School of Technology

Assessment Brief

Module Code

CIS5015

Module Title

Research and Professional Skills

Academic Year

2023-2024

Semester

Two

Module Leader email

sabrina.guetibi@sist.ac.ma

Content

Assessment Details

Assessment title	Abr.	Weighting	
PRES1 – Project Presentation	PRES1	25%	

Pass marks are 40% for undergraduate work unless stated otherwise.

Task/assessment brief:

Milestone 1: Oral presentation (25%)

The proposal presentation should include the following components:

Title
The title should be brief and convey the meaning of the intended project.

Research Statement
This should state what you propose to study along with the context in which it will be done.

Rationale and research questions / hypotheses
This should describe the background to the topic, the reasons for investigating it and summarise the main thinking found in the literature concerning this topic. Concretely, you should justify why this topic is worth investigating and who will benefit from your research. This should consist of a review of the main recent and relevant documents and published material that relate to the subject being studied. The main objective of this review of literature is to work out a research gap (show why there is a need to investigate your topic). The gap should inform the focus of the study in the form of research questions or hypotheses.

Methodology: Planning, resources, and consideration of ethical implications
This should describe and justify the strategy adopted for the study; case study, action research, … and methods used for collecting data together with justification of these methods. It should also describe how the collected data will be analysed. The reliability and validity of the tools and ways of processing data should be mentioned. Ethical considerations should be raised.

Links to literature and compliance with Harvard referencing
Use the Harvard system throughout. You will need to submit a references list with your PowerPoint presentation and research timetable after your presentation. As a guideline, you can use as many references as you want but not below 10 different sources across a range of books, journals, policy documents, newspapers or professional publications and internet sites.

Oral presentation performance
The slides should be concise and meaningful (avoid bulky slides full of unnecessary details). You should demonstrate your mastery of the topic throughout your delivery which must be fluent and error-free. Revise your grammar and spelling mistakes before submitting your slides and notes.

| Word count (or equivalent): | 15 min or 1000 words equivalent +/-10% |

This a reflection of the effort required for the assessment.

Academic or technical terms explained:

N/A

Submission Details

Submission Deadline:	This will be provided on the Moodle submission point.	**Estimated Feedback Return Date**	This will normally be 20 working days after initial submission.
Submission Time:	Before 4 PM		

Moodle/Turnitin: Any assessments submitted after the deadline will not be marked and will be recorded as a non-attempt unless you have had an extension request agreed or have approved mitigating circumstances. See the School Moodle pages for more information on extensions and mitigating circumstances.

File Format: The assessment must be submitted as a pdf document (save the document as a pdf in your software) and submit through the Turnitin submission point in Moodle.

Your assessment should be titled with your:

student ID number, module code and assessment ID, e.g. st12345678 BHL5007 WRIT1

Feedback Feedback for the assessment will be provided electronically via Moodle. Feedback will be provided with comments on your strengths and the areas which you can improve. View the guidance on how to access your feedback.

All marks are provisional and are subject to quality assurance processes and confirmation at the programme Examination Board.

Assessment Criteria

Learning outcomes assessed

- Critically evaluate current research and scholarship literature within the computing and information systems domain and plan a programme of independent research.
- Propose appropriate research methodologies and design for the collection, analysis and presentation of data to a project specification.

- Reflect on their role within a project team on a real world problem and evaluate their own performance.

Other skills/attributes developed

This includes elements of the Cardiff Met EDGE (Ethical, Digital, Global and Entrepreneurial skills) and other attributes developed in students through the completion of the module and assessment. These will also be highlighted in the module guidance, which should be read by all students completing the module. Assessments are not just a way of auditing student knowledge. They are a process which provides additional learning and development through the preparation for and completion of the assessment.

Marking/Assessment Criteria

Assessment Criteria PRES1

Assessment Objectives		Weighting
A	**Title and research statement** Clear title and informative research statement which provides all details relevant to the study (who, what, where, when, how and why)	20%
B	**Rationale and Research Questions** Background and context of the study, giving clear justification for the study and its value. Relevant, unambiguous and well-structured research questions and / or hypotheses.	30%
C	**Planning, resources and consideration of ethical implications** Evidence of careful planning and identification of resources required to carry out the study. Discussion of the ethical implications of the study and how they will be managed.	30%
D	**Links to literature and compliance with Harvard referencing** Use of literature to support viewpoints and context of the study with careful and consistent use of the Harvard referencing system.	10%
E	**Expression in clear, concise and correct language** Communication skills demonstrated in the oral presentation of material and attention to spelling, accuracy and grammar in the speaker's notes	10%

Marking Scheme

85%+	Demonstrates an exceptional understanding of the learning outcomes. The review showcases profound insights into the questions, addressing complex issues with an unparalleled depth of critical analysis. Establishes a robust foundation of relevant factual knowledge and theoretical issues, showcasing mastery in the subject matter. Addresses all important issues with an extraordinary level of detail, specificity, and systematic exploration. Displays unparalleled creativity, critical analysis, and an extensive range of referenced materials beyond the core subject matter. Exemplifies flawless written or oral communication with no significant omissions or errors. Shows an exceptional level of organization and coherence in presenting arguments and ideas. Reflects an outstanding level of engagement and original thought.
70% - 84%	An excellent assignment. It demonstrates a high level of understanding of the learning outcomes. The review provides evidence of significant understanding of the questions and of the complex issues involved with deep critical analysis. There is a sound basis of relevant factual knowledge and/or theoretical issues included. Most of the important issues as dealt with in a detailed, specific and systematic way. Evidence of creativity, critical analysis and a wide base of referenced material beyond that of the core subject matter are included. No significant omissions or errors in written or oral communication.
60 - 69%	A very good assignment. It demonstrates a reasonably high level of understanding of the learning outcomes. The review provides evidence of a clear understanding of the question and grasp of the complexity of the issues involved. There is a sound basis of relevant factual knowledge and/or theoretical issues involved, with a few significant omissions of errors. The issues involved are dealt with overall in a systematic way. Some of the issues may be limited in critical approach but organised to show a comprehensive understanding.
50 - 59%	A good assignment. It demonstrates a sound understanding of the learning outcomes. The review provides evidence of understanding of the basic issues in the question. There is a basis of factual knowledge and/or relevant theoretical issues. Although some errors and omissions may be apparent, most issues are dealt with clearly and accurately. The majority of issues have been dealt with at a level available through course material. The answer shows planning in its construction, with a clear train of thought or development of argument present. Average competent performance will be presented. Failure to reference adequately will not allow you to enter this band
40 - 49%	A satisfactory assignment. It demonstrates an understanding of the learning outcomes. The review demonstrates limited understanding of the main issues. There is relevant factual knowledge and/or awareness of theoretical issues, however, this may be dealt with in a patchy and/or poor and confused for lower grades. Many significant errors may be present. Lacks clarity of expression. The answer may be poorly planned and with little development of argument. Harvard referencing: you must use at least 6 sources.
FAIL GRADES:	
35 - 39%	An unsatisfactory assignment which demonstrates a lack of understanding of the learning outcomes. A review that fails to demonstrate any appreciable understanding of the basic issues of the question. Relevant factual knowledge and/or factual awareness of theoretical issues, if present at all, are very poor and limited. Many significant errors and omissions are apparent. Much or all of the answer is irrelevant to answering the particular question. Poorly organised.
-35%	Attempts an answer, but relevant factual knowledge and/or awareness of the theoretical issues is very poor. Only superficial points are made. The answer is so short or irrelevant that only a few marks are justified. For example, one or two points made which show only some peripheral awareness of possibly relevant issues.

Further Information

Who can answer questions about my assessment?

Questions about the assessment should be directed to the staff member who has set the task/assessment brief. This will usually be the Module Leader. They will be happy to answer any queries you have.

Staff members can often provide feedback on an assignment plan but cannot review any drafts of your work prior to submission. The only exception to this rule is for Dissertation Supervisors to provide feedback on a draft of your dissertation.

Referencing and independent learning

Please ensure you reference a range of credible sources, with due attention to the academic literature in the area. The time spent on research and reading from good quality sources will be reflected in the quality of your submitted work.

Remember that what you get out of university depends on what you put in. Your teaching sessions typically represent between 10% and 30% of the time you are expected to study for your degree. A 20-credit module represents 200 hours of study time. The rest of your time should be taken up by self-directed study.

Unless stated otherwise you must use the **HARVARD** referencing system. Further guidance on referencing can be found in the Study Smart area on Moodle and at www.citethemrightonline.com (use your university login details to access the site). Correct referencing is an easy way to improve your marks and essential in

achieving higher grades on most assessments.

Technical submission problems

It is strongly advised that you submit your work at least 24 hours before the deadline to allow time to resolve any last minute problems you might have. If you are having issues with IT or Turnitin you should contact the IT Helpdesk on (+44) 2920 417000. You may require evidence of the Helpdesk call if you are trying to demonstrate that a fault with Moodle or Turnitin was the cause of a late submission.

Extensions and mitigating circumstances

Short extensions on assessment deadlines can be requested in specific circumstances. If you are encountering particular hardship which has been affecting your studies, then you may be able to apply for mitigating circumstances. This can give the teachers on your programme more scope to adapt the assessment requirements to support your needs. Extensions and mitigating circumstances policies and procedures are regularly updated. You should refer to your degree programme or school Moodle pages for information on extensions and mitigating circumstances.

Unfair academic practice

Cardiff Met takes issues of unfair practice **extremely seriously.** The University has procedures and penalties for dealing with unfair academic practice. These are explained in full in the University's Unfair Practice regulations and procedures under Volume 1, Section 8 of the Academic Handbook. The Module Leader reserves the

right to interview students regarding any aspect of their work submitted for assessment.

Types of Unfair Practice, include:

Plagiarism, which can be defined as using without acknowledgement another person's words or ideas and submitting them for assessment as though it were one's own work, for instance by copying, translating from one language to another or unacknowledged paraphrasing. Further examples include:

- Use of any quotation(s) from the published or unpublished work of other persons, whether published in textbooks, articles, the Web, or in any other format, where quotations have not been clearly identified as such by being placed in quotation marks and acknowledged.
- Use of another person's words or ideas that have been slightly changed or paraphrased to make it look different from the original.
- Summarising another person's ideas, judgments, diagrams, figures, or computer programmes without reference to that person in the text and the source in a bibliography/reference list.
- Use of assessment writing services, essay banks and/or any other similar agencies (NB. Students are commonly being blackmailed after using essay mills).
- Use of unacknowledged material downloaded from the Internet.

- Re-use of one's own material except as authorised by your degree programme.

Collusion, which can be defined as when work that that has been undertaken with others is submitted and passed off as solely the work of one person. Modules will clearly identify where joint preparation and joint submission are permitted, in all other cases they are not.

Fabrication of data, making false claims to have carried out experiments, observations, interviews or other forms of data collection and analysis, or acting dishonestly in any other way.

How is my work graded?

Assessment grading is subject to thorough quality control processes. You can view a summary of these processes on the Assessment Explained Infographic.

Grading of work at each level of Cardiff Met degree courses is benchmarked against a set of general requirements set out in Volume 1, Section 4.3 of our Academic Handbook. A simplified version of these Grade Band Descriptors (GBDs) with short videos explaining some of the academic terminology used can be accessed via the Facilitation of Learning resource page.

We would strongly recommend looking at the Study Smart area of Moodle to find out more about assessments and key academic skills which can have a significant impact on your grades. Always check your work thoroughly before submission.