Assignment Guidance and Front Sheet

This front sheet for assignments is designed to contain the brief, the submission instructions, and the actual student submission for any WMG assignment. As a result the sheet is completed by several people over time, and is therefore split up into sections explaining who completes what information and when. Yellow highlighted text indicates examples or further explanation of what is requested, and the highlight and instructions should be removed as you populate 'your' section.
This sheet is only to be used for components of assessment worth more than 3 CATS (e.g. for a 15 credit module, weighted more than 20%; or for a 10 credit module, weighted more than 30%).

To be completed by the student(s) prior to final submission:
Your actual submission should be written at the end of this cover sheet file, or attached with the cover sheet at the front if drafted in a separate file, program or application.

Student ID or IDs for group work	**e.g. 1234567**

To be completed (highlighted parts only) by the programme administration after approval and prior to issuing of the assessment; to be consulted by the student(s) so that you know how and when to submit:

Date set	10/10/22
Submission date (excluding extensions)	8/12/22 Viva in class 9/12/22 Tabula Additional info, see the brief.
Submission guidance	See the brief.
Marks return date (excluding extensions)	20 working days from the date of submission.
Late submission policy	If work is submitted late, penalties will be applied at the rate of **5 marks per University working day** after the due date, up to a **maximum of 10 working days** late. After this period the mark for the work will be reduced to 0 (which is the maximum penalty). "Late" means **after the submission deadline time as well as the date** – work submitted after the given time even on the same day is counted as 1 day late.
Resubmission policy	If you fail this assignment or module, please be aware that the University allows students to remedy such failure (within certain limits). Decisions to authorise such resubmissions are made by Exam Boards. Normally these will be issued at specific times of the year, depending on your programme of study. More information can be found from your programme office if you are concerned. **If this is already a resubmission attempt, this means you will not be eligible for an additional attempt. The University allows as standard a maximum of two attempts on any assessment (i.e. only one resubmission). Students can only have a third attempt under exceptional circumstances via a Mitigating Circumstances Panel decision.**

To be completed by the module owner/tutor prior to approval and issuing of the assessment; to be consulted by the student(s) so that you understand the assignment brief, its context within the module, and any specific criteria and advice from the tutor:

Module title & code	WM241-18: Human-Behaviour in Cyber Systems
Module owner	Elzbieta Titis
Module tutor	Elzbieta Titis
Assessment type	CW2: Fixing the prototype
Weighting of mark	20%

Assessment brief

CW2: Fixing the prototype

In groups (group work rules are laid down below), you will assess and redesign a poorly designed prototype for an online shopping system. This will be done according to usability guidelines and heuristics, and will include the following two steps:

1. Evaluating the prototype against a set of usability guidelines;
2. based on this, redesigning the prototype to improve its usability.

The assignment will be completed using the Cyber Security Centre's private cloud. Each group will receive access to an isolated environment where they will develop and host a fully functional website, which will then be assessed against marking criteria (see below).

You should aim to fix the prototype comprehensively, that is identify and fix as many issues as you can (still, you should prioritise fixing more severe issues as opposed to minor issues). The work will be assessed during group presentation (live viva) when you will be asked to demonstrate to the module leader how you fixed the prototype. During this demonstration, you will be also asked questions checking your overall understanding of usability and the issues you fixed. **You should be able to justify your group's design choices, including implications for security.** Guidance about what will happen in the viva session will be provided in the class during a dedicated Q&A session.

On the day of the viva, you will hand over a summary document (printed copy signed by all group members) including the following: a) a list of usability problems discovered against problems you fixed (graded according to severity and mapped to the Nielsen's heuristics); b) your individual contribution by groups members; c) recommendations on security requirements (optional). **Failure to provide this document on the day or providing incomplete summary (e.g., without stating individual contribution) will result in failing the assessment.** There is no word count limit for this summary. On the day, you will be provided with an oral feedback and feed-forward.

To Tabula, you will submit **link to your fully functional websites alongside with the summary document (must be the same summary you handed over on the day of the viva).** You will then receive your final written feedback with grade. Shared group grade may be adjusted based on your individual contribution and assessment during the viva presentation (when you may be asked questions individually). Each group member should demonstrate **at least basic contribution towards fixing the prototype (identifying issues).**

You will be assessed based on the following:

- comprehension given by the number of issues you fixed;

- an overall quality and level of complexity of the work;
- an overall understanding of usability/security issues, including justification of your design choices/recommendations.

The following is the determination of grades:

To receive up to 50%:

- You apply HTML to the code provided to make basic changes improving usability;
- You fix minimum of 10 issues;
- For all the fixed issues, the work demonstrates suitable quality and level of complexity;
- You demonstrate developing understanding of usability in relation to fixed and/or identified issues, including implications for security.

To receive up to 70%:

- You apply HTML to the code provided to make basic changes improving usability;
- You also apply JavaScript to the code provided to make more advanced changes;
- You fix minimum of 20 issues;
- Majority of fixed issues are of high severity;
- For all the fixed issues, the work demonstrates suitable quality and level of complexity;
- You demonstrate sound understanding of usability in relation to fixed and identified issues, including implications for security.
- You make appropriate recommendations on minimum security requirements.

To receive up to 100%:

- You apply HTML to the code provided to make basic changes improving usability;
- You also apply JavaScript to the code provided to make sophisticated changes;
- All issues are fixed to the highest standard so that the prototype could be successfully launched in real life;
- You demonstrate sophisticated understanding of usability in relation to fixed and identified issues, including implications for security.
- You make appropriate, comprehensive recommendations on security requirements against the OWASP benchmark.

Free-riding policy. If you decide not to participate in the group work your composite mark will be reduced in line with your individual contribution and you may receive 0%.

Groupwork rules are the following:

- Address a free rider issue promptly and proactively as a group.
- Resolve the issue informally with the individual(s) in question (might be a genuine problem your colleague is encountering).
- Seek support from the module leader if needed.
- If no visible improvement …
    - Reducing the composite mark OR
    - Additional individual assignment capped at 60% (at the module leader discretion)
- If you have mitigating circumstances, declare them on Tabula (please, also let the module leader know to advise the group members).

How to work together (guideline):

- Get to know one another (e.g., interests, passion, competencies, strengths, weaknesses).
- Build relationships so that you can be effective:
    - Where to meet i.e., which platform or face-to-face?

- How often to meet
- How long to meet
- Roles in team – organizer/coordinator, task delegation

- Keep record of what was decided during meetings.
- Keep record of your individual contribution.
- **When communicating with the module leader about the group issues/questions (e.g., free rider problem), cc all group members.**

Word count	NA
Module learning outcomes (numbered)	1. Design, implement, and evaluate an interface for a well-defined community of users to interact with an application to achieve worthwhile user objectives; 2. Analyse the relationship between the human-computer interface, user behaviour, and cyber security consequences.
Learning outcomes assessed in this assessment (numbered)	1,2.
Marking guidelines	As specified in the brief. **Please also refer to the University Marking Scale (attached below).**
Academic guidance resources	Links to handbook/resources, workshops, seminars, feedforward, etc.

Marking scale

Class	Scale	Mark	Descriptor
First	Excellent 1st	100	Work of original and exceptional quality which in the examiners' judgement merits special recognition by the award of the highest possible mark.
		94	Exceptional work of the highest quality, demonstrating excellent knowledge and understanding, analysis, organisation, accuracy, relevance, presentation and appropriate skills. At final-year level: work may achieve or be close to publishable standard.
	High 1st	88	Very high quality work demonstrating excellent knowledge and understanding, analysis, organisation, accuracy, relevance, presentation and appropriate skills. Work which may extend existing debates or interpretations.
	Upper Mid 1st	82	
	Lower Mid 1st	78	
	Low 1st	74	
Upper Second (2.1)	High 2.1	68	High quality work demonstrating good knowledge and understanding, analysis, organisation, accuracy, relevance, presentation and appropriate skills.
	Mid 2.1	65	
	Low 2.1	62	
Lower Second	High 2.2	58	Competent work, demonstrating reasonable knowledge and understanding, some analysis, organisation, accuracy, relevance, presentation and appropriate skills.
	Mid 2.2	55	
	Low 2.2	52	
Third	High 3rd	48	Work of limited quality, demonstrating some relevant knowledge and understanding.
	Mid 3rd	45	
	Low 3rd	42	
Fail	High Fail (sub Honours)	38	Work does not meet standards required for the appropriate stage of an Honours degree. Evidence of study and demonstrates some knowledge and some basic understanding of relevant concepts and techniques, but subject to significant omissions and errors.
	Fail	32	Work is significantly below the standard required for the appropriate stage of an Honours degree. Some evidence of study and some knowledge and evidence of understanding but subject to very serious omissions and errors.
		25	Poor quality work well below the standards required for the appropriate stage of an Honours degree.
	Low Fail	12	
Zero	Zero	0	Work of no merit OR Absent, work not submitted, penalty in some misconduct cases