

MIS761: 2024 – Trimester 2 – Individual Assignment Marking Rubric

	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Pass	Credit	Distinction	High Distinction
Critical Thinking & Research Foundations Supporting the Issue <i>Weighting: 20%</i> <i>Max: 3 Marks</i> <i>ULO: 1,2</i>	<p>The critical thinking and research necessary to underpin the cybersecurity issue and solution proposed in the artifact are not apparent, showing no effective use of cybersecurity frameworks, theories, or examples. There is little to no effort to critically think through the issue or solution.</p> <p>The understanding and integration of cybersecurity practices are nearly absent.This indicates a fundamental misunderstanding or lack of engagement with the core principles of cybersecurity.</p>	<p>There is little to poor applied critical thinking evident and insufficient research to support the cybersecurity issue and solution proposed in the artifact. It includes superficial use of frameworks, theories, or examples.</p> <p>The understanding and integration of cybersecurity practices are lacking, with minimal effort to go beyond basic insights, highlighting significant gaps in research and critical thinking.</p>	<p>There is superficially applied critical thinking evident and basic research that supports the cybersecurity issue and solution proposed in the artifact. It includes some use of frameworks, theories, or examples but lacks depth.</p> <p>The understanding and integration of cybersecurity practices are minimal, with basic insights that primarily draw from course materials, indicating a need for deeper research and understanding.</p>	<p>There is applied critical thinking evident and fundamental research that supports the cybersecurity issue and solution proposed in the artifact. It includes frameworks, theories, or real-world examples that inform the artifact's educational value and practical relevance.</p> <p>The understanding and integration of cybersecurity practices are present, showing a good grasp of the field's challenges, though it may rely more on course materials than cutting-edge insights.</p>	<p>There is applied critical thinking evident and fundamental research that tightly supports the cybersecurity issue and solution proposed in the artifact. It incorporates relevant frameworks, theories, or real-world examples that enhance the artifact's educational value and relevance.</p> <p>The understanding and integration of cybersecurity practices are clearly evident, utilizing course materials effectively and extending into additional relevant insights, showing a solid grasp of important concepts.</p>	<p>There is highly applied critical thinking evident and fundamental research that directly, expertly supports the cybersecurity issue and solution proposed in the artifact. It includes advanced frameworks, theories, or real-world examples that significantly enhance the artifact's educational value and practical relevance.</p> <p>The understanding and integration of cybersecurity practices are evident, going beyond course materials to include cutting-edge insights, showcasing a profound grasp of the field's current and emerging challenges.</p>
Structural Design & Delivery <i>Weighting: 20%</i> <i>Max: 3 Marks</i> <i>ULO: 1</i>	<p>The structural design of the training artifact’s message is not apparent or cannot be clearly interpreted from the training artefact.</p> <p>There is no structural logic to the training artefact’s message and therefore the delivery point is either obscure, ambiguous or of little relevance to the intended subject matter of the training artefact.</p>	<p>There is some superficial structuring applied to the training artefact’s message that required more thought to clarify the message and advice.</p> <p>The structural logic applied to the training artefact is limited resulting in a feeble delivery point for the message that lacks clarity relevant to the intended subject matter of the training artefact.</p>	<p>There is some simplistic structuring applied to the training artefact’s message that required more thought to focus the message and advice.</p> <p>The structural logic applied to the training artefact is somewhat limited resulting in a weak delivery point for the message that has some basic clarity relevant to the intended subject matter of the training artefact.</p>	<p>There is some considered structuring applied to the training artefact’s message that is evident in the focus the scope of the message and advice.</p> <p>The structural logic applied to the training artefact is good resulting in a steady delivery point for the message that has some clarity and is relevant to the intended subject matter of the training artefact.</p>	<p>There is definite structure in the applied design of the training artefact’s message that is evident in the tight focus relating to the quality of the message and advice.</p> <p>The structural logic applied to the training artefact is very good resulting in a consistent delivery point for the message that is clear and highly relevant to the intended subject matter of the training artefact.</p> <p>The message provides a clear, relevant contextual theme, well-focused and aligned with the business’s cybersecurity challenges, demonstrating a solid understanding and providing tailored solutions.</p> <p>The solutions and educational content are relevant and practical, offering strategies that are applicable to the entity’s operational context, though there may be room for deeper integration or broader applicability.</p>	<p>There is excellent structure in the applied design of the training artefact’s message that is evident in the aligned focus relating to the high quality of the message and advice.</p> <p>The structural logic applied to the training artefact is excellent resulting in a consistent delivery point for the message that is clear and intrinsically relevant to the specific subject matter of the training artefact.</p> <p>The message presents a deeply insightful and contextually rich narrative that is perfectly aligned with the business's cybersecurity challenges, demonstrating profound understanding and tailored solutions.</p> <p>The solutions and educational content provided are not only relevant but also actionable, offering clear strategies that are directly applicable to the entity's operational context.</p>
Relevance and Practicality <i>Weighting: 25%</i> <i>Max: 3.75 Marks</i> <i>ULO: 1,2</i>	<p>There is a lack of a substantive message, with the context either not established or poorly communicated, failing to address the cybersecurity challenges of the business.</p> <p>The solutions and educational content are ineffective and impractical, offering no actionable strategies or relevant advice, severely limiting the artifact’s utility in enhancing the entity’s cybersecurity posture.</p>	<p>The message is poorly developed, lacking depth and clarity needed to align with the business’s cybersecurity challenges effectively.</p> <p>The solutions and educational content are insufficiently relevant or practical, offering minimal actionable advice and lacking clear strategies that could be applied to the entity’s operational context.</p>	<p>The message is basic and requires significant enhancement to effectively address and align with the business’s cybersecurity challenges.</p> <p>The solutions and educational content lack depth and direct applicability, providing only general strategies that do not fully engage with the entity's specific operational context.</p>	<p>The message within the artifact shows consideration, with relevant content that could benefit from stronger focus and clearer alignment with the business’s challenges.</p> <p>The solutions and educational content are somewhat applicable, providing generally relevant strategies that need further refinement to fully meet the entity’s operational needs.</p>		

Audience Engagement
Weighting: 20%
Max: 3 Marks ULO: 2

The artifact fails to engage the audience, lacking any effective approaches or methods that resonate with or are appropriate for the audience.

The artifact struggles to engage the audience, with approaches that are unfocused or mismatched to the audience's needs and level of understanding (i.e., too high-level or technical in nature).

The artifact engages the audience minimally, with approaches that are either too simplistic or not sufficiently tailored to the audience’s level of understanding or technical capability.

The artifact engages the audience to a good extent, using approaches that are somewhat relevant but require further refinement to fully capture and hold the audience’s attention.

The artifact effectively engages the audience, employing relevant approaches that are clear and impactful. The message and advice have clear relevance, resonating well with the audience's expectations and educational needs.

The artifact excels in engaging the target audience, employing innovative and creative approaches such as interactivity, compelling visuals, and narrative storytelling to captivate and educate.

Self-Reflection
Weighting: 15%
Max: 2.25 Marks ULO: 2

There is little to no understanding of audience needs, with content that is irrelevant or so poorly tailored that it fails to communicate any useful cybersecurity information or principles. The reflection fails to articulate how comments was integrated, showing no improvement to the artifact's relevance or effectiveness.

The understanding of audience needs is inadequate, resulting in content that fails to resonate or provide value, lacking consideration of how the audience might interpret or apply the message. The reflection poorly articulates how comments was integrated, with little evidence of any substantial improvement to the artifact's relevance or effectiveness.

The understanding of audience needs is basic, with content that only somewhat meets audience expectations and requires significant adjustments to improve relevance and engagement. The reflection somewhat articulates how comments was integrated, showing minimal improvements to the artifact’s relevance and effectiveness.

The understanding of audience needs requires further development, with some content aligning with audience expectations but needing adjustments to enhance clarity and relevance. The reflection adequately articulates how comments was used, indicating some improvements to the artifact’s relevance and effectiveness.

The understanding of audience needs is well-reflected, with content that is precisely aligned with audience interpretation, ensuring good retention and applicability of the provided cybersecurity principles. The reflection on comments effectively articulates how seminar input and business interactions have been integrated, demonstrating improvements to the artifact’s relevance and effectiveness. The self-evaluation provides a detailed analysis of personal learning and development, discussing key changes and the effectiveness of strategies used to enhance the artifact's alignment with the entity's needs.

The understanding of audience needs and expectations is nuanced, with educational content seamlessly integrated with engaging delivery, ensuring high retention and practical application of cybersecurity principles. The reflection on comments clearly articulates how input from seminars and interactions with business managers has been integrated, demonstrating substantial improvements to the artifact’s relevance and effectiveness. The self-evaluation provides a critical analysis of personal learning and the development process, highlighting significant adaptations that meet the entity's needs and demonstrating a deep understanding of the effectiveness of the communication strategy.

The self-evaluation does not provide a meaningful analysis of personal learning or the development process, with no insight into adaptations made or the effectiveness of the communication strategy.

The self-evaluation lacks depth and critical analysis of personal learning and the development process, providing insufficient detail on how the artifact was adapted to meet the entity's needs.

The self-evaluation provides a basic analysis of personal learning and the development process, with limited detail on the impact of adaptations and effectiveness of the communication strategy.

The self-evaluation offers a reasonable analysis of personal learning and the development process, but could provide deeper insights into how changes improved the artifact and the strategy used.