

Assessment Rubric

This rubric will be used to mark your assignment. You are advised to use it to supplement your understanding of what is expected for the assignment and to direct your effort towards the most rewarding parts of the work. Your assignment will be marked out of 100, and marks will be scaled back to contribute to the defined weighting for assessment of the course.

Review Criteria	Max Mark	Exemplary	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Unsatisfactory
Overall holistic evaluation of the report 15	20	17-20 Highly original and very interesting. Excellent, detailed and relevant discussion that develops and enhances the reader's understanding of the topic. Very clear key message and associated conclusion.	14-16 Interesting with some originality. Relevant discussion of sufficient detail to allow the reader to develop a clear understanding of the topic. Identifiable key message and related conclusion.	12-13 Interesting but lacking originality. Although relevant, discussion sometimes lacks sufficient detail to allow the reader to develop a consistent understanding of the topic. Apparent key message and associated conclusion.	10-11 Not very interesting or original. Discussion is not always relevant nor sufficiently detailed to enable the reader to develop an understanding of the topic. Difficult to be certain what the key message is and how the conclusion relates to it	0-9 Boring and mundane. Discussion lacks detail, is mostly irrelevant and doesn't help the reader to develop an understanding of the topic. No discernible key message or conclusion.
Communication, Structure and Presentation 6	10	8-10 Exemplary use of language enhancing the quality of the submission. Very well ordered with logical and clear structure supported by appropriate headings and sub heading. All use of others' ideas and materials acknowledged. References are all included and are formatted consistently and appropriately.	7 Very good use of language. Well-ordered and logical. Headings and sub-headings help to clarify text. All use of others' ideas and material is acknowledged. All references are included, though some minor inconsistency of in-text citation or formatting. Diagrams and/or images are used effectively.	6 Reasonable but needs some revision. Mostly well-ordered and logical, most supported by headings and sub-headings All use of others' ideas and material is acknowledged. Some references are missing and occasional inconsistencies of in-text citation and formatting. Diagrams and/or images improve readability.	5 Poor, needs significant revision. Order is not always logical and is sometimes confusing. Headings are largely those suggested by the assignment specification and the questions posed. All use of other's ideas and material is acknowledged, though sometimes inconsistently. Missing references and inconsistent in-text citation and formatting.	0-4 Very difficult to understand. Order is confusing and not always logical. Headings and sub-headings do little to help clarify the text Not all use of other's ideas and material is acknowledged. Missing in-text citations, i.e. plagiarism. References in the bibliography not used in the text. Poorly and inconsistently formatted.

too many for no reason at all

Review Criteria	Max Mark	Exemplary	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Unsatisfactory
		Diagrams and/or images are ideally suited to the points where they are used.			Diagrams and/or images are not well selected.	Diagrams and/or images detract from the key messages.
Project Description 13	20	<p>17-20</p> <p>The project basics are given: aims, methods, data source, data nature, authority, expected impact, and a creative analysis of alternative possible uses of mining results.</p> <p>The scope of the project introduces clear and richly variable challenges around ethical considerations.</p> <p>Project description is supported by external evidence.</p>	<p>14-16</p> <p>The project basics are given: aims, methods, data source, data nature, authority, expected impact, and some alternative possible uses of mining results.</p> <p>Project description is supported by evidence.</p>	<p>12-13</p> <p>The project description provides adequate context for the discussion concerning ethical aspects, although some key elements could be expanded to support richer ethical discussion.</p> <p>Project description is linked to verifiable statements.</p> <p>Very Partial Should specify point</p>	<p>10-11</p> <p>Project description is barely adequate for the purpose.</p>	<p>0-9</p> <p>Key elements of the project description are missing or insufficiently explained.</p>
Ethical aspects raised 16	20	<p>17-20</p> <p>A broad range of potential ethical issues are raised.</p> <p>Issues include some of at least each type: biased decisions, individual privacy, and public interest or quality of life.</p> <p>Discussion of ethical issues by linking to ACM Statement and ACS code of Conduct demonstrates a mature understanding of professional ethics.</p> <p>Analysis of the issues demonstrates an understanding of the complexity in balancing alternative viewpoints</p>	<p>14-16</p> <p>Several potential ethical issues raised.</p> <p>Potential ethical issues raised address at least 2 out of 3 of biased decisions, privacy, and public interest or quality of life.</p> <p>Discussion of ethical issues linked to many of the ACM Statement and ACS Code of Conduct items.</p> <p>Pros and cons identified throughout.</p>	<p>12-13</p> <p>At least 3 distinct ethical issues raised and clearly explained with reference to the project.</p> <p>Issues raised are discussed in the context of ACM Statement and ACS Code of Practice.</p> <p>Some issues are presented from more than one viewpoint.</p>	<p>10-11</p> <p>At least 2 distinct ethical issues are raised and discussed in the project context.</p> <p>There is a cursory attempt to relate the issues to the ACM Statement and ACS Code of Conduct but the analysis is shallow.</p> <p>Some alternative viewpoints are recognised, but only lightly.</p>	<p>0-9</p> <p>Ethical issues may be raised but are not adequately discussed in the context of the project (<i>How would they occur? Who could be affected? And so forth</i>).</p> <p>Unclear whether the relevance and purpose of the ACM Statement and ACS Code of Conduct have been fully understood.</p> <p>Generally a failure to recognise alternative viewpoints.</p>

Review Criteria	Max Mark	Exemplary	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Unsatisfactory
<p>Recommendation on how to manage ethical aspects</p> <p>25</p>	30	<p>24-30</p> <p>Several technological solutions identified towards addressing ethical concerns specifically in the project context.</p> <p>Procedural, governance and educational approaches to managing ethical issues identified and contextualised for application in the project.</p> <p>Some surprising or creative ideas offered.</p> <p>Balanced presentation of alternative measures that were or could be taken.</p> <p>Opinion is persuasive and supported by argument.</p>	<p>21-23</p> <p>Some technical approaches to ethical concerns described.</p> <p>Some procedural, governance or educational approaches to managing ethical issues identified.</p> <p>Balanced presentation of alternative approaches that differ from the recommended approach.</p> <p>Opinion is clear and consistent with argument.</p>	<p>18-20</p> <p>A few technical approaches identified but not clear that they are relevant to the project in question.</p> <p>A few procedural, governance or educational approaches to managing ethical issues identified but not clear whether they are relevant.</p> <p>Alternative approaches to recommended approach given but not well defended.</p> <p>Opinion clear but rationale missing.</p>	<p>15-17</p> <p>A few technical, procedural, governance or educational approaches to managing ethical issues identified.</p> <p>Management approaches not well tied to project context.</p> <p>Poor presentation and analysis of defensible alternatives.</p> <p>Recommendation given.</p>	<p>0-14</p> <p>Scant description or range of procedural, governance, educational or technical approaches offered, demonstrating ineffective research.</p> <p>Pros and cons for various approaches to managing ethical issues not (or barely) presented.</p> <p>Recommendation unclear or incomplete.</p>

75