



IN ASSOCIATION WITH



UNDERSTANDING HOW TO RESPOND TO YOUR CAPSTONE CASE STUDY ESSAY PROMPT

CAPSTONE – SES311

Introduction

Students are expected to respond to the prompt by bringing together knowledge and skills from across the entire BSS program. Answers must be in English, contain properly analyzed data, display critical thinking, and incorporate knowledge and theories relating to ethics, the law and security sciences.

The Prompt

All prompts follow the same basic pattern.

“Assess the likelihood of [*specific security threat*] to the [*specific location*] and develop a plan for the Ministry of Interior that

- responds to the threat by covering prevention, mitigation and response,
- utilizes international best practice, and
- is consistent with the ethical and legal responsibilities of security officers.”



Marking Your Answer

There is no one correct way of writing a *Capstone* Extended Essay, in terms of either format or answer. Student responses will be marked according to the following five criteria drawn from the BSS Program Intended Learning Outcomes. Students should take care that their answer covers all aspects of the prompt.

More information on the Program Intended Learning Outcomes can be found in the **Student Handbook: SH03 Program Intended Learning Outcomes**. All parts of the Student Handbook are available in English and Arabic.

The Definition Criterion

The Definition criterion (PILOs 2.1.1 and 2.2.1) is used to evaluate the student’s ability to “assess the likelihood” of the given threat.

Based on standard intelligence practices, we are looking for an appreciation of the magnitude and likelihood/probability of the threat, but also acceptance that our ability to estimate the magnitude and likelihood is not perfect.

Table 1: Definition Criterion Annotation

Unsatisfactory	Baseline	Developing	Good	Exemplary
Problem not identified.	One aspect of the problem identified.	Multiple aspects of the problem identified	...and outlines associated constraints	...and sets an overall framework for the investigation.
The student does not assess the security threat	The student describes the size/seriousness or likelihood of the threat (stated in qualitative or quantitative terms).	The student describes the size/ seriousness and likelihood of the threat (stated in qualitative or quantitative terms).	The student explains the limits, assumptions, or weaknesses of his threat assessment.	The student places his threat assessment within a clearly explained method/model that is based on industry/ intelligence standards or international best practice.



The Innovation Criterion

The Innovation criterion (PILO 2.2.3) is used to evaluate the student’s ability to “develop a plan for the Ministry of Interior that responds to the threat by covering prevention, mitigation and response”.

We are looking for a well specified, effective and realistic proposal that attempts to prevent the threat from occurring, can reduce/mitigate the severity of any consequences if it does occur, and can enable an adequate response if it does occur.

Table 2: Innovation Criterion Annotation

Unsatisfactory	Baseline	Developing	Good	Exemplary
No approach recommended.	Uni-dimensional approach recommended.	Multi-dimensional approach recommended	...with realistic design specifications	...and that are appropriate for context (e.g. technology, policy, customs).
The student does not provide a plan.	The student describes how to prevent or mitigate or respond to the threat.	The student describes two or more of how to prevent or mitigate or respond to the threat.	The student’s descriptions contain enough detail that its feasibility and effectiveness are clear.	The student’s detailed specifications clearly incorporate international best practice.

The Application Criterion

The Application criterion (PILO 2.3.3) is used to evaluate the student’s ability to develop a plan that “is consistent with the ethical and legal responsibilities of security officers” in Saudi Arabia.

We are looking for the knowledge and critical thinking skills developed through the Law, Ethics and Responsibility cluster (for details, see your **Student Handbook: SH04 Course Catalogue**). Students must clearly explain how their plan takes account of Saudi Arabia’s special religious, social and cultural context, and how its requirements are consistent with ethical and legal norms.



Table 3: Application Criterion Annotation

Unsatisfactory	Baseline	Developing	Good	Exemplary
No application attempted.	Single finding applied to specific context within Saudi Arabia.	Multiple findings applied to specific context within Saudi Arabia	...and generalisations drawn about how to apply the concepts	...and describe extrapolations to other security challenges.
The student does not identify any ethical, legal, or cultural considerations relevant to his plan.	The student describes one ethical, legal, or cultural consideration relevant to his plan.	The student describes two or more ethical, legal, or cultural considerations relevant to his plan.	The student details credible ways to address the identified ethical, legal and cultural considerations.	The student describes how these considerations have been addressed in other referenced security operations.

The Justification Criterion

The Justification criterion (PILO 2.2.4) is used to evaluate the student’s ability to prepare contingency plans.

We are looking for weaknesses and potential problems in the proposal to be identified, and for workarounds or alternative approaches that can still deliver the most important aspects of the original plan.

Table 4: Justification Criterion Annotation

Unsatisfactory	Baseline	Developing	Good	Exemplary
No justification provided.	One shortcoming of the solution/ method described.	Multiple shortcomings of the solution/ method described	...with an explanation of why shortcomings are not serious	...and identifies areas for future research to improve outcomes.
The student does not identify any weaknesses in his plan.	The student describes one thing that could go wrong with the plan.	The student describes multiple things that could go wrong with the plan.	The student proposes credible alternatives that preserve outcomes should the identified parts of the plan go wrong.	The student discusses other named cases, scenarios or international best practice that explain the effectiveness of his contingency plan.



The Evidence Criterion

The Evidence criterion (PILOs 2.1.2 and 2.2.2) is used to evaluate the student’s ability to support claims with clearly referenced facts, figures and data.

We are looking for a range of quantitative and qualitative evidence. Student opinions or experiences are not acceptable as evidence; demonstrable or measurable facts and figures are acceptable, as are clearly referenced expert interpretations. Evidence must be unambiguously used to support claims made within the student’s response. This evidence can be drawn from any BSS course or from your own independent research.

Table 5: Evidence Criterion Annotation

Unsatisfactory	Baseline	Developing	Good	Exemplary
No evidence gathered.	One piece of evidence gathered.	Multiple pieces of evidence gathered	...that are of different types and sources	...and with their quality explicitly assessed.
The student does not provide any facts or figures to support any claims.	The student provides one fact, figure, dataset or graphic in support of one claim.	The student provides facts, figures, datasets or graphics in support of two or more different claims.	The student presents evidence in multiple formats such as written sentences, data tables, graphs, statistical output or maps. Clear referencing must be present to demonstrate multiple sources.	The student discusses the reliability and credibility of any evidence presented in terms of data completeness, collection methods, accuracy of measurement or source authority etc.