Cardiff Metropolitan University | Prifysgol Metropolitan Caerdydd

Cardiff School of Technologies

Assessment Brief

Module Code	Module Title
IST6000	Professional, Sustainable & Ethical Technology
Academic Year	**Semester**
25/26	1

Module Leader email

MDTomlinson@cardiffmet.ac.uk

Contents

Assessment Details

Assessment title	Abr.	Weighting
The Tech Innovator's Portfolio	PORT1	100%

Pass marks are 40% for undergraduate work and 50% for postgraduate work unless stated otherwise.

Task/Assessment brief:

Introduction & Rationale

This assessment requires you to work in a self-selected group of 4-5 students to simulate the initial stages of a technology start-up. You will develop a concept for a new tech product or service, and through a portfolio of documents, you will analyse its professional, ethical, legal, and sustainable dimensions.

The primary goal is to bridge the gap between theoretical knowledge of ethics and professional standards and their practical application in a dynamic, real-world context. This assessment requires you to not only propose a technology solution but also to critically evaluate its place in society and the responsibilities you hold as technology professionals.

Group Formation & Start-up Concept

In Week 1, you will form groups. Your first task as a group is to conceive a technology start-up. The concept should be ambitious and innovative, but grounded in a realistic application of technology. It can be specific to the degree pathways represented in your group,

Portfolio Structure & Components

Ensure that your group nominates a single 'final version' of the group work (Parts 1, 2, and 3) to be submitted by all members, ensuring consistency.

Part 4 is an individual submission; all group members should upload their individual work along with their reflection.

Part 1: The Start-up Charter & Proposal (Group Submission)

- **Word Count:** 1000 words
- **Weighting:** 25%
- **Description:** This document is the foundation of your start-up. It outlines the what, why, and how of your venture, with a foundational statement on your intended professional and ethical stance.
- **Required Sections:**
    1. **Company Name & Mission Statement:** A clear, concise identity for your start-up.
    2. **Product/Service Description:** Detail what your technology does, its core features, and the problem it solves.
    3. **Target Audience & Market:** Who are your intended users? What is the market landscape?
    4. **Core Technology Stack:** Briefly outline the key technologies you would employ (e.g., Cloud infrastructure, AI models, specific programming languages, security protocols).
    5. **Initial Ethical Stance & Professional Commitment:** A statement outlining your company's core values regarding user privacy, data handling, inclusivity, and sustainability. This section must reference at least one major professional body's Code of Conduct (e.g., BCS, IET, ACM).

Part 2: Ethical, Legal, and Sustainability Impact Assessment (ELSIA) (Group Submission)

- **Word Count:** 2000 words
- **Weighting:** 40%

- **Description:** This is the core analytical piece of the portfolio. Building on your proposal, you must critically assess the potential impacts of your start-up. This is not a box-ticking exercise; it requires deep, critical analysis.
- **Required Sections:**
    1. **Ethical Framework Analysis:** Select two ethical theories (e.g., Deontology, Utilitarianism, Virtue Ethics) and apply them to a significant ethical dilemma your start-up could face (e.g., data privacy vs. feature utility; algorithmic bias; potential for misuse).
    2. **Regulatory & Governance Compliance:** Identify and analyse the key UK/EU regulations, laws, and standards that apply to your product/service. You must include a detailed consideration of:
        - Data Protection: GDPR and the Data Protection Act 2018.
        - Accessibility & Equality: The Equality Act 2010 and relevant standards (e.g., WCAG).
        - Any domain-specific regulations (e.g., financial conduct rules, upcoming AI Act considerations).
    3. **Sustainability & Environmental Impact:** Evaluate the environmental footprint of your technology across its lifecycle (from hardware manufacturing/sourcing to data centre energy consumption and e-waste). Propose a clear strategy to minimise this impact.
    4. **Societal Impact & Mitigation:** Consider the broader societal consequences. How might your technology affect the digital divide, job markets, misinformation, or community cohesion? How will you design your product and policies to mitigate negative impacts and promote positive social outcomes?

Part 3: The "Professional Challenge" Scenario Response (Group Submission)

- **Word Count:** 500 words
- **Weighting:** 15%
- **Description:** During a designated workshop in Week 7, your group will be presented with a randomised "crisis" scenario. You will have a short time to discuss and then formally write up your professional response. This tests your ability to apply ethical and professional principles under pressure.
- **Task:** Your submission must be a formal memo addressed to the "Board of Directors" (i.e., the module tutor) that:
    1. Identifies the nature of the crisis.
    2. Analyses the immediate ethical, legal, and professional implications.
    3. Outlines a clear, actionable, and ethically sound plan to manage the situation.
- **Example Scenarios:** A major data breach; a key team member leaves to join a competitor with your IP; your primary funder demands an unethical pivot in your business model; a viral social media campaign accuses your product of being biased or harmful.

Part 4: Individual Reflective Analysis (Individual Submission)

- **Word Count: 500 words**
- **Weighting: 20%**
- **Description:** This is your personal reflection on the project, your professional development, and the group work dynamic. It is submitted individually and confidentially. This component is crucial for demonstrating your personal engagement and serves as the mechanism for ensuring fair assessment by incorporating a peer evaluation of your contribution to the group tasks.
- **Peer Contribution and Mark Adjustment:** The collective peer feedback from all individual reflections to moderate the final mark awarded for the group components (Parts 1, 2, and 3) for each individual student. Significant, corroborated evidence of non-contribution may result in a lower mark for those components for the individual concerned. Conversely, evidence of exceptional contribution may be rewarded.

  In your reflection, you must evaluate each of your peers (excluding yourself) using the following scale and provide a brief, evidence-based justification for your rating:
    1. **Excellent Contribution:** The team member consistently took initiative, completed all assigned tasks to a high standard, and actively helped others.
    2. **Good Contribution:** The team member reliably completed all assigned tasks to a good standard and participated well in group discussions.

3. **Satisfactory Contribution:** The team member completed most of their assigned tasks, but sometimes required reminders or support from the group**.**
4. **Limited Contribution:** The team member failed to complete significant assigned tasks, was frequently absent, or did not engage meaningfully with the group process.

- **Prompts for Reflection:**
  1. Critically evaluate your own contribution to the group project, identifying your specific roles and tasks.
  2. Evaluate the contribution of your group members. For each member (excluding yourself), assign one of the contribution ratings (Excellent, Good, Satisfactory, Limited) and provide a brief, professional, and evidence-based justification for your choice.
  3. Discuss the most significant ethical or professional challenge your group faced (either in the project work or the group dynamic itself) and analyse how it was managed.
  4. Explain how the process of creating this portfolio has informed your understanding of your responsibilities as a future technology professional.
  5. Identify two key areas for your own continuing professional development (CPD) that have emerged from this module, and outline how you plan to address them.

Academic Integrity and Referencing

- **Description:** The demonstration of academic integrity and correct referencing is a professional standard expected across all parts of the portfolio.
- Failure to meet this standard will negatively impact the marks awarded for the relevant components. All external sources of information, ideas, or data must be scrupulously acknowledged.

All components of this portfolio must adhere to the university's standard referencing style, as outlined in Harvard - Cite Them Right (12th edition).
This includes, but is not limited to:

- In-text citations for any paraphrased or quoted material.
- A comprehensive reference list at the end of each written submission (Parts 1, 2, and 3 should have a shared reference list; Part 4 will have its own).
- Correctly formatted citations for a range of sources, including academic journals, books, official government/regulatory documents, industry standards, and reputable websites.

Correct referencing is not just about avoiding plagiarism; it is a key professional skill that demonstrates the evidence base for your analysis and arguments. You are strongly advised to use the university library's online resources and guides for Cite Them Right.

Word count (or equivalent):	4000 word equivalent (+/- 10%)

This is a reflection of the effort required for the assessment. Word counts will normally include any text, tables, calculations, figures, subtitles and citations. Reference lists and contents of appendices are excluded from the word count. Contents of appendices are not usually considered when determining your final assessment grade.

Academic or technical terms explained:

Algorithmic Bias: Systematic and repeatable errors in a computer system that create unfair outcomes, such as privileging one arbitrary group of users over others. This bias can arise from the data used to train the model, the algorithm's design, or how the results are interpreted and applied.

Continuing Professional Development (CPD): The ongoing, self-directed process of tracking and documenting the skills, knowledge, and experience you gain, both formally and informally, as you work. It is a core requirement for maintaining membership in professional bodies like the British Computer Society (BCS) or the Institution of Engineering and Technology (IET).

Deontology: An ethical framework that judges the morality of an action based on a set of rules, duties, or obligations. In deontology, specific actions are inherently right or wrong, regardless of their consequences. For example, a deontological view might hold that lying is always bad, even if it leads to a good outcome.

Digital Equitable Society (Digital Equity): A state in which all individuals and communities have the information technology capacity needed for full participation in our society, democracy, and economy. It goes beyond simple 'digital inclusion' (access to tech) to focus on the skills, support, and opportunities required to use that technology effectively.

ELSIA (Ethical, Legal, and Sustainability Impact Assessment): The specific name for the report required in Part 2 of this portfolio. It is a structured process of evaluating the potential ethical, legal, and environmental consequences of a technology project.

Ethical Framework: A structured system of principles and theories used to guide moral decision-making. Key examples include Deontology, Utilitarianism, and Virtue Ethics. You are expected to apply these frameworks to analyse complex situations.

GDPR (General Data Protection Regulation): The primary data protection law for the UK and EU. It governs how organisations must handle personal data, emphasising principles like lawfulness, fairness, transparency, data minimisation, and user rights (e.g., the right to access, the right to be forgotten).

Green Technology (Sustainable Computing): The practice of designing, manufacturing, using, and disposing of computers, servers, and associated subsystems (such as monitors, printers, storage devices) efficiently and effectively with minimal or no impact on the environment.

Misinformation / Disinformation: Misinformation refers to false information that is intentionally or unintentionally disseminated. Disinformation is deliberately misleading or biased information, a manipulated narrative, or a set of facts that is purposely distorted or fabricated, often used as propaganda. Both are key societal issues exacerbated by technology platforms.

Stakeholder: Any individual, group, or organisation who can affect, be affected by, or perceive themselves to be affected by your technology project. This includes obvious stakeholders, such as users and investors, as well as non-obvious ones, including local communities, government regulators, and even non-users who are indirectly affected.

Sustainability Lifecycle: The full lifecycle of a technology product, from the extraction and processing of raw materials (for hardware), through its design, manufacturing, distribution, and operational use (including energy consumption), to its end-of-life (e-waste, recycling, disposal).

Utilitarianism (a form of Consequentialism): An ethical framework that determines the rightness of an action by its outcome or consequences. The most ethical choice is the one that produces the greatest good for the greatest number of people.

Virtue Ethics: An ethical framework that focuses on the character of the moral agent rather than the rules or consequences of their actions. It asks, "What would a virtuous person do in this situation?" and emphasises virtues like honesty, compassion, integrity, and justice.

Artificial Intelligence Models – Guidance for this assessment:

Artificial Intelligence (AI) models can be a powerful tool to support your learning. The University has provided some resources to support you in its appropriate usage:

- Library Services AI Hub
- Student Guide to AI and Assessment
- Code of Conduct for Students on the use of AI
- Cite Them Right resource on citing materials relating to AI (if permitted)

As per the academic regulations (Academic Handbook Ah1_08), in all cases you must submit work that is your own, acknowledging any part of it that has been informed by another source – including that which is AI generated. Upon submission of work, you will be asked to confirm the following statement:

> *I confirm that this assignment is my own work, except where I have acknowledged the use of works from other sources, including the use of any artificial intelligence (AI) tools, in accordance with what is allowable as described in the assessment brief.*

Please note the following:

- AI should not be used as a substitute for your own knowledge, and you should never include any material that you do not understand and could not explain if asked.
- Not being able to explain your work when asked is likely to be a key factor when considering cases of academic misconduct related to AI.

The following information provides specific guidance for this assessment about what level of AI use is appropriate for this assessment. Remember that in all cases you must submit work that is your own, acknowledging any part of it that has been provided by another source.

NO USE OF GENERATIVE AI EXPECTED • Your assignment should be produced using information sourced by you from your learning materials and academic sources and cited appropriately. • AI tools for checking spelling, grammar and referencing may be used.	
AI ACKNOWLEDGED • You can use AI tools to learn about your topic, as part of your study, or in preparing initial guidance on assignments (e.g. headline structure, suggestions for inclusion of topics). • Any materials that you have sourced from AI should be rewritten or reconfigured and integrated into your own work and referenced appropriately. It is recommended that this is confirmed by a relevant academic source. • Any support gained from AI should be acknowledged in a statement at the end of the assignment, making clear what the support was, and how you used it and developed it for your own work. Example statements are available in the Student Code of Conduct.	☑
AI EMBEDDED • Use of AI is an integral and expected part of the assessment. • The explicit inclusion of AI within the assessment means that instructions on the expected use will be part of the assessment brief. • Your assessment brief will describe how you should acknowledge the way in which you used AI tools.	

Submission Details

Submission Deadline:	This will be provided on the Moodle submission point.	**Estimated Feedback Return Date**	This will normally be 20 working days after initial submission.
Submission Time:	By 4.00pm on the deadline day.		

Moodle/Turnitin:

Any assessments submitted after the deadline will not be marked and will be recorded as a non-attempt unless you have had an extension request agreed or have approved mitigating circumstances. See the School Moodle pages for more information on extensions and mitigating circumstances.

File Format:

The assessment must be submitted as a pdf document (save the document as a pdf in your software) and submit through the Turnitin submission point in Moodle.

Your assessment should be titled with your:

student ID number, module code and assessment ID,
e.g. st12345678 IST6000 PORT1

Late Submission Window Eligibility

Where submissions are eligible for the late-submission window this will be communicated in the relevant assessment submission point within Moodle.

Feedback

Feedback for the assessment will be provided electronically via Moodle. Feedback will be provided with comments on your strengths and the areas which you can improve. View the guidance on how to access your feedback.

All marks are provisional and are subject to quality assurance processes and confirmation at the programme Examination Board.

Assessment Criteria

Learning outcomes assessed

Learning Outcomes
[LO1] Synthesise and discuss the principles of ethics within computing and the wider application.
[LO2] Determine relevant regulations, governance frameworks and standards required for ethically aligned design.
[LO3] Consider the ethical, legal, social, professional, and environmental behaviours and best practices for technology professionals.
[LO4] Review contemporary ethical issues at the intersection of technology, economy, politics, environment, and society.
[LO5] Review the importance of a professional and ethical approach to computing and/ or engineering, along with the importance of lifelong professional development.

Assessment Criteria	100%
Part 1 The Start-up Charter & Proposal: [LO3] [LO4] [LO5]	25%
Part 2 Ethical, Legal, and Sustainability Impact Assessment (ELSIA): [LO1] [LO2] [LO3] [LO4]	40%
Part 3 The "Professional Challenge" Scenario Response: [LO2] [LO3] [LO5]	15%
Part 4 Individual Reflective Analysis: [LO1] [LO5]	20%

Other skills/attributes developed

This includes elements of the Cardiff Met EDGE (Ethical, Digital, Global and Entrepreneurial skills) and other attributes developed in students through the completion of the module and assessment. These will also be highlighted in the module guidance, which should be read by all students completing the module. Assessments are not just a way of auditing student knowledge. They are a process which provides additional learning and development through the preparation for and completion of the assessment.

Ethical	This assessment develops and evidences applied ethical reasoning by requiring students to progress from theoretical knowledge to practical application. The portfolio structure requires students first to formulate a foundational "Ethical Stance" for a simulated company. This is followed by a deep analytical task, the Ethical, Legal, and Sustainability Impact Assessment (ELSIA), where students must synthesise formal philosophical frameworks with real-world technological dilemmas. Finally, ethical competence is tested under pressure in the "Professional Challenge" scenario, where students must justify a course of action based on sound ethical principles.
Digital	This assessment fosters advanced Digital Professionalism by moving beyond standard literacy to the critical application of the laws and standards that govern the modern technology landscape. Students demonstrate this skill by analysing and integrating complex, real-world digital regulations—such as the UK GDPR and the principles of the EU AI Act—into their project's design and governance structure within the ELSIA. The production of the portfolio itself also serves as an artefact of professional digital communication skills.
Global	A global perspective is embedded throughout this assessment, requiring students to analyse the international dimensions and consequences of technology. The portfolio tasks necessitate global research, particularly in the sustainability lifecycle analysis, which examines international supply chains, component manufacturing, and the worldwide e-waste crisis. Furthermore, the societal impact evaluation requires consideration of how the proposed technology will affect diverse global cultures, economies, and the international digital divide.
Entrepreneurial	This assessment is, by its nature, an entrepreneurial endeavour, simulating the innovation lifecycle from ideation to critical evaluation. It builds entrepreneurial capability by requiring students to work as a founding team to develop a novel tech start-up concept. Key skills are evidenced through the portfolio's components: the Start-up Charter demonstrates innovation and strategic planning; the ELSIA serves as a comprehensive risk and impact analysis; and the "Professional Challenge" scenario develops real-time problem-solving and crisis management, core attributes of any successful entrepreneur.

Marking/Assessment Criteria

80%-100% (First Class - Outstanding/Exceptional) An outstanding and exceptional portfolio, potentially worthy of publication, that demonstrates a sophisticated and systematic understanding of all module concepts. The start-up proposal is innovative and professionally persuasive, with a sophisticated ethical stance. The ELSIA demonstrates exceptional synthesis and nuanced critical analysis of all ethical, legal, and sustainability dimensions. The crisis response is decisive, insightful, and considers second-order effects with sophistication. The individual reflection is deeply insightful, rigorously synthesising theory and personal practice. Referencing and scholarship are exemplary, exceeding the expectations for the level.
70%-79% (First Class) A First Class portfolio demonstrates a detailed and systematic understanding across all components. The start-up proposal is professional and persuasive, with a clearly articulated ethical stance. The ELSIA provides a detailed and critical analysis, confidently synthesising ethical frameworks and determining relevant regulations with clear justification. The crisis response is professional, decisive, and ethically sound. The individual reflection shows strong evidence of effective self-evaluation, connecting learning to future development. The work is supported by investigation beyond module materials, with consistently accurate referencing.
60%-69% (2:1 - Upper Second Class) A 2:1 portfolio is characterised by sound, well-structured work with some detailed analysis and critical enquiry. The proposal is clear and viable, and the ELSIA successfully applies key ethical and legal concepts, though the synthesis may be less seamless than at the first-class level. The crisis response is appropriate and substantiated. The reflection demonstrates a clear ability to evaluate personal performance, moving beyond simple description. Research is sound, with only occasional, minor errors in referencing.
50%-59% (2:2 - Lower Second Class) A 2:2 portfolio is satisfactory and competent, covering all required sections but often favouring description over critical analysis. The proposal is plausible and the ELSIA identifies relevant issues, but the analysis lacks depth. The crisis response is satisfactory but may be simplistic. The reflection is present but tends to be a descriptive account of events rather than a critical evaluation. The work shows an over-reliance on programme materials, and there are some errors in referencing.
40%-49% (Third Class) A Third Class portfolio demonstrates a basic understanding of the requirements but is underdeveloped and lacks analytical depth. The proposal and ELSIA identify some relevant points, but the application of key concepts is insecure and relies on reproducing information. The crisis response may be naive or unconvincing, and the reflection is superficial and largely descriptive. There are frequent errors in referencing and little evidence of reading beyond programme materials.
30%-39% (Narrow Fail) A Narrow Fail portfolio is incomplete and/or flawed, with significant weaknesses across the criteria. Key sections may be missing or poorly defined, and the work contains factual inaccuracies in important areas. There is a failure to apply key concepts from the module, such as synthesising ethical theories or determining a suitable professional response to the crisis. Reflection is extremely limited, and referencing is largely unsuccessful.
1%-29% (Clear Fail) A Clear Fail portfolio shows little or no evidence of meeting the learning outcomes. The work is absent, substantially irrelevant, or demonstrates no serious attempt to address the assessment brief. There is no evidence of analysis, synthesis, or critical evaluation, and reflections and referencing are negligible or absent. The work may be confused, clumsy, and show no understanding of professional or ethical practice.

Marking Rubric

Level 6	80%-100% (1st Class +)	70%-79% (1st)	60%-69% (2:1)	50%-59% (2:2)	40%-49% (3rd)	30-39% (Narrow Fail)	1-29% (Clear Fail)
Overall summary	Excellent (80-89%) or outstanding and exceptional (90-100%) Beyond level 6 Worthy of publication	Very good	Good	Satisfactory	Threshold	Not met some learning outcomes/assessment criteria	Not met many learning outcomes/assessment criteria 0% – Absent/work not submitted, penalty in some misconduct cases
Part 1: The Start-up Charter & Proposal(25%)	An outstandingly professional, persuasive, and innovative proposal that demonstrates exceptional, systematic understanding of the professional and societal context. The review of contemporary issues is insightful and the ethical stance is expertly integrated, reflecting a sophisticated approach to professional practice.	A very good proposal, presented to a high professional standard. It shows a detailed and thorough understanding of professional best practices and contemporary issues. The ethical stance is clearly articulated, well-aligned with the chosen professional codes, and demonstrates a confident review of professional responsibilities.	A sound and well-structured proposal that considers professional, social, and ethical behaviours appropriately. The review of contemporary issues is evident, and the application of professional codes is sound. There is some independent thinking, but it may rely partly on reproducing information.	A satisfactory proposal that covers all required sections but may lack depth. There is a basic understanding of professional behaviours and issues, but the presentation is favoured towards factual reporting. The ethical stance is present but may be generic.	A basic proposal where all sections are attempted but may be underdeveloped. It demonstrates limited understanding of professional behaviours and frequently reproduces information.	An incomplete or very poorly defined proposal. Fails to adequately consider professional, social, or ethical behaviours. Key sections may be missing or irrelevant.	Shows no serious attempt to meet the brief. Fails to meet many of the learning outcomes. The work is absent, substantially irrelevant, or shows no understanding of professional practice.

Level 6	80%-100% (1st Class +)	70%-79% (1st)	60%-69% (2:1)	50%-59% (2:2)	40%-49% (3rd)	30-39% (Narrow Fail)	1-29% (Clear Fail)
Part 2: Ethical, Legal, and Sustainability Impact Assessment (ELSIA)(40%)	A highly successful, systematic, and potentially publishable ELSIA. The synthesis of ethical frameworks is exceptional, the determination of regulations is insightful, and the critical review of impacts is nuanced, demonstrating a detailed analysis and independent inquiry.	A detailed and systematic ELSIA that demonstrates a confident synthesis of ethical theories with the practical dilemma. It successfully determines relevant regulations with clear justification and critically reviews a range of contemporary impacts in a sustained and substantiated argument.	A sound ELSIA with some detailed analysis and critical enquiry. It successfully applies ethical theories and determines relevant legal frameworks, though the synthesis may be less seamless. The review of impacts is appropriate and substantiated.	A competent ELSIA that tends to be more descriptive than analytical. It identifies relevant ethical and legal issues but with limited critical depth or enquiry. The review of impacts is present but not deeply analysed.	A basic ELSIA that identifies some relevant issues but with very limited analysis. The application of ethical theories and determination of laws is insecure, and the work relies heavily on reproducing factual information.	A flawed ELSIA with factual inaccuracies in important areas. Fails to synthesise concepts or determine regulations appropriately. Does not meet many learning outcomes.	Little to no evidence of analysis, synthesis, or critical evaluation. Fails to review issues or determine regulations. The work is largely descriptive, irrelevant, or absent.
Part 3: The "Professional Challenge" Scenario Response(15%)	An outstandingly professional and decisive response that considers the ethical, legal, and professional implications with sophistication. The plan is innovative, actionable, and demonstrates an exceptional understanding of professional conduct under pressure.	A very good, professional-standard response. The memo is well-articulated and the proposed plan is decisive, ethically sound, and justified with clear determination of relevant professional and legal standards.	A good, professional response. The plan is clear, appropriate, and considers ethical and professional behaviour well. The judgement is appropriate and arguments are substantiated.	A satisfactory response. A plausible plan is offered, but the consideration of professional or legal implications may be simplistic. The expression is clear overall.	An adequate response. An attempt is made to address the scenario, but the plan may be naive, unconvincing, or demonstrate limited consideration of professional best practices.	A poor response that fails to grasp the nature of the crisis. The plan is inappropriate, unethical, or absent. Fails to determine a suitable course of action.	A confused and clumsily expressed response that shows little ability to consider professional behaviour or determine a course of action. Work is absent or irrelevant.

Level 6	80%-100% (1st Class +)	70%-79% (1st)	60%-69% (2:1)	50%-59% (2:2)	40%-49% (3rd)	30-39% (Narrow Fail)	1-29% (Clear Fail)
Part 4: Individual Reflective Analysis(20%)	Demonstrates exceptional and insightful critical self-evaluation and provides sophisticated, constructive, and evidence-based peer feedback. Rigorously synthesises personal experience with module theory and outlines a sophisticated CPD plan.	Strong evidence of effective reflection and provides insightful and professional peer feedback. The analysis of personal performance is insightful, synthesises learning, and reviews the importance of a professional approach.	Demonstrates a clear ability to reflect on practice and provides clear and constructive peer feedback. The reflection moves beyond description to offer some critical evaluation and synthesis of personal learning.	Some ability to reflect, with peer feedback present but perhaps lacking detail or justification. The reflection is favoured towards descriptive accounts of events. The review of professional development is limited.	Limited and superficial reflection with peer feedback that is overly brief, unprofessional, or lacks evidence. The account is largely descriptive, with little synthesis or critical evaluation.	Self-evaluation is extremely limited and peer feedback is absent or wholly inappropriate. Fails to review the importance of a professional approach or plan for development.	Self-evaluation, reflections, and any form of peer analysis are negligible or absent. No evidence of an ability to engage in reflection or synthesise learning.

Further Information

Who can answer questions about my assessment?

Questions about the assessment should be directed to the staff member who has set the task/assessment brief. This will usually be the Module Leader. They will be happy to answer any queries you have.

Staff members can often provide feedback on an assignment plan but cannot review any drafts of your work prior to submission. The only exception to this rule is for Dissertation Supervisors to provide feedback on a draft of your dissertation.

Referencing and independent learning

Please ensure you reference a range of credible sources, with due attention to the academic literature in the area. The time spent on research and reading from good quality sources will be reflected in the quality of your submitted work.

Remember that what you get out of university depends on what you put in. Your teaching sessions typically represent between 10% and 30% of the time you are expected to study for your degree. A 20-credit module represents 200 hours of study time. The rest of your time should be taken up by self-directed study.

Unless stated otherwise you must use the **HARVARD** referencing system. Further guidance on referencing can be found in the Study Smart area on Moodle and using Cite Them Right (use your university login details to access the site). Correct referencing is an easy way to improve your marks and essential in achieving higher grades on most assessments.

Technical submission problems

It is strongly advised that you submit your work at least 24 hours before the deadline to allow time to resolve any last minute problems you might have. If you are having issues with IT or Turnitin you should contact the IT Helpdesk on (+44) 2920 417000. You may require evidence of the Helpdesk call if you are trying to demonstrate that a fault with Moodle or Turnitin was the cause of a late submission.

Late submission and mitigating circumstances

If you are experiencing personal difficulties which are impacting your ability to engage with assessment, there are a range of support options available, including via your Personal Academic Tutor, the Mitigating Circumstances procedure and the Support to Study procedure.

The Mitigating Circumstances policy and procedure sets out when and how students can:

- Submit eligible assessments late but have it recorded as 'on time', up to four times per level of study.
- Self-declare significant exceptional circumstances in order to defer the assessment to the next submission opportunity.

More information about Late Submission and Mitigating Circumstances is available on MetCentral.

Students with a disability or chronic illness should contact the University's Student Wellbeing Team to discuss any appropriate reasonable adjustments which may be made to their learning and assessments.

Academic Misconduct

Cardiff Met takes issues of academic misconduct **extremely seriously.** The University has procedures and penalties for dealing with academic misconduct. These are explained in full in the University's Academic Misconduct regulations and procedures under Volume 1, Section 8 of the Academic Handbook. The Module Leader reserves the right to interview students regarding any aspect of their work submitted for assessment.

Types of Academic Misconduct, include:

Plagiarism, which can be defined as using without acknowledgement another person's words or ideas and submitting them for assessment as though it were one's own work, for instance by copying, translating from one language to another or unacknowledged paraphrasing. Further examples include:

- Use of any quotation(s) from the published or unpublished work of other persons, whether published in textbooks, articles, the Web, or in any other format, where quotations have

not been clearly identified as such by being placed in quotation marks and acknowledged.

- Use of another person's words or ideas that have been slightly changed or paraphrased to make it look different from the original.
- Summarising another person's ideas, judgments, diagrams, figures, or computer programmes without reference to that person in the text and the source in a bibliography/reference list.
- Use of assessment writing services, essay banks and/or any other similar agencies (NB. Students are commonly being blackmailed after using essay mills).
- Use of unacknowledged material downloaded from the Internet.
- Re-use of one's own material except as authorised by your degree programme.

Collusion, which can be defined as when work that that has been undertaken with others is submitted and passed off as solely the work of one person. Modules will clearly identify where joint preparation and joint submission are permitted, in all other cases they are not.

Fabrication of data, making false claims to have carried out experiments, observations, interviews or other forms of data collection and analysis, or acting dishonestly in any other way.

How is my work graded?

Assessment grading is subject to thorough quality control processes. You can view a summary of these processes on the Assessment Explained Infographic.

Grading of work at each level of Cardiff Met degree courses is benchmarked against a set of general requirements set out in Volume 1, Section 4 of our Academic Handbook. A simplified version of these Grade Band Descriptors (GBDs) with short videos explaining some of the academic terminology used can be accessed for Foundation, 1st year, 2nd year and 3rd year undergraduate and MSc programmes.

We would strongly recommend looking at the Study Smart area of Moodle to find out more about assessments and key academic skills which can have a significant impact on your grades. Always check your work thoroughly before submission.

Cardiff Met

MetCaerdydd