

CMM500 Assessment Brief

Academic Year	22-23
Semester	2
Module Number	CMM500
Module Title	MSc Project
Assessment Method	Coursework
Deadline (time and date)	<p>Once a week, by 16:00 each Friday – progress report.</p> <p>16 February 2023 @ 16:00 Project description</p> <p>16 February 2023 @ 16:00 Ethics form.</p> <p>25 April 2023 @ 16:00 Recorded presentation and demo.</p> <p>25 April 2023 @ 16:00 Project report</p> <p>25 April 2023 @ 16:00 Additional materials. This is project-dependent e.g. code, questionnaire result, etc.</p> <p>By 28 April 2023 Q&A session (to be arranged by the student). The recorded presentation must have been submitted at least 24 hours before the Q&A session takes place.</p>
Submission	Assessment Dropbox in the Module Study Area in CampusMoodle
Word Limit (see Assessment Word Limit Statement)	Project report deliverable: 12000 words excluding cover page, table of content, references, appendices, code and results.
Module Co-ordinator	Ines Arana

What knowledge and/or skills will I develop by undertaking the assessment?

You will gain the knowledge and skills required to undertake an IT, computing, cyber security or data science project from critical review of the literature, to the development of a solution to the problem.

What knowledge and/or skills will I develop by undertaking the assessment?

On successful completion of the assessment students will be able to achieve the following Learning Outcomes:

1. Analyse the problem and conduct a critical review of relevant literature.
2. Prepare a well justified and detailed project specification and project plan, including use of resources with consideration of legal, ethical, social and professional issues as well as risks to the project.
3. Critically appraise alternative solutions to the problem and develop, test and critically evaluate a well-justified solution to the problem. The solution should include a substantial practical application of technical skills.
4. Using written, graphical and oral communication, report on and demonstrate the main aspects of the project in an effective and professional manner.

Please also refer to the Module Descriptor, available from the module Moodle study area.

What is expected of me in this assessment?

Task(s) - content

You are expected to: demonstrate the knowledge and practical skills required to undertake a substantial security project.

You will undertake FOUR tasks as follows:

- **Task 1** – propose a project and undertake a review of the legal, ethical, social and professional issues pertaining the proposed project as well as the risks to the project.
- **Task 2** – undertake a critical review of the literature.
- **Task 3** – develop a solution to the problem at hand and critically evaluate this solution.
- **Task 4** –communicate key aspects of your project both orally and in written form.

Task(s) - format

You should submit the following deliverables to the appropriate dropbox on CampusMoodle by the deadline (see front page):

1. Progress report – once a week using the template provided.
2. Project description and ethical review documents, using the templates available on CampusMoodle.
3. Recorded presentation and demonstration.
4. Project report.
5. Additional materials (e.g. code).

What is expected of me in this assessment?

In addition, you should arrange for a Q&A session to take place between yourself, your supervisor and your second marker (see front page for dates).

How will I be graded?

A grade will be provided for each criterion on the feedback grid which is specific to the assessment. The overall grade for the assessment will be calculated using the algorithm below. At the end of the module, you will have received separate subgrades which will be combined as follows.

A	At least 50% of the subgrades to be at Grade A, at least 75% of the subgrades to be at Grade B or better, and normally 100% of the subgrades to be at Grade C or better.
B	At least 75% of the subgrades to be at Grade B or better, and normally 100% of the subgrades to be at Grade C or better.
C	At least 50% of the subgrades to be at Grade C or better, at least 75% of the subgrades to be at Grade D or better. Criterion 7 "Q&A" at grade D or better.
D	At least 50% of the subgrades to be at Grade D or better, at least 75% of the subgrades to be at Grade E or better. Criterion 7 "Q&A" at grade D or better.
E	At least 50% of the subgrades to be at Grade E or better.
F	Failing to achieve at least 50% of subgrades at Grade E or better.
NS	Non-submission.

Grading grid

GRADE	A	B	C	D	E	F
DEFINITION / CRITERIA (WEIGHTING)	EXCELLENT Outstanding Performance	COMMENDABLE/VERY GOOD Meritorious Performance	GOOD Highly Competent Performance	SATISFACTORY Competent Performance	BORDERLINE FAIL	UNSATISFACTORY Fail
CRITERION 1 Background and literature review (20%)	Excellent project motivation and background to the problem to be addressed. Thorough critical and succinct appraisal of the literature covering all the relevant topics at an appropriate level of detail.	Very good project motivation and background to the problem to be addressed. There is a critical appraisal of the literature which covers most relevant topics at an appropriate level of detail with some small deficiencies in the topic coverage and/or the level of critical appraisal.	Good project motivation and background to the problem to be addressed. There is a review of relevant literature which includes a good critical appraisal of most relevant topics. A small number of relevant topics may be covered in a descriptive manner, with a lack of synthesis.	The project motivation and problem to be addressed are mostly clear although they may lack detail. The literature review covers most topics but it is mainly descriptive, but there is demonstration of critical skills for at least one key topic.	The project motivation is and /or the problem to be addressed are unclear. The literature review is substantially incomplete and there is little demonstration of critical skills.	Little effort.
CRITERION 2 Problem analysis, requirements specification and methodology (10%)	Clear and complete statement of objectives, and an excellent logical specification of functional and non-functional requirements where appropriate. Complete and critical discussion of alternative methodologies with well-justified choice.	Clear and (almost) complete statement of objectives, and a very good, logical specification of functional and non-functional requirements which may contain some minor deficiencies. Very good critical discussion of alternative methodologies which may be incomplete. Well-justified choice of methodology.	Clear and mostly complete statement of objectives, including a good specification of functional and non-functional requirements which not be entirely complete and may contain some deficiencies. The discussion of alternative methodologies may be incomplete and lack critical appraisal. Some justification for the choice of methodology.	Reasonable statement of objectives, and a satisfactory specification of functional and non-functional requirements which may be incomplete. The discussion of alternative methodologies is very limited. Little justification for the choice of methodology.	The statement of objectives is unclear and the specification of functional and non-functional requirements contains numerous errors and/or omissions. No discussion of alternative methodologies or discussion contains numerous errors.	Little effort
						Little effort.

GRADE	A	B	C	D	E	F
DEFINITION / CRITERIA (WEIGHTING)	EXCELLENT Outstanding Performance	COMMENDABLE/VERY GOOD Meritorious Performance	GOOD Highly Competent Performance	SATISFACTORY Competent Performance	BORDERLINE FAIL	UNSATISFACTORY Fail
CRITERION 3 Design, implementation testing and achievement (30%)	Accomplished design and implementation of a solution to the problem at hand as evidenced by a concise and professionally presented overview of design and implementation of the solution, together with the quality of the demonstrated solution/artifact. The solution is sophisticated with wide scope. Evidence of thorough testing. Professional coding.	Very good design and implementation of a solution to the problem at hand as evidenced by a concise and very well presented overview of design and implementation of the solution, together with the quality of the demonstrated solution/artifact. The solution is commendable with wide scope. There may be a few minor errors regarding functionality. Evidence of very good testing with some omissions. Very high quality coding.	Good design and implementation of a solution to the problem at hand as evidenced by a well presented overview of design and implementation of the solution, together with the quality of the demonstrated solution/artifact. The solution is highly competent with some design deficiencies or limited scope. The main functionality is mainly correct but some of functionality may not work or may be missing. Evidence of good testing with some omissions. High quality coding.	Satisfactory design and implementation of a solution to the problem at hand as evidenced by a satisfactorily presented overview of design and implementation of the solution, together with the quality of the demonstrated solution/artifact. The solution is competent but its design may be deficient and its scope is very limited. Some design and / or implementation details may be missing. Some key functionality has been achieved but other functionality contains errors and/or is missing. Evidence of adequate testing with some errors and/or omissions. Satisfactory coding.	Substantially incomplete and/or incorrect design. The implementation of a solution to the problem at hand contains numerous errors with little evidence of competency in the required technical skills. Little or no evidence of adequate testing.	
CRITERION 4 Evaluation and future work (10%)	Excellent critical, thorough and insightful evaluation of the work. Clear, well-justified proposals for future work which demonstrate exceptional depth and breath of understanding of both the work undertaken and its impact.	Very good critical, evaluation of the work. Clear, well-justified proposals for future work.	Good evaluation of the work with some demonstration of critical skills. The evaluation may be incomplete and/or lack depth.	Shallow evaluation of the work which may be incomplete.	Little evaluation of the work.	Little effort.

GRADE	A	B	C	D	E	F
DEFINITION / CRITERIA (WEIGHTING)	EXCELLENT Outstanding Performance	COMMENDABLE/VERY GOOD Meritorious Performance	GOOD Highly Competent Performance	SATISFACTORY Competent Performance	BORDERLINE FAIL	UNSATISFACTORY Fail
CRITERION 5 Professional conduct, LESP and risks (10%)	Professional conduct with extensive demonstration of independent thinking, critical skills and consistent progress (evidenced by the progress reports). Excellent consideration of all relevant legal, ethical, social, and professional issues as well project risks. Accomplished demonstration of knowledge and understanding of key LESP rules and guidelines related to the project which include the scenario of the project being commercial.	Commendable consideration of all relevant legal, ethical, social, and professional issues as well project risks. Very good demonstration of knowledge and understanding of key LESP rules and guidelines related to the project which include the scenario of the project being commercial.	Good consideration of all relevant legal, ethical, social, and professional issues as well project risks with minor deficiencies.	Satisfactory consideration of relevant legal, ethical, social, and professional issues as well project risks.	Little or substantially deficient consideration of legal, ethical, social, and professional issues as well project risks.	Little effort.
CRITERION 6 Report presentation, oral presentation and demonstration (10%)	Report presentation: professional quality of presentation. Logical, clear development of narrative. Excellent report structure. Informative abstract. The word limit is respected. All sources of information are appropriately acknowledged (citations and references). Figures and tables are of the right size, are appropriately positioned, contain appropriate numbering and caption and are cited within the text.	Like grade A but falling a little short in at most 2 respects. Report presentation: very good quality of presentation. The narrative is almost always logical, with clear development. Very good report structure. Informative abstract. The word limit is respected. All sources of information are appropriately acknowledged (citations and references) with a few minor deficiencies. Figures and tables are of the right size, are appropriately positioned, contain appropriate numbering	Like grade A but falling a little short in several respects and possibly falling significantly short in one respect. Report presentation: good quality of presentation. Generally logical, clear development of narrative. Good report structure. Informative abstract with some deficiencies. The word limit is respected. Sources of information are acknowledged (citations and references) with some	Adequate quality of presentation. Report at least coherent. Sources are acknowledged although citations and references may not be entirely satisfactory. The oral presentation is mostly coherent. At least a basic demonstration has been accomplished.	The report contains substantial flaws. The oral presentation is difficult to follow or too simplistic.	Little effort.

GRADE	A	B	C	D	E	F
DEFINITION / CRITERIA (WEIGHTING)	EXCELLENT Outstanding Performance	COMMENDABLE/VERY GOOD Meritorious Performance	GOOD Highly Competent Performance	SATISFACTORY Competent Performance	BORDERLINE FAIL	UNSATISFACTORY Fail
	Consistent numbering, font type and size used for headings, subheadings, etc Oral presentation: excellent presentation with logical, clear development of narrative and good time-keeping. Demonstration: excellent demonstration of the accomplished solution with good time keeping.	and caption and are cited within the text, although they may be a few with minor deficiencies. Consistent numbering, font type and size used for headings, subheadings, etc Oral presentation: very good presentation with logical, clear development of narrative and good time-keeping. Demonstration: very good demonstration of the accomplished solution with good time keeping.	deficiencies. Most figures and tables are of the right size, are appropriately positioned, contain appropriate numbering and caption and are cited within the text, although a few may have major deficiencies. Consistent numbering, font type and size used for headings, subheadings, etc Oral presentation: good presentation with logical, clear development of narrative and good time-keeping. Demonstration: good demonstration of the accomplished solution with good time keeping.			
CRITERION 7 Q&A (10%)	Excellent, confident answers to questions, demonstrating extensive depth of understanding. Professional response to alternative ideas. Insightful.	Very good answers to most questions, demonstrating commendable understanding of the project with some minor deficiencies. Very good response to alternative ideas.	Good answers to most questions with some deficiencies.	Satisfactory responses to most questions.	Responses to questions often poor with little demonstration of understanding.	Little effort.

Coursework received late, without valid reason, will be regarded as a non-submission (NS) and one of your assessment opportunities will be lost.

What else is important to my assessment?

What is plagiarism?

"Plagiarism is the practice of presenting the thoughts, writings or other output of another or others as original, without acknowledgement of their source(s) at the point of their use in the student's work. All materials including text, data, diagrams or other illustrations used to support a piece of work, whether from a printed publication or from electronic media, should be appropriately identified and referenced and should not normally be copied directly unless as an acknowledged quotation. Text, opinions or ideas translated into the words of the individual student should in all cases acknowledge the original source" ([RGU 2022](#)).

What is collusion?

"Collusion is defined as two or more people working together with the intention of deceiving another. Within the academic environment this can occur when students work with others on an assignment, or part of an assignment, that is intended to be completed separately" ([RGU 2022](#)).

For further information please see [Academic Integrity](#).

What is the Assessment Word Limit Statement?

It is important that you adhere to the Word Limit specified above. The Assessment Word Limit Statement lists what is included and excluded from the word count, along with the penalty for exceeding the upper limit.

What if I'm unable to submit?

- The University operates a [Fit to Sit Policy](#) which means that if you undertake an assessment then you are declaring yourself well enough to do so.
- If you require an extension, you should complete and submit a [Coursework Extension Form](#). This form is available on the RGU [Student and Applicant Forms](#) page.
- Further support is available from your Course Leader.

What additional support is available?

- [RGU Study Skills](#) provide advice and guidance on academic writing, study skills, maths and statistics and basic IT.
- [RGU Library guidance on referencing and citing](#).
- [The Inclusion Centre: Disability & Dyslexia](#).
- Your Module Coordinator, Course Leader and designated Personal Tutor can also provide support.

What else is important to my assessment?

What are the University rules on assessment?

The University Regulation '[A4: Assessment and Recommendations of Assessment Boards](#)' sets out important information about assessment and how it is conducted across the University.