# **Individual Coursework Networks 2021/2021**

# Tasks

Your individual coursework is the writing of 2essays.

## Task 1

The first task is to discuss the following

**What advantages do SDNs provide over traditional networks?**

## Task 2

You should write an essay on any facet of computer networking that interests you.

Your essay title should be in the form of a question statement or problem.

## Details

Each essay should be about 2000 words and be well structured as follows:

### **Abstract**

You should provide a short abstract outlining briefly your significant findings.

### **Introduction**

A more detailed introduction to the question/problem and its context.

### **Main Body**

A clear structured main body, comprising linked subsections, discusses and explores the main thesis. This should be supported throughout by evidence from literature.

### **Conclusion**

A concluding statement what were you draw together your findings, based on the sections in your main body, and outline the implications of these findings together with a recommendation.

### **References**

Your essay should be well researched, well referenced and use the Harvard referencing system.

## Marking Criteria

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **A+/A/A-** | **B+/B/B-** | **C+/C/C-** | **D/E** | **F** |
| **Structure and organisation** | Coherent and well structured. Develops a logical argument and marshals ideas clearly. Material not directly related to the flow of the argument confined to footnotes. | Could be better organized by sequencing some of the materials more appropriately. | Argument obscured by repetition or lapses in organisation. | Frequently deviates from a clear line. | Fails to develop any clear theme or line of argument. |
| **Critical analysis and originality** | Creative approach to question; clear evidence of imagination and flexibility of thought; critical and wide-ranging use of relevant literature. | Approach to question is well informed, showing evidence of good understanding of sources and critical thought. | Competent use of written sources with some attempt at analysis. | Limited grasp of basic issues around the topic, with emphasis on ‘‘paraphrasing’ of sources rather than ‘discussion’. | Derivative, over-reliant on undigested source materials; no attempt at critical discussion. |
| **Use of evidence** | Excellent use of relevant evidence, thoughtfully selected, from a variety of sources. | The evidence included was relevant to the essay, but limited range of sources employed. | Lacking or inappropriate evidence in some places. Relevance of some evidence presented is not clearly demonstrated. | Often reliant on unsupported assertion or irrelevant material. | Biased use of evidence; essay contains high proportion of irrelevant material. |
| **Conclusion** | Well-defined concluding section which recapitulates the important points made in the body of the essay and provides a summary analysis of the material. | Competent attempt to recapitulate the main points raised in the essay, but limited analytical focus. | Recapitulation of the main points, but devoid of analysis. | Rather brief and formalised concluding section. | The essay ends abruptly and without an appropriate concluding section. |
| **Introduction** | Introduction demonstrates an excellent grasp of the question and provides a clear outline of scope of the essay. | Introduction shows a good grasp of the question and an attempt to define the scope of the essay. | Introduction rather perfunctory and limited to an attempt to define the scope of the essay. | Introduction demonstrates an incomplete grasp of the question. | Absence of any introduction to the essay; instead launches straight in with no attempt to introduce and define the topic. Question may have been misunderstood. |
| **References** | Extensive bibliography covering all the main sources. Clear and precise references. | Bibliography covers most sources; references largely complete and accurate. | Some sources used, but important omissions. References often inaccurate. | Not many references to the literature, and referencing usually inadequate where attempted. | Bibliography, referencing and footnotes virtually non-existent. |