Assessment 1 – Identifying Professional Considerations

Key Info

- 1000 word piece of writing
- Draft submission b 4pm Friday 22nd October
- Peer review process to be announced
- Final submission by 4pm Friday 5th November
- 40% of your mark for this course

The Task

Introduction

You might have noticed that the learning outcomes for this course are generally of the form "identify X and suggest ways to make improvements". This first task is focused on the identification part. I am looking for you to reflect on your position in a (semi)real situation and anticipate some potential societal consequences.

Part 1: The Project

First choose a piece of technical work you are doing, or have previously done, such as a coursework or internship. We'll refer to this as your project. The default here for most of you is likely to be the task for the Informatics Large Practical, or Introductory Applied Machine Learning. SEPP's coursework is explicitly off limits, as you've already answered some relevant questions on that.

For the purposes of this task, you should imagine that you are actually undertaking your project in a real world (i.e. not coursework) setting. This may be as part of a research project, development of a new system at an existing company, or as part of a small team at a startup. The important parts are that it fits into a full system with defined purpose and that the intention is to deploy this system into the world.

Part 2: The Essay

Write an essay that answers the following question:

"How might your work on this project contribute to unintentional harm?"

The three main parts of this task are (in probable order of difficulty):

1. Describing the important details of the project concisely for a non-technical reader.
2. Anticipating potential harms or other negative influences of this system and making an argument for how important it is to attend to them.
3. Self-reflection on your own role and responsibility within this scenario and how it fits into a wider context of other actors/stakeholders.

You can explicitly make these separate subsections if you like, but the whole essay should still flow together as a coherent piece. If you do this, I would strongly recommend keeping the project description as concise as possible.

Peer Review

The deadline for the first draft of this essay is **4pm on Friday 22nd October**. At this point, you will be submitting on Learn, as well as to your Peer Review partner. Details for how to do this, and how to do

the peer review will be given closer to the time. In summary though, you will have a week to review your partner's essay and provide feedback, then another week to finish the essay using that feedback before you finally submit it on Learn to be marked, deadline **4pm Friday 5th November**.

Advice

Good essays will:

- Clearly choose a main position
- Clarify important details with reference to other sources
- Consider the terms used and define them where necessary
- Justify arguments with reference to course materials
- Anticipate and address counterarguments

How well you do these things will be the core criteria for marking your essays.

Marking

You can expect the marking to be very similar to essays in SEPP. Here, again, are some of the main things markers will be looking for:

- Answers the question
- Clarity
- Appropriate structure
- Supported by other sources
- Quality of argument
- Recognition of counterarguments / alternate views
- Knowledge and understanding
- Style and presentation

You will receive a mark according to the following scale (in line with the University's Extended Common Marking Scheme):

- Pass (40+): Essay attempts to address the provided question but is hard to understand and/or makes few clear points.
- Good (50+): Essay is understandable, clarifies key terms, and comes to one or more obvious conclusions. Some course materials and external sources are referenced.
- Very good (60+): Essay has a good structure, flowing between and building upon subsequent points. It identifies possible counter arguments or alternative views and integrates a variety of external sources. The self-assessment is honest, but not very reflective.
- Excellent (70+): Essay reads well and contains well-made arguments which pull together a variety of views and sources. The self-assessment shows extra effort in reflection.
- Excellent (80+): Marks in this range are uncommon. This essay draws the reader in and makes points beyond what would be expected of undergraduate students in Informatics.