



Prifysgol Cymru
Y Drindod Dewi Sant
University of Wales
Trinity Saint David

Swansea
College of Art
Founded 1853

BA (HONS) MUSIC (PERFORMANCE & PRODUCTION)

MAJOR PROJECT HANDBOOK 2018-2019

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

The guidance notes presented here are applicable to the Major Project modules present in the final year of the BA (Hons) Music (Performance and Production) offered by the Faculty of Art and Design.

Students should note that the general aims of project work are:

- To develop skills in innovation and creativity;
- To develop self-reliance;
- To develop investigative ability.
- To demonstrate the skills and knowledge acquired during the course of study.

The quality of innovation, creativity, self-reliance and investigative ability that is displayed will always contribute significantly to the final degree classification awarded to the student.

CHOOSING A MAJOR PROJECT

Generating an idea for a Major Project is probably one of the most difficult exercises you will have to undertake. In this Faculty the view is held that ownership of the project rests with the student. This means that it is the student's responsibility to generate an idea for a project and to see it through to completion. This is one way in which self-reliance is engendered. Here are some possible ways in which a project idea may be generated:

- Think of your personal interests and see if there are any technical or design problems within the field of interest, which need to be solved.
- Talk to specialists who may be willing to share ideas. For example – project supervision staff, industrialists, business people, specialist organisations or professional bodies.
- Read magazines and technical journals concerned with your interests.
- Look out for trends in technological developments.
- Find out about current research in the Faculty, the Institute, and other academic institutions.
- Use the Internet (but use it with care).
- Consider using a market survey to identify a problem.
- Consider alternative approaches to established ideas and/or technology.

As you can see, you don't have to be alone to generate an idea. Self-reliance will determine which method you choose.

PROJECT SUPERVISION

Major Projects on the programme are monitored by a team of supervisors. A team typically consists of at least two members, each of whom has recognised expertise in facets of the course and a general knowledge of its educational requirements. Each student has access to *all* members of the supervision team for his/her project. There are set timetabled hours in the week when team members are available for consultation. If you wish to see a member of the team, you should do so by appointment. You would normally see a team member on a scheduled and regular basis, but it is strongly advisable that you discuss your project with all members involved at some point and that you do not leave excessively long gaps between seeing anyone at all so that progress can be monitored and any issues picked up in good time.

PROJECT ASSESSMENT

Major Projects are assessed in clearly delineated stages throughout the academic year. The supervision team is responsible for assessment. This means that each student will be required to formally present his/her work to the supervision team at each stage.

The presentation itself is 40 minutes in duration. On average the student will talk for twenty minutes, questioning and answer will take place for ten minutes, and then the student will leave to allow the supervision team to make an assessment for the final ten. Students should be aware that the External Examiner *always* independently verifies the grading of Major Projects and so any disagreements can formally be settled at this later stage. On a cautionary note, because all of the assessment stages count towards the final project grade, student absence at any stage must have a serious cause. For example, illness can be a serious cause, but it must be covered by a doctor's certificate. Some proof of the reason for absence must be given. Think of it in the same way as you would attending a formal examination.

As has been noted in the introduction, the fundamental qualities that are being assessed are innovation, creativity, self-reliance and investigative ability. These qualities manifest themselves in different ways for different subject areas. Therefore, the following sections cover the specific requirements and assessment criteria for the stages in each programme, and the maximum marks allocated for each stage of assessment.

MAJOR PROJECT ASSESSMENT SCHEDULE

Stage 1: End term 1	Stage 2: End term 2	Stage 3: Mid-term 3	
"Pitch" for Major Project proposal	Provisional Presentation of the Artefact	Professional Presentation of the Artefact	Report
10% of 60 credits	10% of 60 credits	60% of 60 credits	20% of 60 credits

Stage 1 Assessed Criteria:

- Project Brief: aims, objectives, intentions.
- Research: technical, cultural, and social context. Industrial application.
- Process: target audience; project planning; learning journal, blog, production diary, or similar.
- Preliminary ideas/proposed solutions: test recordings, proof of concept demos, storyboards, etc.
- Communication: presentation techniques, effective response to questions, AV integration.

Stage 2 Assessed Criteria:

- Conceptual Ability: quality of ideas and the way in which these are developed.
- Methodology: how you did it. Informed by research.
- Self-Management and Use of Project Plan: evidence the ability to manage their own learning, use project planning techniques, meet deadlines, and evidence this process through the use of a learning journal, blog, production diary, or similar.
- Level of Progress: quality of work at this stage of the project.
- Communication in Viva.

Stage 3 Assessed Criteria:

- Creativity, innovation and originality in the solution.
- Quality of production: artefact aesthetics, synthesis of diverse digital media content, technical knowledge and skills, fit for purpose, etc.
- Analysis, Synthesis, and Evaluation: critical evaluation of final project solution (for example a comparison of original concept to final product using explicit quality criteria); evidence of target audience research and feedback (including usability testing or market research data where appropriate).
- Communication in Viva. Quality of presentation.

Report Assessed Criteria:

- Produce a comprehensive report that is written in an appropriate technical and/or academic style that accurately evidences the production process, and that includes analysis of, and self-reflection upon, that process. (See below.)

WRITTEN REPORT

The Major Project Report is an integral component of the final year project. The report represents the essential documentation of all the key processes and tasks undertaken throughout the project, and provides a key indication of the level of understanding which has been achieved over an extended period of study. Hence, in order to obtain a good overall mark in the Major Project, a student must produce a methodical, professional, and academically rigorous report. Study this guide carefully as it provides useful hints on how to construct a better report.

The report must be submitted through Turnitin. These will be read by the relevant members of the Programme Team and the External Examiner.

Page layout and line spacing for the report should be set as:

- Paper size: A4
- Orientation: Portrait
- Margins:
 - Top: 2 cm
 - Bottom: 3 cm
 - Left: 3.5 cm
 - Right: 2 cm
 - Gutter: 0 cm

Use a plain sans-serif modern font such as Calibri, Arial, or Helvetica. Line spacing should be set to 1.5 lines for the entire document.

Diagrams, Screen Grabs, and Graphics

The report should contain appropriate and relevant diagrams, screen grabs and/or graphics to support the text. If the text refers to a visual element of the project, then some form of visual representation should be provided in the report.

Images, graphics, and tables should normally be placed close to the relevant text to allow the reader to quickly refer to essential information. However, large amounts of background data or image sequences are generally placed in the report's appendix, supported by appropriate references in the main text (such as "see Appendix 3").

Report Structure

The standard structure is as follows:

- Title page.
- Declaration.
- Acknowledgement.
- Abstract (no more than 200 words).
- Contents.
- Main chapters:
 1. Introduction
 2. Background research
 3. Methodology
 4. Analysis of design developments and results of final design
 5. Conclusion
 6. Future work and any study limitations (e.g. weaknesses of the project)
 7. References
- Supporting material:
 1. Appendices – tables, graphs, graphics, screen grabs, etc.

Note that this is only a guide: whilst some sections are compulsory the actual number of sections in the report will be determined by the nature of the project, e.g. more subsections may be required in the Background Research chapter to make it easier for the reader to follow.

Title, Declaration, Acknowledgement Pages

These pages are not numbered.

The title page consists of:

- The title of the work;
- Name of the author (i.e. you);
- The course for which the work is submitted;
- The Faculty name;
- The date of submission.

The declaration page consists of the following statement:

The work of this report completed under the supervision of (name supervisors). I declare that this report is the product of my own work and is not being submitted for any other degree.

Signature

Acknowledgement page: remember to thank those who have been of assistance.

Abstract

The abstract is a summary of the entire report in no more than 200 words. It is often easier to write the abstract at the end of the project and when all other sections in the report have been completed. The abstract is likely to be clearer and more focused by emphasising the following information:

- The source, premise or nature of the project or investigation;
- The method(s) adopted for the project;
- The solution(s) proposed; and
- The overall effectiveness and main findings of the proposed solution(s), supported by some indication of how these were verified or produced for the project.

This page is not numbered.

REFERENCING

The Harvard style should be used. See the separate 'Word Referencing Guide'. A typical list of references should look something like this:

- Bolter, J. D. (2001) *Writing Space: Computers, Hypertext, and the Remediation of Print*. Mahwah, London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Calleja, G. (2007) 'Digital Game Involvement: A Conceptual Model' in *Games and Culture*, 2, 3, 236-260. From: <http://gac.sagepub.com> [8.4.09]
- Douglas, J. Y. & Hargadon, A. (2004) 'The Pleasures of Immersion and Interaction: Schemas, Scripts, and the Fifth Business' in Wardrip-Fruin, N. & Harrigan, P. (Eds.) *First Person: New Media as Story, Performance, and Game*. Cambridge, London: MIT Press.
- Eskelinen, M. (2001) 'The Gaming Situation' in *Game Studies* 1, 1. From: <http://www.gamestudies.org/0101/eskelinen/> [6.1.11]
- Eskelinen, M. (2004) 'Towards Computer games Studies' in Wardrip-Fruin, N. & Harrigan, P. (Eds.) *First Person: New Media as Story, Performance, and Game*. Cambridge, London: MIT Press.
- Frasca, G. (1999) 'Ludology Meets Narratology: Similitude and Differences Between (Video) Games and Narratives' in *Parnasso* 3. From: <http://www.ludology.org/articles/ludology.htm> [6.1.11]
- Frasca, G. (2003) 'Ludologists Love Stories, Too: Notes From a Debate That Never Took Place' in *Proceedings of the Digital Game Research Conference 2003 (DiGRA 2003)*. From: http://www.ludology.org/my_articles.html [6.1.11]
- Ip, B. (2011) 'Narrative Structures in Computer and Video Games. Part 1: Context, Definitions, and Initial Findings' in *Games and Culture* [In Press].
- Juul, J. (2001) 'Games Telling Stories?' in *Game Studies* 1, 1. From: <http://www.gamestudies.org/0101/juul-gts/> [6.1.11]
- Mateas, M. (2002) *Interactive Drama, Art and Artificial Intelligence*. Unpublished PhD thesis. From: <http://www-2.cs.cmu.edu/~michaelm/publications/CMU-CS-02-206.pdf> [3.5.05]
- Nitsche, M. (2008) *Video Game Spaces*. Cambridge, London: MIT Press.
- Ryan, M-L. (2006) *Avatars of Story*. Minneapolis, London: Univeristy of Minneapolis Press.
- Simons, J. (2007) 'Narrative, Games, and Theory' in *Games Studies* 7, 1. From: <http://gamestudies.org/0701/articles/simons> [6.1.11]

ELECTRONIC MEDIA

Call of Duty: Modern Warfare 2 (2009) Santa Monica CA: Activision.

Deus Ex (2000) Dallas TX: Ion Storm.

Fallout 3 (2008) Rockville MD: Bethesda Softworks.

Grand Theft Auto: Vice City (2002) New York NY: Rockstar Games.

Heavy Rain (2010) Paris: Quantic Dream.

Uncharted 2: Among Thieves (2009) Santa Monica CA: Naughty Dog.