Professional Experience and Project Development  
55-403325  
Task 1a - Project Specification LSEPI Analysis (12.5%)

# Learning Outcomes assessed in this task

* **LO1** Develop personal and professional skills and an awareness of legal, social, ethical and professional issues (LSEPI) within the IT industry.
* **LO4** Communicate effectively and to an appropriate standard in a range of media and writing styles and present information clearly, objectively and logically, in an appropriate format.

# Specification

For this assignment you are required to choose one of the Project Specifications provided. These are from real projects that Computing students have recently attempted. They have not been edited other than to remove personal information.

It is your task to understand the scope of the project (making assumptions if you need to) and to discuss how LSEPI issues could be considered in the project. There is not a right or a wrong solution to this, just your opinion. You will need to back up your arguments using at least two recent references in this area (to include at least one academic reference to a book/article/report/paper and one reference to a website reporting on the public examples you have selected).

The written piece should be approximately 800-1000 words. Please study the task list and marking scheme carefully to understand what should be included in your submission. Include the project specification you are analysing at the end of your report (this and any references won't count towards your word count).

# Hand in Details

**Deadline**: **Monday 11th November, 3pm**

**Electronic submission**: Upload your work to Blackboard **in two places** (see below for details).

* Upload to a TurnitinUK assignment (**Task 1a - Project Specification LSEPI Analysis (Turnitin)**) which checks against all previously uploaded work for similarities. This will highlight to you, and the marker of your work, any overlap with previous submissions and should prevent (or highlight) any plagiarism in your work. You can use this tool to submit your work early and view the report it generates. The latest upload is the piece of work that will be marked.
* Upload to Blackboard in the **Task 1a - Project Specification LSEPI Analysis** submission point, where the feedback rubric will be used to give you a mark and feedback for your work.

SHU rules for late hand-in apply. Further guidance, including what to do if you are unable to submit, can be found on [Assessment4Students](https://academic.shu.ac.uk/assessment4students/submitting-work-sitting-exams/submitting-work/).

# Recommended task list

Here is some guidance on how to work on this assignment:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Identification of main issues | There should be 2 or 3 main issues that can be identified. If you need to make assumptions in order to specify the main issues then clearly state these. |
| Impact of issues on project | Once the main issues have been identified you can discuss how these might impact on the project. They could have a positive or a negative impact. |
| Relate your points to public examples | Relate the discussion above to public examples that have made the news in the past few years. |
| Referencing | Use at least two types of references in your report using the APA referencing system. |
| Presentation and use of English | Spell check, get the grammar right and make your report look neat and professional. |

# Marks and feedback

See marking scheme below for details.

You will receive a mark out of 100 for the work and the mark and feedback will be accessed via 'My Grades' on Blackboard.

# In-Module Retrieval (IMR)

Following first-sit assessment, In-Module Retrieval (IMR) will be offered to students achieving below 40% for the assessment task.

IMR means that you will have an opportunity to resubmit a reworked version of your original assignment, following feedback, within a short space of time (usually 5-10 working days) in order to achieve a pass grade. The maximum mark available is 40%.

You will need to look out for an email from your Module Leader (to your SHU email address) shortly after the marks have been released. This will give you more details and tell you what you need to do next.

If you decide not to participate in the In-Module Retrieval attempt and subsequently do not pass the module, you will be referred which means you will have an opportunity to resubmit an assignment during the reassessment period (usually July for students on standard courses).

The time available to you to submit an IMR attempt will be less for those students who submit after the original submission deadline date (with or without an approved extension).

Further information about IMR is available on Assessment 4 Students on MyHallam.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | **0-29%** | | **30-39%** | | | **40-49%** | **50-59%** | **60-69%** | **70-79%** | **80-100%** | |
| **Identification of main issues** | | LSEPI issues not identified or not relevant to project specification selected. | | Insufficient number of LSEPI issues identified, not relevant to project specification selected. | | | Only 1 or 2 LSEPI issues identified but poorly described and/or not necessarily the key ones for the project. Little or no context or explanation. | 2 or 3 LSEPI issues identified, clearly described and relevant to the project. Little or no explanation to justify selection. | 3 LSEPI issues identified, well described and clearly put in context relevant to the project. Good and appropriate explanation to justify selection. | All LSEPI issues identified and well described with appropriate relevance and justification to the project given | All key LSEPI issues identified, exceptionally well described and thorough explanation of their relevance to the project. Additional, potential issues described. | |
| **/30** | | 0-9 | | 10-12 | | | 12-14 | 15-17 | 18-20 | 21-23 | 24-30 | |
| **Impact of issues on project** | | No impact reported or not appropriate for project spec. selected. | | Some impact described but not relevant to project spec. selected | | | Relevant impact described but little explanation for selection. Not all issues identified considered. | Relevant impact described with clear explanation of how they relate to issues identified. | Rich description of impact of project, clearly related to issues identified. Some indication of possible ways to address these. | Detailed explanation of the impact of the issues on the project and several means by which to address these | Thorough explanation of impact of issues identified on project. Valuable indication how some of these could be addressed. | |
| **/30** | | 0-9 | | 10-12 | | | 12-14 | 15-17 | 18-20 | 21-23 | 24-30 | |
| **Relate your points to public examples** | | No public example provided. | | Public example(s) provided but not relevant. | | | Public example(s) provided but little explanation on their relevance given. | Appropriate public example(s) provided with some explanation on their relevance given. | Public example(s) provided are well fitting with issues identified and explanation on their relevance is clear. | Multiple public examples are given from a range of scenarios that relate to the project specification. | Rich selection of public example(s) provided, covering all issues identified and the relation to these very clearly explained. | |
| **/20** | | 0-5 | | 6-7 | | | 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | 14-15 | 16-20 | |
| **Referencing** | | No references. | | Only 1 or 2 references, but inappropriate and/or not APA formatted. | | | Only 1 type of relevant references and/or poor use of APA standard. | At least 2 types of references appropriate for the project and conform to APA standard. | Good set of references well-suited to the project and conform to APA standard. | Wide selection of references used from multiple sources and cited using the APA standard. | Rich and varied set of references covering all issues discussed and well-presented using APA standard. | |
| **/10** | | 0-2 | | 3 | | | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8-10 | |
| **Presentation and use of English** | | Poor layout with many language errors easily picked up by spell checkers. | | Poor layout, some language errors easily picked up by spell checkers. | | | All parts of report included but no effort on presentation and basic use of English. | Simple but clear-structure of report. Good use of English. | Good presentation. Correct and effective use of English. | Very good use of English, presented in a professional manner and a pleasure to read. | Innovative and effective presentation, clearly highlighting structure of report. Excellent use of English. | |
| **/10** | | 0-2 | | 3 | | | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8-10 | |
| **Class** | | **Mark Range** | | **CG%** | **General Characteristics** | | | | | |
| First (Excellent) | | 93-100 | | 96 | Exceptional knowledge and understanding of the subject and its underlying concepts; critical evaluation/synthesis/analysis and of reading/ research; evidence of breadth and depth of reading/research to inform development of work; exceptional demonstration of relevant skills; excellent communication; performance in some, if not all, areas deemed beyond expectation of the level. | | | | | |
| 85-92 | | 89 |
| 78-84 | | 81 | Excellent knowledge of the subject **as the student is typically able to go beyond what has been taught (particularly for a high 1st)**; evidence of breadth of reading/research to inform development of work; excellent demonstration of relevant skills; demonstrates strong communication skills. | | | | | |
| 70-77 | | 74 |
| Upper Second (Very good) | | 67-69 | | 68 | As below but very good work characterised by evidence of wider understanding of the subject as the student **is typically able to relate facts/concepts together with some ability to apply to known/taught contexts**; identification and selection of material to inform development of work; very good demonstration of relevant skills; demonstrates good communication skills. | | | | | |
| 64-66 | | 65 |
| 60-63 | | 62 |
| Lower Second (Good) | | 57-59 | | 58 | A good breadth of knowledge and understanding of the taught content although **balanced towards the descriptive rather than analytical**; uses set material to inform development of work; addresses all aspects of the given brief; good demonstration of relevant taught skills, though may be limited in range; communication shows clarity but structure may lack coherence. | | | | | |
| 54-56 | | 55 |
| 50-53 | | 52 |
| Third (Sufficient) | | 47-49 | | 48 | **Knowledge and understanding is sufficient to deal with terminology, basic facts and concepts** but fails to make meaningful synthesis; relies on set material to inform development of work; generally addresses most of the requirements of the given brief; adequate demonstration of relevant skills over a limited range; communication/presentation is generally competent but with some weaknesses. | | | | | |
| 44-46 | | 45 |
| 40-43 | | 42 |
| Fail (Insufficient) | | 30-39 | | 35 | Insufficient knowledge and understanding of the subject and its underlying concepts; some ability to evaluate given reading/research however work is more generally descriptive; naively follows or may ignore set material in development of work; given brief may be only tangentially addressed or may ignore key aspects of the brief; demonstration of relevant skills over a reduced range; communication shows limited clarity, poor presentation, structure may not be coherent. | | | | | |
| 20-29 | | 25 |
| 10-19 | | 15 | Highly insufficient or no evidence of knowledge or understanding of the subject; **understanding of taught concepts is typically at the word level with facts being reproduced in a disjointed or decontextualised manner**; ignores set material in development of work; fails to address most or all of the requirements of the brief; fails to demonstrate relevant skills; lacks basic communication skills. | | | | | |
| 1-9 | | 5 |
| ZERO | | 0 | | 0 | Work of no merit OR absent, work not submitted, penalty in some misconduct cases. | | | | | |