

Marking Criteria for Written Assignment II
INFT3800 – Professional Practice in IT

Criterion	Mark	Absent or Poor	Below Average	Average	Good	Excellent
1) Answering all questions on the ethics consideration template	/5	0-1: Questions are not or only poorly answered.	2: Unsatisfactory. Overly brief, overly general, poorly structured/balanced.	3: Adequate. The questions are answered incompletely, with some inaccuracies, and/or inconsistencies.	4: Good. The questions are clearly answered indicating a high level of consistencies and accuracies.	5: Excellent. All questions are answered completely or comprehensively.
2) Clear and concise information on the project summary	/5	0-1: No or very limited and shallow summary.	2: Superficial and relatively shallow summary.	3: Adequate. Summary shows some depth and breadth.	4: Good. Summary shows good depth and breadth, good balance of different aspects.	5: Excellent and well-balanced summary of various aspects of the applied ethics application.
3) In-depth explanation and reasoning of the project details of the ethics consideration application	/7	0-1: No or poorly presented elaboration.	2: Very limited elaboration of research background, significance and hypotheses to the project details show little relevance to applied ethics.	3-4: Adequate elaboration of research background, significance and hypotheses to the project details g of at least 2 aims.	5-6: Good elaboration of the research background, its significance and hypotheses to the project details.	7: Excellent elaboration of the research background, significance and hypotheses to the project details with high relevance to the applied ethics.
4) Clear plan for analysis and reporting	/3	0-1: No or poorly developed plan for analysis and reporting	1.5: very limited discussion on the developed plan for analysis and reporting	2: Adequate plan for analysis and reporting and easy to understand.	2.5: Good. Clear, concise, careful writing of the plan for analysis and reporting that help understand the information of the ethics consideration.	3: Excellent. Excellent synthesis of the plan for analysis and reporting, reflect a thorough outline of how the information will be gathered, reported and dissiminated.
5) Overall quality of writing	/5	0-1: Poor or no structure, many language issues.	2: Mix of major and minor language issues.	3: Adequate quality of writing and adequate paragraph structure.	4: Good quality of writing, well thought out paragraph structure.	5: Excellent quality of writing, well thought out paragraph structure.
SUBTOTAL	/25					
Failure to correctly use the template	–	Up to –5 marks (e.g. for wrong order, missing applicant's name (student name), wrong font, wrong font size, wrong line spacing, etc.)				
Late penalty (–2.5 marks for each day or part of day that the submission is late)	–	As per the course outline, the mark will be reduced by 10% of the possible maximum mark for that assessment item for each day or part day that the assessment item is late (in cases without an approved extension of time).				
SACO Penalty	–	There is a clear rule about plagiarism. Submissions that appear to be plagiarised will be referred to the Student Academic Conduct Officer (SACO), with possible outcomes such as a mark of zero for the entire submission. Students are strongly advised to repeat the University's Academic Integrity Module, and to be sure never to take text, ideas, or images from anywhere without clearly noting the source.				
TOTAL	/25					