your artefact, your evaluation of the success of your artefact, and the results of your research. You will demonstrate your understanding of research methods, including critical analysis of existing literature to inform your decision-making. You will also strengthen your understanding of ethical issues in your research area.

If you have questions about this assignment, please post them to the discussion board "**FAQs: Assessments**" on Blackboard. This can be found under the **Assessment** tab.

Section 2: Task Specification

You are required to create an artefact in order to answer your research question. Your artefact could be a piece of software, a user interface, an app, a system, a framework, a model, a visualisation, a data model/pipeline, an analysis, an optimisation of an algorithm or protocol, an aggregator or dashboard, a detailed interactive prototype or the automation of a complex task.

Note that this list is not exhaustive – you may decide to create something else. However, the two most important aspects are

- 1) It should be informed by research (academic, technical, user - based)
- 2) There should be an appropriate evaluation (model accuracy & performance, benchmarking/software tests, heuristic, stakeholder feedback etc).

Once you have created your artefact, you will write a report to communicate the problem domain, research and findings to an academic audience. Your report will summarise the project, and should be 5,000-6,000 words in length (Note: abstract, references and appendices, if any, do not count towards the overall limit). See university word count policy <http://www1.uwe.ac.uk/aboutus/policies.aspx>.

Report structure guidance will be provided on Blackboard.

Section 3: Deliverables

Item	Detail	Date & Submission Mechanism
Artefact	You should provide a link to your code repository or artefact when submitting your report. You should add the link to your code repository or artefact in the "Comments" section of the report submission.	8 January 2026, 14:00:00 UK time, via Blackboard
Report	You should submit your report in either Word or .pdf format. You should use the naming convention <student number> report.docx <student number> report.pdf where <student number> is replaced by your student number. For example, if your student number is 12345678, and you are submitting a .pdf file, your file should be saved with the title 12345678 report.pdf.	8 January 2026, 14:00:00 UK time, via Blackboard

Section 4: Marking Criteria

Criterion	Marks	Poor/Fail (<50)	Good (50-59)	Very Good / Merit (60-69)	Excellent / Distinction (70+)
Rationale, Scope and Objectives	5	Lacking clear purpose or rationale; very vague or unrealistic in scope. Aims and objectives not addressed.	Mostly clear though a little vague/general, with some explanation as to relevance. Bounding and scope not fully stated.	Clear and mostly SMART; context and importance quite well justified. Scope and aims largely addressed.	Very clear, SMART and research-based; convincing rationale. Well addressed aims and objectives.
Novelty and Innovation	10	Lacking novelty / poorly executed version of similar work / Project is trivial, dated or uses outdated techniques. Little demonstration of problem-solving skills.	Derivative or rather uninteresting; lacking personal creativity / some demonstration of importance of work. Techniques used are appropriate but unimaginative. Demonstration of problem-solving skills are sound but limited.	Some innovation; Largely safe, conventional but solid approach / Project is relevant, up to date and using current techniques / Good demonstration of problem solving skills.	Highly innovative / creative. Substantial personal interpretation of the material and methods. Project is relevant, up to date and using current techniques / Excellent demonstration of problem-solving skills.
Literature Review and Academic Content	20	Irrelevant material; Minimal, low level, perhaps entirely reliant on internet sources	Some less relevant or basic / outdated material; Lack of / Some sound academic content but unchallenging/ not fully understood	largely relevant work cited, largely descriptive / uncritically treated; Very good breadth and depth of academic content, understood & applied	Relevant, state-of-the-art literature understood and critically reviewed; Exceptional breadth & depth of academic content, understood & applied
Design and Approach & User requirements	15	Poorly chosen / flawed approach; not relevant/poor match to stated objectives / No consideration of user needs	Some structure to approach though perhaps lacking formal aspects /cursory consideration of user needs	Good attempt to use methodologies; theoretical interpretation / Good understanding of user needs	Clear use of theory and appropriate process methodologies (e.g. test-driven design / reproducibility / model validation); highly suited to research objectives / Extensive, evidence-based user needs assessment
Implementation	15	Artefact not working / insufficiently documented or available to enable testing by markers	Some issues of implementation / errors; Not all objectives met	Artefacts largely working and error-free; most objectives met	Interface or analytical outputs clear, sophisticated and error free; objectives fully met or surpassed
Ethical Consideration and Approach	10	Lack of concern or coverage of ethical aspects of the project	Ethical treatment present but limited	Consideration of ethical aspects though perhaps disconnected from process or implementation	Clear and well-informed consideration of ethical issues with demonstrated impact on project approach and outputs
Evaluation and Reflection, evidence of planning and management	15	Lack of evaluation or reflective commentary, little or no use of supervision evidenced.	Some evaluation and reflection but relatively weak, superficial or biased. Poor or incomplete records and large periods without supervisor input is evidenced.	Some evaluation but lacking structure; reflection good if lacking depth. Very good use of supervision and feedback; records available and evidence supplied.	Structured, rigorous evaluation; Deep and honest reflection. Excellent use made of feedback and supervision meetings; clear records kept and evidence supplied.
Presentation, Organisation, Documentation & Attribution	10	Very poorly organised and hard to understand; Spelling or grammatical errors; Code not documented /uncommented or of unclear origin	Some organisation and typological issues; Some lack of clarity in code presentation or attribution	largely well organised and easy to follow; minor presentation issues; occasional code presentation issues	Logical layout of sections and narrative; Grammar and spelling correct; Accurate and complete referencing; Clear commenting of own code; Clear attribution of others' code

Section 5: Feedback mechanisms

You will receive regular formative verbal feedback on your artefact and report from your supervisor throughout the project. Your supervisor will not read your whole report draft. You will need to negotiate with your supervisor what they will read, and when they would like to see it. Normally a supervisor will only read a small proportion of your work, and comment on it. They will not correct your work. The cut-off date for reading drafts is 2 weeks before the main sit submission date.

Following the final submission, the feedback from your two markers will be collated and emailed to you.

Section 6: Appendices

6.1 Completing your assessment

Where should I start?

Your supervisor will guide you through the process of creating your artefact and writing your report. Information to help you will also be provided on Blackboard.

What do I need to do to pass?

To pass the artefact and report, you will need to create an artefact which addresses your research question, and then write a report which documents your design approach, implementation and evaluation of your artefact. You should present the ethical considerations of your project and artefact, together with evidence of your planning and management of the project. Please refer to the criteria listed in Section 4: Marking Criteria. In order to pass this assessment, you will need to gain a mark of 50% or more.

How do I achieve high marks in this assessment?

To achieve high marks across all criteria, your work should be detailed, thoughtful, and consistently demonstrate a deep understanding of your project's objectives and methodologies. Please refer to the criteria listed in Section 4: Marking Criteria.

How does the learning and teaching relate to the assessment?

You can discuss the artefact and report with your supervisor prior to the final submission deadline.

What additional resources may help me complete this assessment?

Please refer to the materials on Blackboard regarding the artefact and report. The FAQs: Artefact and Report discussion board can be used if you have questions about the proposal. Your supervisor will also be able to provide ongoing feedback on your artefact and report prior to the final submission deadline. You may also find the library resources on academic writing useful. Please see

<https://www.uwe.ac.uk/study/study-support/study-skills>

What do I do if I am concerned about completing this assessment?

UWE Bristol offer a range of Assessment Support Options that you can explore through [this link](#), and both [Academic Support](#) and [Wellbeing Support](#) are available.

For further information, please see the [Academic Survival Guide](#).

6.2 Assessment Content

In line with UWE Bristol's [Assessment Content Limit Policy](#) (formerly the Word Count Policy), word count includes all text, including (but not limited to): the main body of text (including headings), all citations (both in and out of brackets), text boxes, tables and graphs, figures and diagrams, quotes, lists.

6.3 Assessment Offences

How do I avoid an Assessment Offence on this module? ²

Use the support above if you feel unable to submit your own work for this module.

The most common forms of Assessment Offences for this assessment are plagiarism (in the report and in submitted code) and falsification of references.

UWE Bristol's [UWE's Assessment Offences Policy](#) requires that you submit work that is entirely your own and reflects your own learning. It is important to:

Ensure that you reference all sources used, using the [UWE Harvard](#) system. Use the guidance available on [UWE's Study Skills referencing pages](#).

Avoid copying and pasting any work into this assessment, including your own previous assessments, work from other students or internet sources

Develop your own style, arguments and wording. Avoid copying and changing individual words but keeping essentially the same sentences and/or structures from other sources

Never give your work to others who may copy it

If you are doing an individual assessment, develop your own work and preparation. Do not allow anyone to make amendments to your work (including proof-readers, who may highlight issues but not edit the work).

When submitting your work, you will be required to confirm that the work is your own. Text-matching software and other methods are routinely used to check submissions against other submissions to the university and internet sources. Details of what constitutes plagiarism and how to avoid it can be found on UWE's Study Skills [pages about avoiding plagiarism](#).

6.4 Use of Generative AI (ChatGPT or similar)

Generative AI may be used to ensure that your report is clear. Suggested prompts are:

""What would a logical structure look like for a report on..."

"Have I written the following objectives in a SMART way?"

The AI will then prompt you to enter your objectives, and will make suggestions about the wording you have used.

"Suggest ways to make this paragraph flow better: [paste paragraph]."

"Can you help me summarize my research methodology in a concise way?"

"How can I make this explanation clearer for readers who may not be experts in..."

"Could you help me verify if my report covers all elements of a thorough evaluation and reflection section?"

You should not copy and paste directly from the response given by the AI. Be particularly careful around referencing, as AI tools will frequently provide references to articles which do not exist. Submitting a report with false references would constitute an Assessment Offence.

	You can use Generative AI in this assignment as suggested above.
---	--

[Using generative AI at UWE Bristol - Study skills | UWE Bristol](#)
(includes information on referencing AI tools)

6.5 Guidance on Referencing:

Please note that the aim of referencing is to demonstrate you have read and understood a range of sources to evidence your key points. You need to list the references consistently and in such a way as to ensure the reader can follow up on the sources for themselves. For this module, you are required to use the UWE Harvard referencing style. Your report will be assessed against the criteria shown in Section 4: Marking Criteria, including the referencing style.

[Referencing - Study skills | UWE Bristol](#)