

## COMP1687 Coursework 2: DETAILED FEEDBACK with MARKS

Assessment Criteria	Feedback	Mark
<b>The quality of the language used in the essay (20).</b> Is the language clear and unambiguous or is it difficult to follow, with poor sentence structure and grammatical errors? Is the language at an appropriate level using a technical vocabulary or is it too simplistic or overly familiar?	<p>The language is somewhat clear in most parts, and there was an attempt to use some technical vocabulary especially in terms of Web related laws. Some grammar and sentence construction related issues, e.g., Therefore, it prevents any recognise a pattern.....=&gt; Therefore, it prevents any recognition of a pattern...?</p> <p>Acronyms should be defined in the first instance, e.g., W3C. You should also be careful not to use 'report' inside the description as it's an essay [both have significant differences in their structure and style]. Suggest revise 'How to Write Better Essays' (Greetham, 2013) in order to understand what is required from an essay overall.</p>	<b>9</b>
<b>The structure of the essay (20).</b> Is the text in a single paragraph or is it organised into sections and subsections? Are the paragraphs and sections sensibly chosen? Is the text overly compartmentalised? Is there a narrative or argument or is it merely a collection of facts and assertions? Is the content contextualised or just a collection of bullet points?	<p>The sequencing of your information sometimes feels as a generic discussion of some Web-related laws, and initiatives [e.g., WAI] that lacks a compelling narrative. Very generic discussion of the other parts [social, ethical, etc.].</p>	<b>10</b>
<b>The quality of the content (20).</b> Is there adequate discussion of legal, social, ethical and professional matters or perhaps only one of these four? Are they discussed superficially or does the discussion have depth and demonstrate understanding of how these aspects are interrelated? Has weight been given to the more interesting or important aspects being discussed?	<p>The narrative does not address the requirements of this coursework properly as almost the entire discussion reads as a collection of Web-related general assertions. You did a good job in reflecting your design/development choices based on these laws though. Some attempts to address other aspects [e.g., ethical and social] which is quite vague and forced.</p>	<b>12</b>
<b>The scope of the discussion (20).</b> Does the account provide generic, specific and reflective discussion of the subject or only one of these three? Are these discussed separately or contextualised to demonstrate understanding and insight?	<p>There were rooms for improvement for a more contextualised discussion concerning the issues. The different LSEPi are in most cases interrelated [ethics may inform social norm which in turn can motivate legal laws, and professional practice] which you largely missed to address. Also, the supporting evidence [e.g., references] could have been extended to include the other issues effectively [right now, almost all of them related to Web related laws/initiatives such as accessibility].</p>	<b>9</b>
<b>The academic standard of the writing (20).</b> Is the essay entirely original or is there evidence of pasted content? Are	<p>An academic essay at this level should include references that are more substantial [e.g., peer-reviewed book, journal article, conference papers,</p>	<b>12</b>

citations provided to support facts and assertions? Are references provided to match the citations? Are all references cited in the essay? Are the references appropriately formatted?	reports, etc.] other than a collection of URLs. Harvard formatting and style for the URLs are largely fine.	
<b>Overall</b>	This submission was solid. In order to achieve a higher mark, the different criteria of the essay could be improved significantly [refer to the feedback above].	<b>52</b>