**Faculty of Engineering, Environment and Computing**

##### Aviation Safety, Security and Emergency Planning

**Assignment Brief**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Module Title  **Aviation Safety, Security and Emergency Planning** | Indiv/Group:  **Individual Coursework** | | Cohort:  **September** | Module Code: |
| Coursework Title  **Report and Case Study** | | | | Hand out date:  **Tuesday 19 January 2021** |
| Lecturer  **Neil Wilson** | | | | Due date and time:  Aula:  **FRIDAY 02 APRIL 21 / 18:00** |
| Estimated Time (hrs): **35**  Word Limit\*: **3000**  (see note 6 below on word limit penalties) | | Coursework type:  **Individual Report** | | % of Module Mark  **100** |
| Submission arrangement: **online via Aula (maximum file size is 20Mb)**  File types and method of recording: **Word or pdf document**  Mark and Feedback date: **Monday 19 April 2021**  Mark and Feedback method: **electronic and individual audio recording via Turnitin in Aula; additional verbal feedback will also be available via Zoom (by appointment)** | | | | |

|  |
| --- |
| Module Learning Outcomes Assessed:     1. Demonstrate an understanding of the regulatory framework underpinning safety and security operations in the aviation industry 2. Critically assess the human aspects of devices and procedures required to achieve safety in the air and on the ground 3. Evaluate the use of a variety of rules and technology in the pursuit of aviation security 4. Demonstrate an understanding of the principles of Emergency Planning Procedures |
| Task and Mark distribution:   1. **Compare** and **contrast** two different aviation disasters, the lessons learnt from the disasters and the impact they had on the aviation business. One of your disasters will be the Tenerife disaster which occurred on 27 March 1977 (classified as a **safety** disaster), and the other will be a **security** disaster of your choice.   In your report, you can use any appropriate academic resources when discussing the security disaster; however, when discussing the Tenerife disaster, you **must** refer to two academic journals, in addition to other appropriate academic sources:  Weick, K. (1990) ‘The vulnerable system: an analysis of the Tenerife Air Disaster’. *Journal of Management* 16 (3), 571-593  McCreary, J., Pollard, M., Stevenson, K., and Wilson, M. (1998) ‘Human Factors: Tenerife Revisited’. *Journal of Air Transportation World Wide* 3 (1), 23-31  **Suggested Word Count: ±2000 words**  *You should firstly choose a security disaster to analyse, as per the classification model delivered in class. You should briefly describe the two disasters (the Tenerife disaster plus a security disaster), and then discuss the operational, managerial, and regulatory aspects of the incidences, the lessons learned and any changes that were introduced as a result of the disasters. Using original and insightful reflection, look for connections and common themes in the explanations for each of your chosen disasters.*   1. Using Alexander’s Disaster Cycle (2002) as a framework, **critically evaluate** the emergency response to the Kegworth accident on 8 January 1989 which was the last major aviation disaster in the UK. You should analyse the response to the disaster in the context of the four main segments of the Cycle: Mitigation, Preparation, Response and Recovery.   **Suggested Word Count: ±1000 words**  *You must write a case study which critically evaluates the performance of all key stakeholders when responding to the Kegworth accident. Be mindful that actions before the event (Mitigation and Preparation) affected actions after the event (Response and Recovery). You will need to engage with a range of literature to formulate your critical evaluation, including the official report into the accident, academic journals and media reports. You may also wish to include within the critical evaluation reference to existing disaster management strategies, found in the Manchester Airport Emergency Orders and the bmi Emergency Response Procedures Manual.*  *Having completed the evaluation of the emergency response with the Disaster Cycle providing a framework, it may be appropriate to then briefly assess the value of Alexander’s model.* |
| Notes:   1. You are expected to use either APA OR CU Harvard style for referencing. For support and advice on this students can contact [Centre for Academic Writing (CAW)](http://www.coventry.ac.uk/study-at-coventry/student-support/academic-support/centre-for-academic-writing/?theme=main). 2. Please notify your registry course support team and module leader for disability support. 3. Any student requiring an extension or deferral should follow the university process as outline 4. The University cannot take responsibility for any coursework lost or corrupted on disks, laptops or personal computer. Students should therefore regularly back-up any work and are advised to save it on the University system. 5. If there are technical or performance issues that prevent submitting coursework through the online coursework submission system on the day of a coursework deadline, an appropriate extension to the coursework submission deadline will be agreed. This extension will normally be 24 hours or the next working day if the deadline falls on a Friday or over the weekend period. This will be communicated via your Module Leader. 6. \*Assignments that are more than 10% over the word limit will result in a deduction of 10% of the mark i.e. a mark of 60% will lead to a reduction of 6% to 54%. The word limit includes quotations, but excludes the bibliography, reference list and tables. 7. You are encouraged to check the originality of your work by using the draft Turnitin links on Aula. 8. Collusion between students (where sections of your work are similar to the work submitted by other students in this or previous module cohorts) is taken extremely seriously and will be reported to the academic conduct panel. This applies to both courseworks and exam answers. 9. A marked difference between your writing style, knowledge and skill level demonstrated in class discussion, any test conditions and that demonstrated in a coursework assignment may result in you having to undertake a Viva Voce in order to prove the coursework assignment is entirely your own work. 10. If you make use of the services of a proof reader in your work you must keep your original version and make it available as a demonstration of your written efforts. Also, please read the university [Proof Reading Policy](https://share.coventry.ac.uk/students/Registry/_layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/students/Registry/Documents/Proof_reading_Guidance.docx&action=default). 11. You must not submit work for assessment that you have already submitted (partially or in full), either for your current course or for another qualification of this university, with the exception of resits, where for the coursework, you maybe asked to rework and improve a previous attempt. This requirement will be specifically detailed in your assignment brief or specific course or module information. Where earlier work by you is citable, i.e. it has already been published/submitted, you must reference it clearly.  Identical pieces of work submitted concurrently may also be considered to be self-plagiarism. |

**Mark allocation guidelines to students**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0-39 | 40-49 | 50-59 | 60-69 | 70+ |
| Work mainly incomplete and /or weaknesses in most areas | Most elements completed; weaknesses outweigh strengths | Most elements are strong, minor weaknesses | Strengths in all elements | Most work exceeds the standard expected |

**Marking Rubric**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **GRADE** | **ANSWER RELEVANCE, KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING**  **35** |  | **DISCUSSION, JUDGEMENT, ARGUMENT & COHERENCE**  **30** |  | **EVIDENCE, INVESTIGATION AND REFERENCING**  **15** |  | **STRUCTURE, STYLE AND CLARITY**  **20** |  |
| **Distinction**  **≥70** | * Innovative response, answers the questions fully * Fully addresses the learning objectives of the assessment task * Evidence of critical analysis, synthesis, evaluation, and insightful reflection * Extensive range of key issues identified |  | * Well-informed, original and engaging discussion from a range of sources * A clear, consistent in-depth critical and evaluative argument * Clear line of argument to support conclusions * Wide-ranging and convincing engagement with theoretical and conceptual analysis. |  | * Excellent and original range of appropriate supporting evidence provided * Material used goes beyond the recommended texts * Consistently and accurately referenced with no errors. |  | * No spelling, punctuation and grammatical errors * Excellent organisation and structure * Expression concise, accurate and well-articulated * Outstanding use of diagrams, charts, graphs, tables etc. to aid analysis, discussion and argument. |  |
| **Merit**  **60-69** | * A very good attempt to address the learning objectives of the assignment * An emphasis on those elements requiring critical review * Appropriate personal/professional reflections * Broad range of key issues identified. |  | * Informed and original discussion * The argument is well-reasoned, considered and challenging * A generally clear line of critical and evaluative argument * The answer demonstrates a very good understanding of theories, concepts and issues. |  | * A good range, depth and complexity of relevant sources is used in a largely consistent way as supporting evidence * There is use of some sources beyond recommended texts * Correctly referenced in the main with minimal deficiencies. |  | * Minimal spelling, punctuation and grammatical errors * Logical organisation and well-structured * Coherent; clearly expressed using professional language * Good use of diagrams, charts, graphs, tables etc. to aid analysis, discussion and argument. |  |
| **Upper Pass**  **50-59** | * Competently addresses objectives but may contain errors or omissions * Critical discussion of issues may be superficial or limited in places * Reflection evident – but lacks depth * Key issues identified. |  | * Some discussion * The argument – whilst structured – is not always convincing * The work is too descriptive in places and there is an over-reliance on the work of others * The answer demonstrates a good understanding of some relevant theories, concepts and issues. |  | * A good range of relevant sources is used, but the critical evaluation aspect is not fully presented * There is limited use of sources beyond the standard recommended materials * Referencing is not always correctly presented. |  | * Some spelling, punctuation and grammatical errors * Organisation evident but the structure lacks clarity * Generally coherent but with some noticeable lapses in expression * Some use of diagrams, charts, graphs, tables etc. to aid analysis, discussion and argument |  |
| **Lower Pass**  **40-49** | * Addresses most objectives of the assignment, but with some notable omissions * There is very limited critical analysis * Very little reflection evident * Some key issues identified. |  | * The work is mainly descriptive with minimal discussion * The argument is limited/developing * There is a weak structure to the argument which lacks coherence * Limited theoretical engagement. |  | * A limited range of relevant sources used * Material not presented as supporting or conflicting evidence * Referencing has many deficiencies. |  | * Many spelling, punctuation and grammatical errors * Inadequate attention to organisation and structure * Vague and over-simplistic expression * Little use of diagrams, charts, graphs, tables etc. to aid analysis, discussion and argument. |  |
| **Fail**  **<40** | * Major deviation from the objectives of the assignment, and may not consistently address the assignment brief; at the lower end, fails to answer the question set or address the learning objectives * There is minimal, or no, evidence of analysis or evaluation * No reflection evident * Significant key issues omitted. |  | * Purely descriptive * The argument is illogical/anecdotal * There is no clear structure to the argument * No evidence of theoretical engagement; at the lower end displays a minimal level of understanding. |  | * Very limited use and application of relevant sources as supporting evidence; very limited evidence of wider reading * At the lower end demonstrates a lack of real understanding * Referencing consistently fails to adhere to the APA/Harvard standard. |  | * Major deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar * Disorganised with major lapses in structure * Incoherent expression * Very limited use of diagrams, charts, graphs, tables etc. |  |