CMT104 – Information, Network and Cyber Security

Coursework 1

Start Date: **Thursday 17th October 2013**
Hand-in Date: **Thursday 21st November 2013 by 09:00 via TurnitIn**

Access control models for electronic information flow control have existed for decades and have been developed over time to support a range of applications and uses. In this coursework you are tasked with summarising the existing literature on access control models and proposing a new combination of rules and methods that are best suited to the changing security threats introduced by the move to mobile collaborative working and de-perimeterization.

The coursework will comprise two parts:
- A group presentation – this will be a short 15 minute pitch to the rest of the group (during the session in Week 8) where you summarise the problem and introduce your ideas. You should include the following in your talk:
  - The problem
  - The existing literature
  - The proposed solution
  - A summary of your skills and expertise as a research team (not as individuals)
- An individual report of no more than 1500 words – this will include a short introduction to the problem, a summary of existing work in relation to the problem, and your own interpretation of the proposed solution as identified in the group presentation.

You should start by reading Chapters 8 and 9 in Ross Anderson's book *Security Engineering (Second Edition)*. You may also like to consider different access control models such as role-based, rule-based, context aware and location-based models.

This coursework will be worth 30% of your overall mark for this module. The individual report will be assessed. The presentation will be a formative but mandatory exercise, where feedback will be given after the presentation.

Late submissions will not be marked.

Marking Guide (see also the Assessment and Feedback Form attached)

Task	Weighting
The problem	5%
Existing Literature Summary	55%
Proposed Solution	30%
Quality of Written work	10%

Dr. Pete Burnap
S/3.04
p.burnap@cs.cardiff.ac.uk

14th October 2013

CMT104 Information, Network & Security

Coursework Assessment and Feedback Form

Student Name: _____   Grade: _____

Assessor Name: Pete Burnap
_____

Marking Guide		Key to grades			
The problem	25%	A	*(85% +)*	Outstanding	
Existing Lit.	35%	A-	*(70 – 84%)*	Excellent	
Proposed Solution	30%	B	*(60 – 69%)*	Good	
Quality of Written work	10%	C	*(50 – 59%)*	Satisfactory	
		F	*(0 – 49%)*	Fail	

Knowledge and Understanding	A	A-	B	C	F
Level of subject knowledge	❏	❏	❏	❏	❏
Able to identify key debates	❏	❏	❏	❏	❏
Understands relevant issues	❏	❏	❏	❏	❏

Evidence and Analysis	A	B+	B	C	F
Logical development of argument	❏	❏	❏	❏	❏
Evaluation of source material	❏	❏	❏	❏	❏
Evidence provided to support case	❏	❏	❏	❏	❏

Reading and Research	A	B+	B	C	F
Selection of appropriate material	❏	❏	❏	❏	❏
Effective use of a wide range of material	❏	❏	❏	❏	❏
Evidence of independent research	❏	❏	❏	❏	❏

Presentation	A	B+	B	C	F
Clarity of Expression	❏	❏	❏	❏	❏
Clear and accurate referencing	❏	❏	❏	❏	❏
Accurate and complete biography	❏	❏	❏	❏	❏
Adherence to presentation criteria	❏	❏	❏	❏	❏

Tutor Comments:

Mark Range	Knowledge & Understanding	Evidence & Analysis	Reading and Research	Presentation
85 – 100%	Outstanding subject knowledge. Excellent understanding of different recent debates and key issues in topic area under investigation.	Demonstrates an ability to construct a very well justified argument or position on the basis of appropriate evidence. Demonstrates an ability to evaluate a wide range of relevant material.	Evidence of the ability to read widely and make effective use of reading to support arguments. Demonstrates an ability to research for information independently and to read critically.	Clear and articulate writing style with no spelling or grammatical errors. Complies with presentation criteria. Accurate referencing within the text and clear acknowledgement of sources used. Accurate and complete bibliography.
70 – 84%	Wide knowledge of subject and ability to apply theory in a critical and thoughtful way. A thorough understanding of different debates and key issues in topic area under investigation.	Strong evidence of the ability to make a sustained argument or position based on appropriate evidence. Shows an ability to evaluate the evidence and synthesise material to form a coherent discussion.	Evidence of the effective use of a wide selection of appropriate material. Uses evidence from research to support arguments. Strong evidence of independent research and some critical reasoning.	Clear and engaging writing style that demonstrates very good command of English. Complies with presentation criteria, accurate referencing within the text and clear acknowledgement of source used.
60 – 69%	Very good subject knowledge and understanding of key issues and debates in topic area under investigation. Evidence of a good understanding of relevant theoretical material.	Evidence of the ability to make a sustained and coherent argument using appropriate evidence. Evidence of ability to evaluate the evidence and synthesise generalisations.	Evidence of appropriate reading and ability to use a range of sources effectively to support arguments. Evidence of independent research.	Clear writing style that demonstrates a good command of English. Few imprecise statements. Adheres closely to presentation criteria. Referencing mostly clear and accurate.
50 – 59%	Sound subject knowledge and understanding of key issues and debates in topic area under investigation. Evidence of understanding some of the relevant theoretical material relevant to the assessment task.	Evidence of the ability to construct an argument using appropriate evidence. Evidence of an ability to collate information and reach some general conclusions. Evidence of a satisfactory level of analysis of theoretical issues	Evidence of ability to select appropriate material from different sources and to develop a coherent argument. Satisfactory deployment of evidence to support argument. Some evidence of independent research.	Correct English usage with few imprecise statements. Adheres to most aspects of presentation criteria and clear attempts made to acknowledge sources accurately within the text.
40 – 49%	Evidence of some understanding of appropriate theory, but lacking depth. Limited understanding of key issues and debates in topics under investigation.	Some evidence of analysis of relevant material but with limited argument and evidence. Evidence of the ability to construct a coherent response to the assessment task, but only a basic level of interpretation and evaluation	Evidence of selection of mainly relevant material from a wide range of sources, but evidence may not be deployed accurately. Narrow selection of material and/or limited evidence of independent research.	Correct English usage, but with some lack of precision. Some aspects of the work are not explained clearly and marks limited by the material that the marker can understand. Presentation criteria may not be wholly adhered to. Referencing and bibliography attempted but may lack accuracy.
30 – 39%	Evidence of some knowledge of topic under investigation, but with serious omissions. Little understanding of key issues and debates. Evidence of reproduction of material from lectures and introductory material, with no interpretation or deeper understanding.	Evidence of basic interpretation of the question or assessment task, but answer may address only part of the topic. Evidence of a general, but rudimentary grasp of the question with only limited ability to sustain a response.	No evidence of research beyond directed reading or lecture notes. Over-reliance on limited range of sources, without analysis or interpretation.	Some incorrect use of English and argument is unclear. Some coherency in notes appropriate to question, but further development of prose required. Fails to reference and fails to adhere to required presentation format.
20 – 29%	Evidence of some knowledge and reading, but the ideas are largely marginal to the question or the assessment task set. Inadequate understanding of topic under investigation with significant errors or omissions.	An unbalanced response that omits essential material. Some evidence that assessment task has been understood, but very little development of ideas. Conclusions are not based on evidence presented.	Superficial reading of a limited or inappropriate range of sources. Failure to engage with reading appropriately in support of argument.	Significantly flawed use of English. The answer rambles and has little coherence or structure.
1 – 19%	The work contains significant errors and indicates little familiarity with the concepts and language expected of an answer to the topic under investigation.	Answer of little relevance to the question. Interpretation of the question is seriously flawed with no attempt to construct and argument	No evidence of reading	Incorrect use of English to such an extent that assignment cannot be understood.
0	Cheating (including plagiarism, collusion, duplication and falsification). Submitting other people's work as your own. Failing to present work.			