

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
Communication, Structure and Presentation 9	10	<p>9-10</p> <p>Exemplary use of language enhancing the quality of the submission.</p> <p>Very well ordered with logical and clear structure supported by appropriate headings and sub-headings</p> <p>All use of others' ideas and materials acknowledged. References are all included and are formatted consistently and appropriately.</p> <p>Diagrams and/or images are ideally suited to the points where they are used.</p> <p>Professional presentation style.</p>	<p>7-8</p> <p>Very good use of language.</p> <p>Well-ordered and logical. Headings and sub-headings assist the reader.</p> <p>All use of others' ideas and material is acknowledged. All references are included, though some minor inconsistency of in-text citation or formatting.</p> <p>Diagrams and/or images are used effectively.</p> <p>Professional presentation style.</p>	<p>6</p> <p>Reasonable but needs some revision.</p> <p>Mostly well-ordered and logical, most supported by headings and sub-headings</p> <p>All use of others' ideas and material is acknowledged.</p> <p>Some references are missing and occasional inconsistencies of in-text citation and formatting.</p> <p>Diagrams and/or images improve readability.</p> <p>Professional presentation style.</p>	<p>5</p> <p>Poor, needs significant revision.</p> <p>Order is not always logical and is sometimes confusing. Headings are largely those suggested by the assignment specification and the questions posed.</p> <p>All use of other's ideas and material is acknowledged, though sometimes inconsistently. Missing references and inconsistent in-text citation and formatting.</p> <p>Diagrams and/or images are not well selected.</p> <p>Professional style attempted.</p>	<p>0-4</p> <p>Very difficult to understand.</p> <p>Order is confusing and not always logical. Headings and sub-headings do little to help clarify the text</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Diagrams and/or images detract from the key messages.</p>

Review Criteria	Max Mark	Exemplary	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Unsatisfactory
Question 1: Code of Conduct 15	20	<p>17-20 The discussion raises subtle and challenging ethical issues related to the code of conduct in important aspects of the scenario. The code itself may be questioned with persuasive argument.</p> <p>All values are addressed in full, with clearly identified extent of demonstration in the scenario.</p> <p>The extent to which the value is pertinent is justified by argument.</p>	<p>14-16 All values are addressed in full. For each value, the extent to which it is demonstrated in the scenario is clear. The extent to which the value is pertinent is justified by argument. More attention may be given to more important or relevant values.</p>	<p>12-13 For most values, the extent to which the value is demonstrated in and pertinent to the scenario is given.</p>	<p>10-11 Perfunctory but arguably correct analysis is given for most of the six values.</p>	<p>0-9 Work does not demonstrate an adequate understanding of the code of conduct.</p>
Question 2: ACM Principle 7	10	<p>9-10 The principle has been well understood as demonstrated by the identification of application (or not) in the scenario supported by considered, reasoned argument with evidence drawn from the scenario together with real-world knowledge.</p> <p>Analysis of the ethical issues demonstrates awareness of alternative viewpoints and possibly cost vs benefits.</p>	<p>7-8 Multiple aspects of the scenario have been used to discuss the application of the principle to the scenario. Potential harm analysis considers a diverse range of harms.</p>	<p>6 It is clear how the principle applies (or not) to the scenario. Potential harm may be too narrowly interpreted.</p>	<p>5 There is a cursory attempt to relate the scenario to the ACM Statement but the analysis is shallow.</p>	<p>0-4 Unclear whether the relevance and purpose of the ACM Statement has been fully understood.</p>

Question 3: Guidelines 16	20	<p>17-20 All 4 segments considered.</p> <p>All selected guidelines show good understanding of the guideline, are rephrased where appropriate, and the benefit of application to the scenario context is clear.</p> <p>All justifications of relevance convincingly argue the relative importance of the guideline to all others in the segment</p>	<p>14-16 All 4 segments considered.</p> <p>Most selected guidelines show good understanding of the guideline, are rephrased where appropriate, and are beneficially applied to the scenario context.</p> <p>Most justifications of relevance convincingly argue the relative importance of the guideline to others in the segment.</p>	<p>12-13 All 4 segments considered.</p> <p>Most chosen guidelines are well explained in the scenario context.</p> <p>For most chosen guidelines, the argument for its relevance is made with reference to the alternative guidelines in the segment.</p>	<p>10-11 All 4 segments have been considered with a chosen guideline from each segment both explained and justified.</p>	<p>0-9 Partial attempt, incomplete or hard to follow.</p>
Question 4: Disregarded guideline 16	20	<p>17-20 The significance of the selected guideline is argued persuasively.</p> <p>The impact of the failure of the guideline is supported by critical analysis demonstrating an understanding of both the costs and benefits of applying the guideline in the scenario from multiple viewpoints.</p> <p>The consequence is thought-provoking and its connection to the failed guideline is explained and logical.</p> <p>Arguments are supported by real-world evidence or literature.</p>	<p>14-16 Guideline that was selected is made clear and is relevant to the scenario.</p> <p>Discussion on impact of the failure of the guideline is supported by critical analysis of both the guideline itself and the events of the scenario with multiple viewpoints on the situation presented.</p> <p>The connection of the alternative potential consequence to the failed guideline is explained and logical.</p>	<p>12-13 Guideline that was selected is made clear and is relevant to the scenario.</p> <p>Discussion on impact of the failure to follow the guideline is reasoned and related to scenario.</p> <p>The connection of the alternative potential consequence to the failed guideline is explained.</p>	<p>10-11 Guideline that was selected is made clear and is relevant to the scenario.</p> <p>There is a cursory attempt to explain the impact of the failure to follow the guideline on the scenario outcome.</p> <p>Alternative potential consequence identified.</p>	<p>0-9 Unclear that the selected guideline was understood.</p> <p>Unconvincing or implausible impact on the scenario outcome.</p> <p>Other potential consequence missing or implausible.</p>

Question 5: 15	20	17-20 Understanding of both techniques is demonstrated by detailed description of application to scenario. Potential benefits of interpretability are well situated in the scenario	14-16 The techniques and their application in the scenario are well explained and potential benefits are articulated.	12-13 It is shown how the techniques can be used in the scenario and some potential benefits are enumerated.	10-11 The techniques and their purpose are broadly understood.	0-9 It is not clear that the paper was read.
--------------------------	----	---	---	---	---	---

Total Marks: **78**