Coursework 2 Specification

Read this assessment brief carefully, it tells you how you are going to be assessed, how to submit your assessment on-time and how (and when) you'll receive your marks and feedback.

Module Code	CSI_4_PPR_2022_S2
Module Title	PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE
Module Leader	Francis Babayemi
% of Module Mark	70% of the final module mark
Distributed	07/03/2022
Submission Method	• Submit online via this Module's Moodle site • Submit a single PDF document • **Word limit: 3,000 words ±10%**
Submission Deadline	Friday 06/05/22 (by 5:00pm)
Release of Feedback & Marks	Feedback and provisional marks will be available in the Gradebook on Moodle from 27/05/22

Coursework Aim:

This assessment has two parts. First of all, it will allow you to demonstrate your ability to be self-directed and self-motivated. You are expected to select a topic of your choice and conduct a critical literature review. Your topic must relate to computing and/or information technology. Develop your knowledge of the topic and then present your logical and constructive arguments. Demonstrate the ability to compare and contrast different viewpoints from literature before drawing your conclusions. Your report must be a well-written and correctly formatted literature review. You should use in-text citations where necessary and reference your work appropriately.

In the second part of this assessment, you are expected to write a personal reflection based on your assessment 1 and 2. In doing this, highlight what went well, challenges you faced, future adjustments you could make, and actions you'll need to take to utilise newly acquired skills and competencies or leverage better learning opportunities in future.

Coursework Details:

Type:	Individual Assessment: Essay writing
Part 1 - Self-directed essay writing - 2000 words	**Essay writing:** An essay is a type of assignment in which you present your point of view on a single topic through the critical analysis and discussion of academic sources. This is a **self-directed assessment** and you should write an essay on a topic of your choice relating to Computer Science or Information Technology. It should be a topic you are passionate or feel strongly about. You are expected to review/use at least five different authors to develop your essay, to support your own arguments, and to show your understanding of the topic. Although you are encouraged to use the web to search for initial information, the articles you review must be peer-reviewed. Here's a hyperlink to the LSBU Library portal (https://bit.ly/3g1qzCB). ● Write a 2000-word essay relating to computing science or information technology. ● Your chosen topic must be approved by your tutor before you start writing. ● Read the marking scheme below to understand how your report will be assessed. ● Use the essay structure guide below to plan and structure your report: **Essay structure guide:** 1. **Introduction: -** Provide short background information about your topic (include evidence such as trends, figures, quotes, stats, if relevant). Define and explain any key concepts. State what you will address in your essay and how you intend to address them. Confirm your position and why you are passionate about this topic. 2. **Main body: -** Plan and structure the main body so the overall point of each paragraph is clear and links together. Provide five to six paragraphs in this section with each one addressing a new and well-explained point. Choose at least 5 journal articles as evidence to support your arguments. Each new point should be critically discussed, supported by cited material, and show your own position. Only use charts, tables, and stats that add value to your essay. All charts and tables must be appropriately titled and discussed in the body of the text. Your writing style should be formal language and you should write in the third-person. 3. **Conclusion:** - Provide a sentence that links back to your topic. Provide statements that summarise your main arguments. Reiterate your key findings, touching on wider issues without and what happens next. Then give a final grand-closing statement. 4. **Reference page: -** Your cited references should be listed using the Harvard style referencing. **Useful links** Essay writing: Introductions: https://libguides.hull.ac.uk/essays/intros Essay writing: https://www.deakin.edu.au/students/studying/study-support/academic-skills/essay-writing Academic style: https://www.deakin.edu.au/students/studying/study-support/academic-skills/academic-style

Part 2 - Individual personal self-reflection - 1000 words	**Reflective writing (25 marks):** This is a way of presenting and reviewing your thoughts about your academic progress. For this second part of your report, write a **1000-word self-reflection**. **Compare and contrast** your own experience working with other students during CW1 team project and working by yourself on CW2. Be honest and critical in appraising your own academic progress, your achievements, and how you dealt with challenges in both cases. You must use the Gibb's (http://bit.ly/3pbSXEG) reflective model to develop, structure, and write your reflection, addressing each point below. **Structure for self-reflection write-up:** 1. **Description:** briefly describe what makes the two assessments different for you. 2. **Feelings:** what were your own personal thoughts and feelings about doing the two assessments? 3. **Evaluation:** break down your thoughts and say what you feel went well for you and what didn't. 4. **Analysis:** how would you interpret your reaction to the challenge you faced? 5. **Conclusion:** now that you have reflected, say what else you could have done to secure a much better learning outcome for you? 6. **Action plan:** now say how would you apply your "lessons learned" to a similar academic or work scenario in future. **Note:** Your reflection must be about your own personal experience. Don't write on behalf of your team or team members. Write this section in the first-person single. **Useful links** Reflective writing: https://www.deakin.edu.au/students/studying/study-support/academic-skills/reflective-writing
Overall report structure	**Your report must include part 1 and part 2** **Cover page: -** This single page should include details such as: - Module name and code; the Title of your topic; your Student ID (no names), and the Submission Date. **Essay topic** 1. Introduction 2. Main body 3. Conclusion **Self-reflection** 1. Description 2. Feelings 3. Evaluation 4. Analysis 5. Conclusion 6. Action plan **Reference Page: -** Your cited references in part 1 and 2 should be listed using the Harvard style referencing.

Referencing:	Harvard Referencing should be used, see your Library Subject Guide for guides and tips on referencing: https://libguides.lsbu.ac.uk/ld.php?content_id=32487069
Regulations:	• Make sure you understand the University Regulations on expected academic practice and academic misconduct. Note in particular: • Your work must be your own. Markers will be attentive to both the plausibility of the sources provided as well as the consistency and approach to writing of the work. Simply, if you do the research and reading, and then write it up on your own, giving the reference to sources, you will approach the work in the appropriate way and will not give markers reason to question the authenticity of the work. • All quotations must be credited and properly referenced. Paraphrasing is still regarded as plagiarism if you fail to acknowledge the source for the ideas being expressed. • TURNITIN: When you upload your work to the Moodle site it will be checked by anti-plagiarism software.

Learning Outcomes

This assessment (CW1 in the table below) will fully or partially assess the following learning outcomes for this module.

Learning outcome	**Assessed by**	
	CW1	**CW2**
A. Knowledge and Understanding		
• Understand how to conduct yourself as an undergraduate and to take control of your learning experiences in an effective manner.	Partially	Fully
• Understand and explore social, ethical and legal issues which affect the development and use of information systems and IT in support of business processes.	Partially	Fully
B. Intellectual Skills		
• Develop the ability to identify, analyse, use and criticise relevant literature from appropriate academic, technical and professional sources.	Partially	Fully
C. Practical Skills		
• Use University resources to obtain evidence to underpin arguments.	Partially	Fully
D. Transferable Skills		
• Make compelling arguments in written and verbal formats.	Fully	Partially

Assessment Criteria and Weighting

LSBU marking criteria have been developed to help tutors give you clear and helpful feedback on your work. They will be applied to your work to help you understand what you have accomplished, how any mark given was arrived at, and how you can improve your work in future.

Marking Criteria	10 - Sophisticated	9 - Exceptional	8 - Outstanding	7 - Very good	6 - Good	5 - Satisfactory	4 - Sufficient	3 - Weak	2 - Very weak	1 - Poor	0 - none evident
Essay introduction: -- Topic: relates to CS/IT, sets the question/topic against a wider context and defines key or problematic terms. Scope: clarifies own understanding of the question/ topic and the scope to be covered. Rationale: background or statistical information used. Approach: outlines the approach to tackling the question/topic. (20 marks)	Sophisticated. Topic, scope, rationale, and approach are accurately and completely joined up and polished, relates to computer science and/or information technology/ systems in all aspects	An exceptional link between the topic, scope, rationale, and approach. Highly joined up and strongly relates to computer science and/or information technology/ systems.	An outstanding link between the topic, scope, rationale, and approach. Highly joined up and strongly relates to computer science and/or information technology/ systems.	A very good connection made between the topic, scope, rationale, and approach. All elements well-written and relate to computer science and/or information technology/systems.	A good connection made between the topic, scope, rationale, and approach. Key elements of the report are well-written and often relate to computer science and/or information technology/systems with minor gaps and not detailed enough.	A satisfactory attempt at linking the topic, scope, rationale, and approach. Some elements of the report are well-written. Relates to computer science and/or information technology/systems with some gaps and not always clear or detailed.	A sufficient attempt at linking the topic, scope, rationale, and approach. Some elements of the report are missing. Relates to computer science and/or information technology/ systems but not well linked or detailed.	A weak attempt at linking the topic, scope, rationale, and general approach. Key elements of the report are missing and little relevance to computer science and/or information technology/systems but not focused and sometimes not relevant.	A very weak attempt at linking the topic, scope, rationale, and general approach. Most elements of the report are missing. Some relation to computer science and/or information technology/systems but not focused and sometimes not	A Poor attempt at linking the topic, scope, rationale, and general approach. Most elements of the report are missing. Some relation to computer science and/or information technology/systems but not focused and sometimes not relevant.	Failed. No attempt.

									relevant.		
Essay main body: -- Based on the essay structure guide. Critical analysis and personal interpretation. Evidence of research and understanding of subject/topic area. Evidence of rigour, debate, evaluation, analysis, interpretation, justification and clear assertions. Debates: views of other sources synthesised, evaluated and critiqued. Interpretation: viewpoint clearly expressed, justified. Linkage: analysis directly links to issues, problems, or views. Sources cited and well-referenced. **(30 marks)**	**Sophisticated, polished, and sustained arguments made with a high level of criticality. Analysis and interpretation are accurate, original and excellently crafted. Evaluation and synthesis are grounded in extensive academic research and discussion. Comprehensive use of evidence-based arguments.**	**Exceptionally strong and sustained arguments made with a high level of criticality. Quality of analysis and interpretation is strong, original and carefully crafted. Evaluation and synthesis are grounded in strong academic research. Clear use of evidence-based arguments.**	**Outstanding. Valid and careful arguments made with a high level of criticality. Quality of analysis and interpretation is maintained, and well crafted. Evaluation and synthesis are grounded in detailed academic research. Detailed use of evidence-based arguments.**	**Very good. Justified arguments made with some criticality. Quality of analysis and interpretation is maintained and well discussed. Evaluation and synthesis are grounded in plausible academic research. Clear use of evidence-based arguments.**	**Good. Balanced arguments made with some level of rigour. Quality of analysis and interpretation is maintained but with some gaps in knowledge. Evaluation and synthesis are grounded in good academic research but more could have been done to build a stronger case. Use of evidence-based arguments.**	**Satisfactory arguments made with some level of rigour. Quality of analysis and interpretation is acceptable but shows some gaps in knowledge. Evaluation and synthesis are grounded in good academic research but limited and can be developed further. Use of evidence-based arguments.**	**Sufficient attempt. Arguments are meaningful but basic and lack rigour. Evaluation is basic. Use of evidence-based arguments.**	**A weak attempt. Arguments are meaningful but basic and lack rigour. Evaluation is basic and doesn't show good understanding. Use of evidence-based argument.**	**A very weak attempt. Arguments are not meaningful and sometimes irrelevant, lacking direction. Evaluation is basic and doesn't show good understanding. Use of evidence-based arguments is very weak.**	**A poor attempt. Arguments are not meaningful and often irrelevant, lacking direction. Evaluation is misconstrued and doesn't show good understanding. Use of evidence-based arguments is poor.**	**A failed attempt. No evidence.**

Essay conclusion: - Sums up the essay. Tell your reader what the essay addresses. Shows gaps/makes recommendations for further research. **(15 marks)**	**Sophisticated and beyond expectations. Accurate and polished. Highly crafted conclusion that brings together all assertions in the text in a sophisticated and skilled summary statement.**	**Exceptional. Well crafted conclusion that brings together all assertions in the text in a highly skilled summary statement.**	**An outstanding conclusion that brings together all assertions in the text in an outstanding summary statement.**	**A very good conclusion that brings together most assertions in the text in a very good summary statement.**	**A good conclusion that brings together some assertions in the text in a good summary statement.**	**A satisfactory conclusion that attempts to bring together assertions in the text in a fair summary statement.**	**A sufficient conclusion that attempts to bring some assertions in the text together in the summary statement.**	**A weak conclusion that did not attempt to bring assertions in the text together in the summary statement.**	**A very weak conclusion that did not bring most of the assertions in the text together in the summary statement.**	**A poor conclusion that did not bring assertions in the text together in the summary statement.**	**A failed attempt. No evidence.**

Personal reflection: -- Gibbs model structure used. Reflects on personal experience and describes what happened, thoughts and feelings. Evaluates pros and cons of CW1 team interaction with CW2 self-directed assessment. Able to analyse and highlight what sense was made of the challenging situations faced. Gives a succinct conclusion on what else could have done. States action plan on how to apply realisations/learning in future study or employment. **(25 marks)**	**Sophisticated use of the Gibbs reflective model to structure, reflect, appraise and understand own learning, academic progress, and future path to take.**	**Exceptional use of the Gibbs reflective model to structure, reflect, appraise and understand own learning, academic progress, and future path to take.**	**Outstanding use of the Gibbs reflective model to structure, reflect, appraise and understand own learning, academic progress, and future path to take.**	**A very good use of the Gibbs reflective model to structure, reflect, appraise and understand own learning, academic progress, and future path to take with little gaps.**	**A good use of the Gibbs reflective model to structure, reflect, appraise and understand own learning, academic progress, and future path to take with some gaps.**	**A satisfactory use of the Gibbs reflective model to structure, reflect, appraise and understand own learning, academic progress, and future path to take with a few gaps.**	**A sufficient use of the Gibbs reflective model to structure, reflect, appraise and understand own learning, academic progress, and future path to take with room for some improvements.**	**A weak (or no) use of the Gibbs reflective model to structure, reflect, appraise and understand own learning, academic progress, and future path to take.**	**A very weak (or no) use of the Gibbs reflective model to structure, reflect, appraise and understand own learning, academic progress, and future path to take.**	**A poor (or no) use of the Gibbs reflective model to reflect, appraise and understand own learning, academic progress, and future path to take. Not structured.**	**A failed attempt. No evidence.**

Academic integrity and professional practice: -- Evidence of academic writing conventions and practices. Evidence of formatted cover page, structured report, depth, coverage, good readability, and presentation. Good set of research peer-evaluated articles. Attention to detail and quality. Use of quotations, labelling, error-free, correct in-text citation, and follows the Harvard Style referencing convention. Word count instruction adhered to. **(10 marks)**	**Sophisticated, accurate, and error free.**	**Exceptional, accurate, and error free.**	**Outstanding, accurate, and error free.**	**Very good, error free but not complete.**	**Good and generally error free but not complete.**	**Satisfactory with room for improvements.**	**Sufficient with missing aspects and room for improvement.**	**Weak and lacks diligence and attention to details.**	**Very weak and lacks diligence and attention to details.**	**Poor and lacks diligence. Shows no attention to details.**	**A failed attempt. No evidence.**

How to get help

We will discuss this Coursework specification in class. However, if you have related questions, please ask a question on the general chat or if too specific contact your lecturer, Francis Babayemi (babayef3@lsbu.ac.uk) as soon as possible.

Quality assurance of coursework specifications

Coursework specifications within the CSI division go through internal (for new modules with 100% coursework also through external) moderation. This is to ensure high quality, consistency and appropriateness of the coursework as well as to share best practice within the CSI division.

Details of the moderators for this coursework specification are below:

Moderated (internal)	Enrico Grisan, Sultana Ashiq
Moderated (CSI lead)	Lucia Otoyo
Signed off by (HoD/DHoD)	

----------For Internal use by CSI lead only----------

Changes required to CW?	
Examples of good practice	

*** if changes are required, moderator to complete the below:**

List of changes required	
ML Response	
Moderator Response	