

Main Themes and Feedback to the Collaborative Discussion Forum

Dear all,

Well done for your continued contributions to the discussion.

I would like to share with you the feedback to the discussion so far via the recording below:

https://kaplanopenlearning.zoom.us/rec/play/5jVOHMbXZ1xSvhODTMWTcKROrdFkB7EaKbS6MurB9hScDyFolrflj93pbNB4yaFEHTiWRFP3s1nTnIDR.xsmXsDINZuJ4SOik?eagerLoadZvaPages=&accessLevel=meeting&canPlayFromShare=true&from=share_recording_detail&continueMode=true&componentName=rec-play&originRequestUrl=https%3A%2F%2Fkaplanopenlearning.zoom.us%2Frec%2Fshare%2Fgslc-AaFsNOWd4zUkWe7zf0UA5F7qIJrSBIE1eeA-Yq_dBJNCiNSzYdPG4Z-EVY6.LyrEUR60Bp1_eMgl

The wordcloud is also included to this post for your interpretations if you would like to.

Below is also a general formative feedback summary for our first collaborative e-portfolio discussion on Codes of Ethics and Professional Conduct, integrating insights from both your postings and the thematic analysis.

This feedback is intended to help guide your academic development and enhance your performance in both formative and summative assessments. It is not directed at any individual student but reflects overarching trends observed across the cohort.

Strengths Identified:

Ethical Awareness and Application:

Many of you demonstrated a solid understanding of ethical principles, with clear references to the ACM and BCS Codes of Conduct. Cases such as Malware Disruption, Therac-25, Dark UX Patterns, and Inadvertent Data Disclosure were thoughtfully analyzed with strong contextual links to ethical codes, public trust, and data protection frameworks like GDPR.

Use of Case Studies and Peer Learning:

Your engagement with the assigned case studies was meaningful and critical. A number of peer responses added thoughtful layers—questioning organizational responsibility,

bias in AI systems, and jurisdictional limits. This indicates increasing comfort with collaborative, analytical discourse.

Citation and Referencing:

The majority of posts included appropriate academic references, with Harvard-style citations mostly well-structured. Sources ranged from peer-reviewed articles to professional codes and policy guidance (e.g., NIST, ENISA, Springer), which adds credibility to your arguments.

Areas for Development:

Depth of Critical Discussion:

While most posts were informative, some lacked critical depth. Academic discussion should include evaluation—not only describing what happened or what a code states, but analyzing implications, contrasting perspectives, and exploring ethical grey areas. Use frameworks or theories where relevant (e.g., Moor’s “policy vacuum” or stakeholder analysis).

Academic Tone and Language:

Avoid informal expressions or contractions (e.g., “you’ve” instead of “you have”). Academic writing must remain formal, objective, and free from conversational tone.

Consistency and Balance in Structure:

Several responses were either overly short or structured in bullet/point form. All posts should be developed into fully formed, evenly weighted paragraphs to ensure clarity and coherence in argumentation.

Referencing Practice:

While citations were present, some posts used only 1–2 repeated sources or placed citations sporadically. Aim to include at least 2–3 relevant, varied references per paragraph, and ensure reference lists are alphabetically ordered.

Peer Responses – Move Beyond Agreement:

When replying to peers, avoid merely agreeing. Aim to add new dimensions to the conversation by introducing alternative viewpoints, challenging assumptions respectfully, or linking to wider research, legal frameworks, or theoretical models.

Integration of Learning Outcomes:

Some posts could have made clearer connections to professional, legal, cultural, and social impacts. These are core to the learning outcomes and should be explicitly linked in each post.

Let me know in case of questions, I am here to help!

Diego