

LEVEL 4 ASSESSMENT SPECIFICATION

Student name:		Student ID number:	
Programme:	BA/MDes Automotive & Transport Design		
Module:	Automotive Design Methods - 2		
Module code:	M4X01361	Contribution to Overall Module Assessment (%):	CW3 - 10%
Lecturer:	Paul Morrow	Internal Verifier:	S. Fontanarosa
Assignment Title:	Futurise a Re-Design 2050	Word count (or equivalent):	2 elements 2 Credit
Submission deadline:	29.04.2020 (by 12:00)	Return date of provisional marks & written feedback:	26.05.2020
Submission method:	All written assessments, where practical and possible, must be submitted via Turnitin unless otherwise instructed by the Lecturer. (Please DO NOT put this assessment specification into Turnitin or it will match many similarities with other students' submissions.) Alternative submission method (if applicable): Late submission of the assessment will result in a late penalty mark. Penalties for late submission: Up to one week late, maximum mark of 40%. Over one week late, 0%. Only the Extenuating Circumstances Panel may approve a change to submission dates.		
Academic honesty / referencing:	Academic honesty is required. In the main body of your submission you must give credit to authors on whose research and ideas your work is based. Append to your submission a reference list that indicates the books, articles, etc. that you have used, cited or quoted in order to complete this assessment.		

Module Learning Outcomes (from module syllabus)

1. Execute design projects respecting the relation between brand and product and to develop a design through inspirational research.
2. Demonstrate appropriate skills and knowledge to successfully execute and present a solution to a given design brief.

TASK DESCRIPTION

Your job is to project your design from the previous (CW2 - Classic Redesign 2025) assignment to the year **2050**. You can evolve the design and/or consider how transport may change in the next 30 years. This is a quick project so don't over think – blitz ideas for the 1st week – then select your favourite idea/style & produce front ¾ perspective manual or digital presentation renderings.

Deliverables:

1. A3 or A2, Front ¾ perspective presentation rendering.
2. Sketch Work (A3 Sketch Book with a front sheet showing your name – you may add to your previous book).

Submission:

Deadline Wed 29th April 2020 by 12:00 Noon on your table in AAG01 or AA206 tbc.

Assessment Criteria:

The project will be assessed in relation to the specific deliverables as follows: **LO1 & LO2** - Will be assessed using the following **Common Assessment Criteria**:

3 - Cognitive and Intellectual Skills (50%): *The Design*

4 - Practical Application Skills (50%): *Sketch work*

Feedback:

You will be provided with written 'Summative' (marks) feedback and the opportunity to discuss your performance in a studio tutorial on or before the feedback date 26.05.2020

GENERIC ASSESSMENT CRITERIA – Level 4

In accordance with the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications, at the end of Level 4 students will be expected to have demonstrated knowledge of the basic underlying concepts and principles of a subject, and an ability to evaluate and interpret these within the context of that area of study. They should be able to present, evaluate and interpret qualitative and quantitative data in order to develop lines of argument and make sound judgements in accordance with basic theories and concepts of their subject(s) of study. They will have learned how to evaluate different approaches to solving problems, and will be able to communicate the results of their study/work accurately and reliably, and with structured and coherent arguments. They will be able to undertake further training and develop new skills within a structured and managed environment and will have the qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring the exercise of some personal responsibility.

Level 4	FAIL	MARGINAL FAIL	SATISFACTORY (3 rd / Pass)	GOOD (2.2 / Pass)	VERY GOOD (2.1 / Merit)	EXCELLENT (1 st / Distinction)	EXCEPTIONAL (1 st / Distinction)
Category	0-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-84%	85-100%
3. Cognitive and intellectual skills (Evaluate underlying concepts and principles of a subject and interpret qualitative and quantitative data in order to develop lines of argument and make sound judgements.)	Wholly or almost wholly descriptive work. Little or no evaluation of the underlying concepts and principles. Failure to develop arguments, leading to illogical or invalid judgements. Minimal or no use of evidence to back up views.	Largely descriptive work, with superficial evaluation of the underlying concepts and principles. Weak interpretation of data, flawed development of arguments and judgements. Information accepted uncritically, uses generalised statements made with scant evidence and unsubstantiated opinions. Ideas sometimes illogical and contradictory.	Limited attempt at evaluation of the underlying concepts and principles, tending towards description. Can interpret qualitative and quantitative data but with some errors. Some evidence to support emerging arguments and judgements but these may be underdeveloped or with a little inconsistency / mis-interpretation.	Good evaluation of the underlying concepts and principles. Can interpret qualitative and quantitative data, with minor errors. An emerging ability to use evidence to support the argument. Mostly valid arguments and logical judgements.	Sound evaluation of the underlying concepts and principles. Can interpret qualitative and quantitative data accurately. Ability to devise arguments using evidence to make mostly appropriate and valid judgements.	Excellent evaluation of the underlying concepts and principles. Can interpret qualitative and quantitative data accurately and with some insight. Excellent ability to devise arguments using evidence and make appropriate and valid judgements.	Exceptional evaluation of the underlying concepts and principles based evidence. Outstanding interpretation of qualitative and quantitative data. Exceptional ability to devise arguments using evidence and make wholly appropriate and valid judgements.

Level 4	FAIL	MARGINAL FAIL	SATISFACTORY (3 rd / Pass)	GOOD (2.2 / Pass)	VERY GOOD (2.1 / Merit)	EXCELLENT (1 st / Distinction)	EXCEPTIONAL (1 st / Distinction)
Category	0-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-84%	85-100%
4. Practical skills (Different approaches to solving problems in particular contexts.)	Limited or no use of taught, basic methods, materials, tools and/or techniques. Little or no appreciation of the context of the application. Very weak evidence of different approaches to problem-solving in particular contexts.	Rudimentary application of taught, basic methods, materials, tools and/or techniques but without consideration and competence. Flawed appreciation of the context of the application. Weak evidence of different approaches to problem-solving in particular contexts.	An adequate awareness and mostly appropriate application of basic methods, materials, tools and/or techniques. Basic appreciation of the context of the application. Can identify problems in particular contexts and propose basic alternative approaches or solutions though there may be errors.	A good and appropriate application of basic methods, materials, tools and/or techniques. Clear appreciation of the context of the application. Good evidence of different approaches to problem-solving in particular contexts and proposes mostly appropriate solutions.	A very good application of a range of basic methods, materials, tools and/or techniques. Very good consideration of the context of the application. Very good evidence of different approaches to problem-solving in particular contexts and proposes appropriate solutions.	An advanced application of a range of taught, basic methods, materials, tools and/or techniques. The context of the application is well considered, and insightful. Excellent evidence of different approaches to problem-solving in particular contexts and proposes appropriate solutions.	Exceptional levels of application and deployment skills in particular practical contexts. Outstanding identification of problems in particular contexts and formulation of wholly appropriate, thoughtful solutions / different approaches.

