DiaLogue Simulation

Case Study: UWV - Accuracy Under Pressure

Simulated by GPT-5 (Teacher) and Student

1 Rubric Table – Material Interpretation

Criterion	Material Explanation (What is observed in student work)
1. Boritz integrity attributes	Student explicitly links theory of correctness, timeliness, completeness, verifiability, and auditability to the UWV data process. Strong work quantifies how each control affects data integrity.
2. Process grounding (7 steps)	Student maps reasoning to the UWV operational flow (application \rightarrow import \rightarrow rules \rightarrow decision \rightarrow notification \rightarrow payment/objection \rightarrow revision). Evidence: each identified risk is located within a step.
3. Control design specificity	Student proposes concrete, verifiable control activities: validation, reconciliation, exception handling, rule versioning, sampling, monitoring. Weak essays remain normative ("should improve transparency") without mechanism.
4. Segregation of Duties (SoD) $+$ IAM	Student constructs a task—role matrix and identifies incompatible duties. Advanced essays connect SoD to identity management (identify—authenticate—authorise).
5. Accountability and traceability	Student demonstrates who owns which decision layer and how actions are logged (decision IDs, rule versions, audit trails). Strong essays introduce RACI or role mapping.
$ \begin{array}{ll} \textbf{6.} & \textbf{Risk} \rightarrow \textbf{Measure} \rightarrow \\ \textbf{Effect} & \end{array} $	Each identified risk is followed by a matching control and expected impact, creating measurable reasoning. Strong work uses tabular or structured representation.
7. Fit to assignment brief	Student explicitly answers: "How do we ensure that data are (1) accurate, (2) auditable/verifiable, (3) timely?)" Answers combine technical, organisational, and ethical aspects.

1.1 Interpretation Guide

- A high 01B score indicates mastery of integration: theory is internalised and used to reason about real cases.
- A mid-range score indicates recognition of concepts but limited operationalisation.
- A low or negative score indicates misconceptions, missing theory, or normative statements without design logic.