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**Faculty of Engineering, Environment and Computing**

**EEC Module Title Operating Systems,**

**Security and Networks**

**Assignment Brief 2019/20**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Module Title  Operating System, Security and Networks | Individual | | Cohort (Sept) | Module Code 207SE |
| Coursework Title (e.g. CWK1)  Portfolio 1 | | | | Hand out date: 21st Jan |
| Lecturer  Mark Elshaw | | | | Due date: 28th Feb |
| Estimated Time (hrs): 20 Hours    Word Limit\*: 1000 | | Coursework type: Portfolio | | % of Module Mark  25% |
| Submission arrangement online via CUMoodle:  File types and method of recording: pdf  Mark and Feedback date: 10th March  Mark and Feedback method: Moodle and Feedback Sheet | | | |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Module Learning Outcomes Assessed:  1.Understand the basic concepts of modern operating systems and the roles of operating systems components  2. Make use of services and functions provided by the operating system, such as process control, file management, threading, memory management, device access. |
| **Operating Systems, Security and Networks 207SE**  **Portfolio 1**  **28th Feb 2020**  The coursework component will be in the form of a portfolio of work. Out of the first 10 portfolio tasks you will submit the ones set out below.    **Submission**  The deadline for submission is 28th Feb. You should submit your work as a single PDF document with each task beg inning on a new page. The submission link is in the 207SE Moodle Web.  Late submissions will be awarded 0 marks. If you have a genuine reason for needing to submit late, you can request an extension from faculty registry (at reception).  \*Your document should be submitted as a PDF in the form 207sePF1.pdf ,  **Tasks**  The tasks are listed below. For complete details of the task s, see the related week in Moodle. You should have been completing these tasks as they were set, so minimal work should be required at this stage.  Note that marks are also awarded for presentation.   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Lab | Task | | 1 | Operating System Tasks | | 2 | Linux Command Line | | 4 | Bootloader | | 5 | Proc | | 6 | Memory Management | | 8 | Cache Buffer | | 10 | Cache Buffer with system calls | |  | Presentation of report | |

|  |
| --- |
| This document is for Coventry University students for their own use in completing their assessed work for this module and should not be passed to third parties or posted on any website. Any infringements of this rule should be reported to **facultyregistry.eec@coventry.ac.uk**. |
| **Marking Scheme**  You will be marked out of 5 f or each Task.  **Practical Task Marking scheme**  Missing or completely incorrect. **0 marks**  Poor attempt. Not complete or not all requirements met. **1 mark**  Minimal work, almost all the basic requirements met for the portfolio. **2 marks** Good work, basic activity fully working but some important elements of the more advance elements missing and the work is not discussed fully. **3 marks**  Excellent work, The basic and more complex elements of the portfolio are complete and properly discussed and presents. It might however be possible to develop a more efficient and elegant approach. **4 marks**  Exceptional work. Thought given to efficiency, elegance, research when completing the task. **5 marks**    **Presentation Marking Scheme**  No report presented. **0 marks**  A few of the tasks presented but code badly laid out, no comments, few screenshots provided, no references. **1 mark**  Most tasks presented, some effort to comment, most screenshots presented, an attempt made to reference. **2 marks**  Well presented with commenting of code, laid out of code considered, references included. **3 marks**  Report looks like a professional report, includes the appropriate use of a recognized approach to layout the code, comments that are meaningful, screenshots where text is same size, table of contents, table of figures, introduction to sections, some reflection on tasks. **4 marks**  The university would be happy to present this as a professional report. The report has all of the things for 4 marks but has that professional use of graphs, layout and spacing. **5 marks**    **Marks Contribution to Module Overall Mark**    The report will be marked out of 40 and converted to the 25% of the module grade as follows:    (Grade/40)\*25 |

Notes:

1. You are expected to use the [CUHarvard re](https://curve.coventry.ac.uk/open/file/bdfb947c-9d43-48d3-8ec8-f511682e1dd1/1/The%20CU%20Guide%20to%20Referencing%20in%20Harvard%20Style.pdf)ferencing format. For support and advice on how this students can contact [Centre for Academic Writing (CAW).](http://www.coventry.ac.uk/study-at-coventry/student-support/academic-support/centre-for-academic-writing/?theme=main)
2. Please notify your registry course support team and module leader for disability support.
3. Any student requiring an extension or deferral should follow the university process as outlined [here.](https://share.coventry.ac.uk/students/Registry/Pages/Deferrals-and-Extension.aspx)
4. The University cannot take responsibility for any coursework lost or corrupted on disks, laptops

This document is for Coventry University students for their own use in completing their assessed work for this module and should not be passed to third parties or posted on any website. Any infringements of this rule should be reported to **facultyregistry.eec@coventry.ac.uk**. or personal computer. Students should therefore regularly back-up any work and are advised to save it on the University system.

1. If there are technical or performance issues that prevent students submitting coursework through the online coursework submission system on the day of a coursework deadline, an appropriate extension to the coursework submission deadline will be agreed. This extension will normally be 24 hours or the next working day if the deadline falls on a Friday or over the weekend period. This will be communicated via email and as a CUMoodle announcement.

# Mark allocation guidelines to students (to be edited by staff per assessment)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0-39 | 40-49 | 50-59 | 60-69 | 70+ | 80+ |
| Work mainly incomplete  and /or weaknesses in most areas | Most elements completed; weaknesses outweigh strengths | Most elements are strong, minor weaknesses | Strengths in all elements | Most work exceeds the standard expected | All work substantially exceeds the standard expected |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **GRADE** | **ANSWER RELEVANCE** |  | **ARGUMENT & COHERENCE** |  | **EVIDENCE** |  | **SUMMARY** |  |
| **First**    **≥70** | Innovative response, answers the question fully, addressing the learning objectives of the assessment task. Evidence of critical analysis, synthesis and evaluation. |  | A clear, consistent in-depth critical and evaluative argument, displaying the ability to develop original ideas from a range of sources. Engagement with theoretical and conceptual analysis. |  | Wide range of appropriately supporting evidence provided, going beyond the recommended texts. Correctly referenced. |  | An outstanding, well-structured and appropriately referenced answer, demonstrating a high degree of  understanding and critical analytic skills. |  |
| **Upper Second**    **60-69** | A very good attempt to address the objectives of the assessment task with an emphasis on those elements requiring critical review. |  | A generally clear line of critical and evaluative argument is presented.  Relationships between statements and sections are easy to follow, and there is a sound, coherent structure. |  | A very good range of relevant sources is used in a largely consistent way as  supporting evidence. There is use of some sources beyond recommended texts. Correctly referenced in the main. |  | The answer demonstrates a very good understanding of theories, concepts and issues, with evidence of reading beyond the recommended minimum. Well organised and clearly written. |  |
| **Lower Second**    **50-59** | Competently addresses objectives, but may contain errors or omissions and critical discussion of issues may be superficial or limited in places. |  | Some critical discussion, but the argument is not always convincing, and the work is descriptive in places, with over-reliance on the work of others. |  | A range of relevant sources is used, but the critical evaluation aspect is not fully  presented. There is limited use of sources beyond the standard recommended  materials. Referencing is not always correctly presented. |  | The answer demonstrates a good understanding of some relevant  theories, concepts and issues, but there are some errors and irrelevant material included. The structure lacks clarity. |  |
| **Third**    **40-49** | Addresses most objectives of the assessment task, with some notable  omissions. The structure is unclear in parts, and there is limited analysis. |  | The work is descriptive with minimal critical discussion and limited theoretical engagement. |  | A limited range of relevant sources used without appropriate presentation as  supporting or conflicting evidence coupled with very limited critical analysis.  Referencing has some errors. |  | Some understanding is demonstrated but is incomplete, and there is evidence of limited research on the topic. Poor structure and presentation, with few and/or poorly presented references. |  |
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# Marking Rubric

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Fail**    **<40** | Some deviation from the objectives of the assessment task. May not consistently  address the assignment brief. At the  lower end fails to answer the question set or address the learning outcomes. There is minimal evidence of analysis or evaluation. |  | Descriptive with no evidence of theoretical engagement, critical discussion or  theoretical engagement. At the lower end displays a minimal level of understanding. |  | Very limited use and application of relevant sources as supporting evidence.  At the lower end demonstrates a lack of real understanding. Poor presentation of references. |  | Whilst some relevant material is present, the level of understanding is poor with  limited evidence of wider reading. Poor  structure and poor presentation, including referencing. At the lower end there is  evidence of a lack of comprehension, resulting in an assignment that is well below the required standard. |  |
| **Late submission** | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |