

# 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)	27/3/23
Submission guidance	Specific submission guidance for this work (see specification).
Marks return date (excluding extensions)	20 working days from the date of the Tabula submission
Late submission policy	If work is submitted late, penalties will be applied at the rate of <b>5 marks per University working day</b> after the due date, up to a <b>maximum of 10 working days</b> late. After this period the mark for the work will be reduced to 0 (which is the maximum penalty). "Late" means <b>after the submission deadline time as well as the date</b> – 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. <b>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.</b>

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:

<b>Module title &amp; code</b>	WM241-18: Human-Behaviour in Cyber Systems
<b>Module owner</b>	Elzbieta Titis
<b>Module tutor</b>	Elzbieta Titis
<b>Assessment type</b>	CW1: Portfolio of research papers
<b>Weighting of mark</b>	30% This assessment contributes to external accreditation.

#### Assessment brief

##### **CW1: Portfolio of research papers**

This course is a seminar. In order to make it a rich and rewarding for the entire class, your participation is required.

There will be three reading sessions each term (six total) and you are expected to come to class prepared each time to discuss the readings and respond to the questions posed by the module tutor and your colleagues during the student-led reading discussions.

For three sessions, individually you will write a short summary of what you discussed; once during the two terms you will be also required to lead the discussion and submit a detailed leader summary.

Consequently, there are two parts to this assessment: a) being a member; and b) being a leader. Leaders will have additional responsibilities/requirements, which is reflected in the weighting scheme (see below). **This means you will submit four summaries total (three summaries as a group member and one as a leader).** This will be a single submission via Tabula. The submission should be made in PDF format and contain your student ID in the title. You must use the Harvard referencing system.

The following are detailed requirements for each part.

#### **I. Member (10%)**

**You will be assessed based on the following:**

- Actively engage in weekly group discussions.
- Write a **short summary (300 words +-10%)** of what you discussed. You could also include your own contribution - two issues you think are important to gain a deeper understanding of the reading, including justification.
- You need to submit summaries for three out of six reading sessions planned for this module but ideally you will be present for all the sessions. In case you are absent for the class discussion, you still need to submit the summary addressing two specific points in the reading planned for that week.

#### **II. Leader (20%)**

Each student in the class will be required to lead one reading group discussion (~30 minutes: 5 min

introduction to the reading and 25 min for discussion) *once* during the two terms.

This means that apart from the main student participation (being a member), everyone will be allocated to the leadership rota and this should be managed among yourselves. As a leader, you will use evidence from the reading to present a brief overview and to set-up two questions to drive the group discussion.

**Expectations for the discussion are the following:**

1. Prepare a clear structure for the discussion (stating how you will lead the discussion) and present a brief overview (5 minute) of the key ideas, concepts, or arguments from the paper you believe will help the group to gain a deeper understanding of the topic and your questions.
2. Prepare two questions that will drive the group to discuss specific points in the readings. Specific means that you should not ask questions such as "What did you think of the paper?".
3. Prepare a short overview of the reading (including discussion structure and the two questions) and send it to your group members in advance of the discussion and cc the module leader.
4. You will be also required to submit a detailed summary of the paper to Tabula by the final deadline. See detail below.

**You will be assessed based on the following:**

1. In advance of the discussion (at least one day prior), send your group members **the overview** of the paper (approx. 300 words), the discussion structure, and the two questions. CC module leader in this correspondence using Warwick email. This is not the summary you will submit to Tabula.
2. Present the reading in a clear & understandable manner supported with evidence from the text.
3. Pose two questions in your group that will drive group members to discuss specific points in the readings.
4. Lead the discussion in a way that connects the reading to the module content already covered and/or the weekly topic under investigation.
5. In case you are absent for the class discussion, point 1 still applies.
6. **Write a 1500-words (+10%) summary.** The summary should be detailed and specific, referring to the two issues identified and bearing qualities of critical analysis. In the Appendix, you will include the overview you were asked to prepare previously; Appendix will not count towards word limit.

Note that having leadership responsibility means that the group will rely on your presence and preparation, and the marking scheme for this assignment was designed to reflect this. Still, since you are required to be the leader only once during the two terms, you will have plenty of flexibility to arrange your slot.

**III. Marking criteria / marking schemes / deadlines**

Members (10%)	Leaders (20%)
Both parts will be assessed based on the following four basic criteria: 1) The work falls within the word limits; 2) it shows evidence of having read the paper; 3) it addresses all questions set, and 4) the paraphrase is sufficiently different from the original paper. In addition, leaders have extra responsibilities and should demonstrate evidence of critical analysis as specified	

above.	
<p>The marking scheme is as follows:</p> <p><b>Excellent – 2 points:</b> The work meets all the basic criteria without any shortfalls and using only significant points.</p> <p><b>Satisfactory – 1 point:</b> The work meets all the basic criteria but there may be some minor drawbacks, e.g., it is slightly over or under word limit, or there is no convincing evidence of having read the paper.</p> <p><b>Poor – 0 points:</b> The work does not meet one or more of the basic criteria.</p> <p>When calculating the overall mark for the member part, the points for each summary will be converted to percentages (up to 75% for all three), and you will also receive 5% for each seminar you were present and actively engaged in the discussion (up to 25%), e.g.:</p> <p>2 point (25%) + 1 point (12.5%) + 1 point (12.5%) = 50% plus up to <b>25% for participation</b> (5% for each session) = 75% max</p>	<p>The following is the determination of grades for leaders:</p> <p><b>To receive up to 40%:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ You sent your group members the overview in advance of the discussion;</li> <li>▪ The work meets all the basic criteria;</li> <li>▪ The work demonstrates developing understanding of the issues/topic;</li> <li>▪ There is some evidence of structure and organisation in your work.</li> </ul> <p><b>To receive up to 60%:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>You are present to lead the discussion;</b></li> <li>▪ The work meets all the basic criteria with some minor drawbacks, e.g., it is slightly over or under word limit;</li> <li>▪ You address significant points in the reading, including justification;</li> <li>▪ The work demonstrates reasonable understanding of the issues/topic;</li> <li>▪ The work demonstrates developing critical analysis, evaluation, and reasoning skills;</li> <li>▪ There is clear evidence of structure and organisation in your work.</li> </ul> <p><b>To receive up to 80%:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ You are present to lead the discussion;</li> <li>▪ The work meets all the basic criteria and has no flaws;</li> <li>▪ You address significant points in the reading, including justification, and provide <b>further background to the issues addressed (2-3 additional papers)</b>;</li> <li>▪ The work demonstrates sound understanding of the issues/topic;</li> <li>▪ The work demonstrates sound critical analysis, evaluation, and reasoning skills;</li> <li>▪ There is comprehensive evidence of clear structure and organisation in your work.</li> </ul> <p><b>To receive up to 100%:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ You are present to lead the discussion;</li> <li>▪ The work meets all the basic criteria</li> </ul>

	<p>and has no flaws;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ You address significant points in the reading, including justification, and provide further background to the issues addressed (<b>4-5 additional papers</b>);</li> <li>▪ The work demonstrates sophisticated understanding of the issues/topic;</li> <li>▪ The work demonstrates matured critical analysis, evaluation, and reasoning skills;</li> <li>▪ There is comprehensive evidence of sophisticated structure and organisation in your work.</li> <li>▪ <b>The work extends existing debates or interpretations and may be close to publishable standard.</b></li> </ul>
Word count is 300 (+-10%) words for each member summary.	Word count is 1500 (+-10%) words for the leader summary.
<p align="center"><b>Tabula deadline: 27/3/23</b></p> <p align="center">You will submit all the four summaries in one document.</p>	
<b>Word count</b>	300 (+-10%) words for each member summary; 1500 (+-10%) words for the leader summary.
<b>Module learning outcomes (numbered)</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Design, implement, and evaluate an interface for a well-defined community of users to interact with an application to achieve worthwhile user objectives;</li> <li>2. Analyse the relationship between the human-computer interface, user behaviour, and cyber security consequences.</li> </ol>
<b>Learning outcomes assessed in this assessment (numbered)</b>	1, 2.
<b>Marking guidelines</b>	<p>Details specified in the brief.</p> <p><b>Please also refer to the University Marking Scale below.</b></p>
<b>Academic guidance resources</b>	Links to handbook/resources, formative feedback/details of feed-forward if required, workshops, seminars, 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