

MARKING CRITERIA and STUDENT FEEDBACK

This section details the assessment criteria. The *extent* to which these are demonstrated by you determines your mark. The marks available for each criterion are shown. Lecturers will use the space provided to comment on the achievement of the task(s), including those areas in which you have performed well and areas that would benefit from development/improvement.

Common Assessment Criteria Applied	Marks Available	Marks Awarded
1. Engagement with Literature Skills		
Good extensive referencing in the appropriate format. Legal issues GDPR covered in some depth and well but not clearly related to Data security in databases, no other relevant. legal issues discussed Referencing extensive and applied well. Laws need to be Named and dated correctly as different versions may be available.	20	13
2. Knowledge and Understanding Skills		
Some good explanations of issues, related to the department, but large chunks of generic data hides important areas such as job descriptions of jobs not related to Data security, it would have been better to give more detail. Iso 27000 etc not mentioned at all,	10	5
3. Cognitive and Intellectual Skills		
Good attempt at discussion of database security, Policies and Risk management discussed quite well- however not related to data security of databases or other electronic data - some areas not so clear.- rather generic and a bit basic However recommendations of software not made, no overall conclusions made, no discussion of security governance.	25	4
4. Practical Application Skills		
Discussion of Risk management well done with a good set of criteria discussed, an awareness of the limitations of GDPR rules shown, however this did not extend further into other discussions. An attempt at designing the new department was appropriately signposted in some areas, however no software or other requirements were discussed at all.	25	10
5. Transferable Skills for Life and Professional Practice		
Overall apart from a few organisation issues a well written piece of work was created, the approach to the personal research project was a little lower level than required but it was well researched with appropriate discussion and conclusion. The New department design was slightly fragmentary and in places the focus on the data security situation was lost. Careful- SPG errors! Privet- should be private- check by reading through, Data classification team Rants data? HMS not explained what it is - should be done the first time an acronym is used.	20	12

Assignment Mark (Assessment marks are subject to ratification at the Exam Board. These comments and marks are to give feedback on module work and are for guidance only until they are confirmed.)	Late Submission Penalties (tick if appropriate)		44
	Up to four weeks late		
	1st/2nd/3rd attempt?	1st	