CPE 344 SEMESTRAL PROJECT:

DUE DATE: MAY 6-13, 2025 (Submission and Presentation)

1. Legal Compliance Audit Report (Philippine IT Laws and Policies)

Objective: Students will select a local tech company or a fictional company, research its adherence to various Philippine IT laws (e.g., Data Privacy Act, E-Commerce Law, etc.), and create a compliance audit report.

Deliverables: A detailed report that identifies legal areas of concern, suggests improvements for compliance, and presents an action plan for adhering to relevant laws.

Rubric for Compliance with Philippine IT Laws and Policies

Criteria	Excellent (4)	Proficient (3)	Basic (2)	Needs Improvement (1)	Score
Adherence to Legal Frameworks (e.g., Data Privacy Act, Cybercrime Prevention Act, E-Commerce Act, FOI policies, etc.)	Fully complies with all relevant IT laws and policies; demonstrates in-depth understanding and implementation.	Mostly complies, with minor lapses in compliance or understanding.	Partially complies, with significant gaps in knowledge or implementation.	Fails to comply with key legal requirements, demonstrating little to no understanding.	
Data Privacy and Security Measures	Implements comprehensive security and privacy protocols; fully protects personal and sensitive data.	Implements standard security measures but has minor vulnerabilities.	Security and privacy measures are incomplete or inconsistently applied.	Lacks basic security and privacy measures, exposing data to risks.	
Ethical Considerations and Responsible Use of IT	Demonstrates strong ethical standards in IT usage, preventing misuse of technology.	Generally follows ethical guidelines with occasional lapses.	Shows limited awareness of ethical IT use and has minor ethical violations.	Engages in unethical or irresponsible IT practices.	
Documentation and Reporting Compliance	Maintains well-organized, up-to-date, and complete documentation of IT policies and compliance activities.	Has documentation, but some reports or records are incomplete or outdated.	Documentation exists but is poorly maintained or lacks essential details.	No proper documentation of compliance activities.	
Response to IT-related Legal and Security Incidents	Has a clear, effective response plan for legal and security incidents; follows protocols diligently.	Has a response plan but needs improvement in execution.	Has a limited or unclear response plan.	No response plan or fails to act on security/legal incidents.	

Scoring Guide
20 - 17 = Excellent (Fully Compliant)
16 - 13 = Proficient (Mostly Compliant)
12 - 9 = Basic (Partially Compliant)
8 or below = Needs Improvement (Non-Compliant)

2. Ethical Decision-Making Framework (Professional and Ethical Responsibilities)

Objective: Students will create an ethical decision-making framework tailored to the role of a computer engineer, using case studies and hypothetical scenarios that involve ethical dilemmas in the tech industry.

Deliverables: A presentation and written report explaining the framework, the reasoning behind ethical decisions, and how to apply this framework in professional practice.

Rubric for Ethical Decision-Making Framework Application

Criteria	Excellent (4)	Proficient (3)	Basic (2)	Needs Improvement (1)	Score

Identification of Ethical Issues	Clearly identifies and defines ethical dilemmas, considering multiple perspectives and professional responsibilities.	Identifies ethical issues but lacks depth in analyzing multiple perspectives.	Recognizes ethical concerns but does not explore them in detail.	Fails to identify or inaccurately describes ethical issues.	
Application of Ethical Theories and Principles	Effectively applies relevant ethical theories (e.g., utilitarianism, deontology, virtue ethics) and professional codes of conduct.	Applies ethical theories but may lack depth or integration with professional standards.	Shows limited understanding of ethical theories and their application.	Does not apply ethical principles or misinterprets them.	
Decision-Making Process and Justification	Presents a structured, logical decision-making framework with clear justification for ethical choices.	Provides a decision-making process but lacks full clarity or justification.	Includes a decision-making process but does not fully justify ethical choices.	Lacks a structured process and provides weak or no justification.	
Consideration of Stakeholders and Consequences	Thoroughly analyzes the impact of decisions on all relevant stakeholders, including long-term effects.	Considers stakeholders but lacks depth in analyzing long-term consequences.	Mentions stakeholders but does not fully explore potential impacts.	Ignores stakeholder considerations and consequences.	
Implementation and Practicality	Proposes realistic, actionable solutions that align with professional and ethical responsibilities.	Suggests solutions but may lack full feasibility or practical implementation.	Offers basic solutions with limited real-world applicability.	Provides impractical or unrealistic solutions.	
Clarity, Organization, and Presentation	Communicates ideas clearly, logically, and professionally, with strong supporting evidence.	Presents ideas effectively but with minor clarity or organization issues.	The framework is somewhat disorganized, making key points difficult to follow.	Lacks clear structure, making the framework difficult to understand.	

Scoring Guide
24 - 21 = Excellent (Comprehensive and Well-Developed Framework)
20 - 17 = Proficient (Good Framework with Minor Gaps)
16 - 13 = Basic (Needs Improvement in Several Areas)
12 or below = Needs Significant Improvement (Incomplete or Ineffective Framework)

3. Impact Assessment of an Engineering Solution (Engineering Solutions and Societal Effects)

Objective: Students will analyze a real-world engineering solution (e.g., a software, product, or service) and assess its societal, cultural, and environmental impacts. They will identify positive and negative effects, ethical considerations, and ways to mitigate harm.

Deliverables: A comprehensive impact assessment report and a presentation with suggestions for improvement or alternatives that are more socially responsible.

Rubric for Engineering Solutions and Societal Effects

Criteria	Excellent (4)	Proficient (3)	Basic (2)	Needs Improvement (1)	Score
Effectiveness of Engineering Solutions	The solution effectively addresses the problem with innovative and well-executed engineering principles.	The solution addresses the problem with minor inefficiencies or limitations.	The solution partially addresses the problem but has significant weaknesses.	The solution is ineffective or does not properly address the problem.	

Sustainability and Environmental Impact	The solution is highly sustainable, environmentally friendly, and minimizes negative effects.	The solution considers sustainability but has minor environmental concerns.	The solution has some sustainability considerations but may cause harm.	The solution lacks sustainability and negatively impacts the environment.	
Ethical Considerations and Social Responsibility	Fully considers ethical concerns, adheres to regulations, and prioritizes public safety and well-being.	Generally considers ethics and safety, but with minor oversights.	Shows limited awareness of ethical concerns or safety considerations.	Ignores ethical responsibilities or compromises public safety.	
Economic and Social Benefits	The solution significantly improves economic conditions and positively impacts society.	The solution has moderate economic and social benefits.	The solution has minimal benefits but is not harmful.	The solution has a negative or negligible effect on society and the economy.	
Adaptability and Scalability	The solution is adaptable and scalable to different contexts and future advancements.	The solution is somewhat adaptable but may need modifications for scalability.	The solution has limited adaptability or scalability.	The solution is rigid and cannot be effectively adapted or expanded.	

Scoring Guide
20 - 17 = Excellent (Highly Effective and Responsible)
16 - 13 = Proficient (Generally Effective and Responsible)
12 - 9 = Basic (Needs Improvement in Some Areas)
8 or below = Needs Significant Improvement (Ineffective or Harmful Solution)

4. Contemporary Issues Research Paper (Contemporary Issues)

Objective: Students will select a current issue in computer engineering (e.g., AI ethics, cybersecurity threats, or the role of automation) and conduct in-depth research, offering solutions or recommendations to address these issues.

Deliverables: A research paper and a class presentation that explores the issue, its relevance, and the potential solutions or policy recommendations for the future.

Rubric for Engineering Contemporary Issues

Criteria	Excellent (4)	Proficient (3)	Basic (2)	Needs Improvement (1)	Score
Understanding of Contemporary Engineering Issues	Demonstrates a deep and well-researched understanding of current engineering challenges and trends.	Shows a good grasp of contemporary engineering issues with some minor gaps.	Displays a basic understanding but lacks depth in analysis.	Limited or inaccurate understanding of contemporary engineering issues.	
Critical Analysis and Problem-Solving	Thoroughly analyzes issues, evaluates multiple perspectives, and proposes innovative solutions.	Analyzes issues well but may lack depth in solution proposals.	Identifies issues but provides limited analysis or simplistic solutions.	Struggles to analyze issues or propose relevant solutions.	
Ethical, Social, and Environmental Considerations	Fully integrates ethical, social, and environmental factors into the analysis and proposed solutions.	Considers ethical and social factors but may lack depth in addressing them.	Recognizes ethical concerns but does not integrate them effectively into solutions.	Lacks awareness or consideration of ethical, social, and environmental impacts.	
Use of Data and Research	Uses high-quality, credible sources to support analysis and conclusions.	Uses relevant research, though some sources may lack credibility or depth.	Uses minimal or weak sources to support arguments.	No substantial research or reliance on unreliable sources.	

Communication and Presentation of Ideas	Communicates ideas clearly, logically, and professionally, with strong supporting evidence.	Communicates ideas effectively but may have minor clarity or structure issues.	Ideas are somewhat unclear or lack logical flow.	Poorly communicates ideas with little coherence or evidence.	

Scoring Guide
20 - 17 = Excellent (Highly Informed and Analytical)
16 - 13 = Proficient (Well-Informed with Minor Gaps)
12 - 9 = Basic (Needs Improvement in Some Areas)
8 or below = Needs Significant Improvement (Limited or Inaccurate Understanding)

5. Lifelong Learning Portfolio (Lifelong Learning Strategies)

Objective: Students will develop a personal lifelong learning plan that includes current skills, career goals, certifications, and strategies for continuous learning in the evolving field of computer engineering.

Deliverables: A portfolio with personal development goals, a timeline for achieving them, and an analysis of the resources available for ongoing learning (e.g., online courses, conferences, industry journals).

Rubric for Lifelong Learning Portfolio

Criteria	Excellent (4)	Proficient (3)	Basic (2)	Needs Improvement (1)	Score
Learning Goals and Personal Development Plan	Clearly defined short- and long-term learning goals aligned with personal and professional growth, supported by a structured development plan.	Sets learning goals but lacks a detailed plan for achievement.	Goals are vague or inconsistent with professional growth; minimal planning.	No clear learning goals or personal development plan.	
Engagement in Learning Activities	Actively engages in diverse learning activities (e.g., courses, certifications, self-study, mentorships) and demonstrates initiative in continuous learning.	Participates in learning activities but lacks variety or consistency.	Engages in minimal learning activities with little initiative.	Shows little to no effort in engaging with learning opportunities.	
Application of Acquired Knowledge and Skills	Effectively applies new knowledge and skills in professional or personal contexts, demonstrating impact and growth.	Applies learning in some areas but lacks clear demonstration of impact.	Limited application of acquired knowledge with little real-world impact.	No evidence of applying learned skills.	
Reflection and Self-Assessment	Provides deep, thoughtful reflection on learning experiences, including strengths, areas for improvement, and future learning plans.	Reflects on learning experiences but lacks depth or future planning.	Basic reflections with minimal insights or plans for improvement.	Little to no reflection on learning experiences.	
Use of Learning Strategies and Resources	Demonstrates effective use of a variety of learning strategies (e.g., time management, goal setting, self-directed learning) and utilizes available resources efficiently.	Uses some learning strategies but may not fully optimize available resources.	Relies on limited learning strategies with minimal effectiveness.	Lacks use of effective learning strategies and resources.	
Portfolio Organization and Presentation	Well-structured, professionally presented portfolio with clear documentation of learning progress, achievements, and future goals.	Organized and presentable portfolio with minor gaps in clarity or documentation.	Portfolio lacks clear organization and contains minimal documentation of learning.	Poorly structured portfolio with unclear or missing documentation.	

Scoring Guide
24 - 21 = Excellent (Highly Engaged and Strategic Lifelong Learner)
20 - 17 = Proficient (Committed Learner with Minor Gaps)
16 - 13 = Basic (Needs Improvement in Several Areas)
12 or below = Needs Significant Improvement (Limited Engagement in Lifelong Learning)

6. Business Proposal for an Engineering Solution (Business and Management Issues)

Objective: Students will work in teams to create a business proposal for a computer engineering product or service. The proposal will include market analysis, a business model, potential challenges, and a plan for implementation.

Deliverables: A written business proposal, including a market feasibility study, cost-benefit analysis, and a presentation to potential stakeholders (e.g., investors, customers).

Rubric for Business Proposal for an Engineering Solution (Business and Management Issues)

Criteria	Excellent (4)	Proficient (3)	Basic (2)	Needs Improvement (1)	Score
Problem Identification and Market Need	Clearly defines the problem with strong market research and data-driven justification.	Identifies the problem with some research but lacks depth.	Addresses the problem but lacks sufficient data or justification.	Poorly defines the problem with little or no market analysis.	
Feasibility and Viability of Engineering Solution	Provides a well-developed, realistic, and scalable solution with technical and financial feasibility.	The solution is feasible but may have minor technical or financial limitations.	The solution has significant feasibility concerns but is somewhat viable.	The solution lacks feasibility and is not practical for implementation.	
Business Model and Financial Plan	Clearly outlines a viable business model, including revenue streams, cost analysis, and profitability.	Presents a good business model but lacks details on cost or revenue streams.	Includes a basic business model but lacks financial justification.	Business model is unclear or unrealistic, with little financial planning.	
Management and Implementation Strategy	Provides a clear, structured plan for implementation, including roles, resources, and timelines.	Implementation strategy is defined but lacks clarity in roles or resource allocation.	The plan is incomplete, missing key aspects of management or execution.	Lacks an implementation strategy, making execution unclear.	
Risk Assessment and Mitigation Strategies	Identifies potential risks (technical, financial, market) and provides effective mitigation strategies.	Recognizes some risks and includes basic mitigation strategies.	Identifies few risks with limited mitigation plans.	Fails to address risks or provide mitigation strategies.	
Sustainability and Social Impact	Demonstrates strong environmental, economic, and social benefits with long-term sustainability.	Includes sustainability considerations but lacks depth in social or environmental impact.	Mentions sustainability but does not provide clear implementation strategies.	Ignores sustainability and social impact concerns.	
Presentation and Communication	Communicates ideas clearly, professionally, and persuasively with strong supporting data.	Presents ideas effectively but with minor clarity or structure issues.	Communicates the proposal but lacks strong organization or supporting details.	Poorly communicates ideas with little coherence or supporting evidence.	

Scoring Guide
28 - 24 = Excellent (Highly Feasible and Well-Developed Proposal)

23 - 19 = Proficient (Good Proposal with Minor Gaps)
18 - 14 = Basic (Needs Improvement in Several Areas)
13 or below = Needs Significant Improvement (Unfeasible or Poorly Developed Proposal)

7. Risk Management Plan for an Engineering Project (Tradeoffs in Professional Practice)

Objective: Students will create a risk management plan for a hypothetical engineering project, analyzing potential risks and trade-offs (e.g., budget, time, technical feasibility) and how these risks can be mitigated.

Deliverables: A comprehensive risk management document, including a risk matrix, mitigation strategies, and a final report detailing how trade-offs are managed in project decision-making.

Rubric for Risk Management Plan for an Engineering Project (Tradeoffs in Professional Practice)

Criteria	Excellent (4)	Proficient (3)	Basic (2)	Needs Improvement (1)	Score
Identification of Risks	Clearly identifies and categorizes all potential risks (technical, financial, safety, environmental, etc.) with strong supporting analysis.	Identifies major risks but may overlook some aspects or lack depth in analysis.	Lists some risks but lacks clear categorization or analysis.	Fails to identify key risks or provides minimal assessment.	
Risk Assessment and Impact Analysis	Provides a thorough risk assessment using appropriate tools (e.g., risk matrix, probability-impact analysis) with detailed explanations.	Uses risk assessment tools but lacks depth or consistency in analysis.	Conducts a basic assessment with limited justification or detail.	No formal risk assessment or weak, unsupported analysis.	
Tradeoffs in Risk Mitigation and Decision-Making	Demonstrates a clear understanding of tradeoffs in risk mitigation, balancing safety, cost, efficiency, and ethical considerations.	Acknowledges tradeoffs but lacks depth in justifying decisions.	Considers tradeoffs but does not clearly explain their impact on the project.	Fails to consider tradeoffs or makes decisions without justification.	
Mitigation Strategies and Contingency Planning	Proposes well-developed, effective mitigation strategies and contingency plans tailored to identified risks.	Provides mitigation strategies, but some may lack feasibility or detail.	Includes basic mitigation strategies but lacks contingency planning.	Provides minimal or unrealistic mitigation strategies with no contingency plans.	
Regulatory and Ethical Compliance	Ensures full compliance with engineering standards, laws, and ethical guidelines while addressing risks.	Addresses compliance but with minor gaps in legal or ethical considerations.	Shows limited awareness of regulatory and ethical standards.	Fails to consider compliance, leading to potential ethical or legal risks.	
Monitoring and Review Process	Establishes a structured, ongoing risk monitoring system with clear review protocols.	Includes a monitoring plan but lacks detail on review frequency or accountability.	Mentions monitoring but does not provide a structured process.	No plan for risk monitoring or follow-up.	
Presentation and Clarity of the Plan	Communicates the plan clearly, logically, and professionally with strong supporting data and documentation.	Presents the plan effectively but with minor clarity or organization issues.	The plan is understandable but lacks structure and supporting evidence.	Poorly communicates ideas with little coherence or documentation.	

Scoring Guide
28 - 24 = Excellent (Comprehensive and Well-Developed Risk Management Plan)
23 - 19 = Proficient (Good Plan with Minor Gaps)
18 - 14 = Basic (Needs Improvement in Several Areas)
13 or below = Needs Significant Improvement (Incomplete or Ineffective Plan)

8. Cultural Sensitivity and Technology Report (Philosophical Frameworks and Cultural Issues)

Objective: Students will examine how cultural sensitivity affects the development and deployment of technology in a global context. This could involve evaluating a specific

technology's impact on different cultures or proposing changes to make it more culturally inclusive.

Deliverables: A report that includes case studies, ethical analyses, and recommendations for integrating cultural considerations into technological design.

Rubric for Cultural Sensitivity and Technology Report (Philosophical Frameworks and Cultural Issues)

Criteria	Excellent (4)	Proficient (3)	Basic (2)	Needs Improvement (1)	Score
Understanding of Cultural Sensitivity in Technology	Demonstrates deep awareness of cultural differences, ethical concerns, and inclusivity in technology use and development.	Shows good awareness of cultural issues but lacks depth in analysis.	Identifies cultural aspects but does not fully explore their implications.	Displays little to no understanding of cultural sensitivity in technology.	
Application of Philosophical Frameworks	Effectively applies relevant philosophical perspectives (e.g., utilitarianism, deontology, ethical relativism) to analyze cultural and technological issues.	Applies philosophical concepts but may not integrate them fully into the analysis.	Shows limited application of philosophical frameworks with basic connections.	Fails to incorporate or misapplies philosophical concepts.	
Impact Analysis of Technology on Diverse Societies	Provides a comprehensive evaluation of how technology affects various cultural groups, addressing both benefits and drawbacks.	Analyzes cultural impacts but lacks balance in addressing both positive and negative effects.	Mentions cultural impacts but does not provide a well-supported analysis.	Does not discuss how technology influences different cultural contexts.	
Inclusion of Ethical and Social Considerations	Thoroughly explores ethical, social, and economic implications of technology in diverse cultural settings.	Discusses ethical and social considerations but lacks some depth or examples.	Touches on ethical aspects but lacks clear connections to cultural issues.	Ignores or fails to address ethical and social concerns.	
Use of Research and Supporting Evidence	Integrates high-quality, credible sources to support claims and analysis.	Uses relevant research, though some sources may lack credibility or depth.	Uses minimal sources or weak evidence to support arguments.	Relies on unsupported claims with little to no research backing.	
Clarity and Organization of the Report	Presents ideas clearly and logically, with a well-structured report and strong argumentation.	Communicates ideas effectively but may have minor structural or clarity issues.	Report is somewhat disorganized, making key points difficult to follow.	Lacks clear structure, making the report difficult to understand.	

Scoring Guide
24 - 21 = Excellent (Comprehensive and Well-Researched Report)
20 - 17 = Proficient (Good Report with Minor Gaps)
16 - 13 = Basic (Needs Improvement in Several Areas)
12 or below = Needs Significant Improvement (Limited or Incomplete Report)

9. Cybersecurity and Legal Implications Case Study (Cybercrime Prevention Act of 2012)

Objective: Students will investigate a real-world or hypothetical case of a cybersecurity breach or cybercrime, exploring the legal, ethical, and professional responsibilities involved in handling such incidents.

Deliverables: A case study report outlining the legal implications of the breach, possible penalties under the Cybercrime Prevention Act, and recommendations for preventing similar incidents in the future.

Rubric

Criteria	Excellent (4)	Proficient (3)	Basic (2)	Needs Improvement (1)	Score

Case Study Understanding and Problem Identification	Clearly identifies and articulates the cybersecurity issue, including relevant technical, legal, and ethical aspects.	Identifies the issue but lacks depth in some areas.	Recognizes the problem but does not fully explore key aspects.	Fails to identify or inaccurately describes the cybersecurity issue.	
Application of Cybersecurity Principles	Effectively applies cybersecurity principles (e.g., risk assessment, data protection, network security) to analyze the case.	Applies cybersecurity concepts but lacks depth or full integration.	Shows limited application of cybersecurity principles.	Does not apply or misinterprets cybersecurity principles.	
Legal and Regulatory Analysis	Thoroughly analyzes applicable laws and regulations (e.g., Data Privacy Act, Cybercrime Prevention Act) and their relevance to the case.	Addresses legal aspects but lacks comprehensive coverage.	Mentions relevant laws but does not analyze them in depth.	Fails to address legal and regulatory implications.	
Ethical Considerations and Decision-Making	Evaluates ethical dilemmas using relevant frameworks (e.g., deontology, utilitarianism) and proposes well-reasoned solutions.	Discusses ethical issues but lacks a structured framework for decision-making.	Acknowledges ethical concerns but provides limited analysis.	Ignores ethical aspects or lacks justification for decisions.	
Impact Assessment (Technical, Business, and Social Implications)	Provides a detailed analysis of the case's impact on individuals, organizations, and society, considering multiple perspectives.	Assesses impact but lacks depth in considering broader implications.	Mentions impact but does not analyze it in detail.	Fails to address the case's broader impact.	
Proposed Solutions and Recommendations	Suggests well-supported, feasible cybersecurity and legal solutions based on best practices.	Proposes solutions, but some may lack feasibility or strong justification.	Suggests basic solutions with limited practical application.	Fails to provide viable solutions or recommendations.	
Clarity, Organization, and Presentation	Presents a well-structured, logically organized, and professionally written case study with strong supporting evidence.	Communicates ideas effectively but with minor clarity or organization issues.	Somewhat disorganized, making key points difficult to follow.	Lacks clear structure, making the report difficult to understand.	

Scoring Guide
28 - 24 = Excellent (Comprehensive and Well-Developed Case Study)
23 - 19 = Proficient (Good Analysis with Minor Gaps)
18 - 14 = Basic (Needs Improvement in Several Areas)
13 or below = Needs Significant Improvement (Incomplete or Weak Analysis)

10. Design and Implement a Privacy Protection System (Data Privacy Act of 2012)

Objective: Students will design a prototype of a data privacy protection system for an organization, ensuring it complies with the Data Privacy Act of 2012. The project will involve technical, ethical, and legal considerations related to data collection, storage, and processing.

Deliverables: A functional prototype, a compliance report, and a presentation

demonstrating the system's features and legal compliance.

Rubric

Criteria	Excellent (4)	Proficient (3)	Basic (2)	Needs Improvement (1)	Score
Compliance with the Data Privacy Act of 2012	Fully aligns with all provisions of the Data Privacy Act, including lawful processing, data subject rights, and accountability measures.	Complies with most aspects of the law but may lack depth in certain areas.	Addresses basic compliance but overlooks key legal requirements.	Fails to meet essential legal requirements of the Data Privacy Act.	
Privacy Risk Assessment and Mitigation Strategies	Conducts a thorough Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA), identifying risks and implementing strong mitigation strategies.	Identifies risks and applies mitigation strategies but lacks comprehensive assessment.	Recognizes some risks but provides limited mitigation strategies.	Does not identify or mitigate privacy risks effectively.	
System Design and Security Measures	Implements a robust security framework, including encryption, access controls, and secure data handling practices.	Includes security measures but may lack some essential components.	Implements basic security measures but with notable weaknesses.	Lacks fundamental security measures, making the system vulnerable.	
User Data Protection and Consent Management	Ensures clear consent mechanisms, user-friendly privacy settings, and effective data access controls.	Provides consent management but may lack clarity or usability.	Includes consent mechanisms but with limited user control.	Does not properly implement user consent or data access controls.	
Ethical Considerations and Transparency	Addresses ethical issues proactively, ensuring transparency in data collection, storage, and sharing practices.	Demonstrates awareness of ethical considerations but lacks full transparency.	Acknowledges ethical concerns but does not fully implement solutions.	Ignores ethical concerns, risking non-transparent data practices.	
Implementation Feasibility and Effectiveness	The system is practical, scalable, and well-integrated into an organizational framework, ensuring long-term usability.	Feasible and functional but may have some scalability or integration challenges.	Partially functional but lacks clear implementation strategies.	Unfeasible or impractical system with major implementation gaps.	
Documentation and Presentation	Provides comprehensive, well-organized documentation, clearly explaining system features, compliance measures, and implementation steps.	Presents the system effectively but with minor gaps in documentation.	Documentation is present but lacks organization or detail.	Poorly documented or unclear presentation.	

Scoring Guide
28 - 24 = Excellent (Highly Compliant and Effective Privacy Protection System)
23 - 19 = Proficient (Good System with Minor Gaps)
18 - 14 = Basic (Needs Improvement in Several Areas)
13 or below = Needs Significant Improvement (Incomplete or Ineffective System)

11. Professional Code of Ethics Review (Professional and Ethical Responsibilities)

Objective: Students will review a code of ethics for a professional organization (e.g., IEEE, ACM) and evaluate how it applies to specific computer engineering challenges, including ethical decision-making and professional conduct.

Deliverables: A comparative report that analyzes the similarities and differences between the reviewed code of ethics and the Philippine engineering code, along with recommendations for aligning practice with ethical standards.

Criteria	Excellent (4)	Proficient (3)	Basic (2)	Needs Improvement (1)	Score
Understanding of the Professional Code of Ethics	Demonstrates a deep understanding of the Code of Ethics, clearly explaining its key principles, values, and guidelines.	Shows good comprehension of the Code but lacks depth in explaining certain principles.	Identifies basic principles but does not fully articulate their importance.	Displays minimal understanding or misinterprets key principles.	
Critical Analysis and Interpretation	Provides a well-reasoned analysis, discussing strengths, weaknesses, and areas for improvement in the Code of Ethics.	Analyzes key aspects but lacks depth in critique or suggested improvements.	Offers basic observations with limited critical analysis.	Fails to analyze or provides a superficial review.	
Application to Real-World Scenarios	Effectively applies ethical principles to real-world case studies, demonstrating sound judgment and decision-making.	Applies ethical concepts but lacks depth in real-world connections.	Attempts to relate ethical principles to practice but lacks strong reasoning.	Does not apply ethical principles to practical scenarios.	
Comparison with Other Ethical Standards	Compares the Code with other relevant professional or industry ethics standards, highlighting similarities and differences.	Provides a comparison but lacks depth in contrasting different standards.	Mentions other ethical standards but does not effectively compare them.	Does not reference or compare with other ethical codes.	
Ethical Reasoning and Justification	Uses ethical theories (e.g., deontology, utilitarianism, virtue ethics) to justify positions on ethical issues.	Justifies positions using ethical principles but lacks strong theoretical support.	Provides some ethical reasoning but lacks clarity or depth.	Fails to justify ethical positions with clear reasoning.	
Clarity, Organization, and Presentation	Presents a well-structured, logically organized, and professionally written review with strong supporting evidence.	Communicates ideas effectively but has minor clarity or organization issues.	Somewhat disorganized, making key points difficult to follow.	Lacks clear structure, making the review difficult to understand.	

Scoring Guide
24 - 21 = Excellent (Comprehensive and Well-Developed Review)
20 - 17 = Proficient (Good Review with Minor Gaps)
16 - 13 = Basic (Needs Improvement in Several Areas)
12 or below = Needs Significant Improvement (Incomplete or Weak Analysis)

12. Legal and Ethical Issues in AI Systems (Contemporary Issues)

Objective: Students will investigate the legal and ethical implications of AI technologies, focusing on privacy, accountability, and societal impact. They will propose a set of ethical guidelines or policies for the development and deployment of AI systems.

Deliverables: A written report with ethical guidelines for AI development, and a presentation to class on how these guidelines address legal and societal concerns.

Rubric

Criteria	Excellent (4)	Proficient (3)	Basic (2)	Needs Improvement (1)	Score
Understanding of AI Technologies	Demonstrates deep understanding of AI concepts, applications, and potential risks.	Shows good understanding of AI but lacks depth in certain areas.	Identifies basic AI concepts but lacks clarity or detail.	Displays minimal understanding or misinterprets AI concepts.	

Legal Compliance and Regulations	Thoroughly analyzes relevant AI-related laws (e.g., Data Privacy Act, AI Act, GDPR) and compliance requirements.	Addresses legal aspects but lacks depth in regulatory analysis.	Mentions laws but does not explain their relevance in detail.	Fails to address legal and regulatory implications of AI.	
Ethical Considerations and Frameworks	Applies ethical theories (e.g., deontology, utilitarianism, virtue ethics) to AI-related dilemmas with well-reasoned arguments.	Discusses ethical concerns but lacks a structured ethical framework.	Identifies ethical issues but does not provide strong reasoning.	Ignores or fails to justify ethical positions.	
Bias, Fairness, and Accountability in AI	Critically evaluates issues of bias, discrimination, transparency, and accountability in AI decision-making.	Discusses AI bias and fairness but lacks depth in analysis.	Acknowledges fairness concerns but does not explore solutions.	Does not address bias, fairness, or accountability.	
Impact on Society and Human Rights	Provides a detailed assessment of AI's societal impact, including privacy, job displacement, and human rights concerns.	Discusses social impacts but lacks full consideration of human rights issues.	Mentions societal impact but with limited exploration.	Fails to discuss AI's effects on society or human rights.	
Recommendations for Responsible AI Use	Proposes well-supported strategies for ethical AI development, risk mitigation, and responsible governance.	Provides recommendations but lacks strong justification or feasibility.	Suggests solutions but with minimal depth or practicality.	Fails to provide viable recommendations.	
Clarity, Organization, and Presentation	Presents a well-structured, logically organized, and professionally written analysis with strong supporting evidence.	Communicates ideas effectively but has minor clarity or organization issues.	Somewhat disorganized, making key points difficult to follow.	Lacks clear structure, making the analysis difficult to understand.	

Scoring Guide
28 - 24 = Excellent (Comprehensive and Well-Developed Analysis)
23 - 19 = Proficient (Good Analysis with Minor Gaps)
18 - 14 = Basic (Needs Improvement in Several Areas)
13 or below = Needs Significant Improvement (Incomplete or Weak Analysis)

PROJECT ASSIGNMENT

1. ABAD, ERICAH GEAN I.
   CUADRASAL, JANICE.
   HINGGO, RICHMOND E.
   SONGKIT, MARTIN NEXIE H.

2. AMBID, HAROLD JOHN S.
   DE LA CRUZ, ROMEL CHARLZ NICO C.
   LABADAN, MAIANICA G.
   TIU, JAMES DAVID C.

3. ANGCOG, ANGEL P.
   DELA CRUZ, SHENETTE JANE L.
   LAMOSTE, DWIGHT KENJIE B.
   TRAZO, ORLY JAY J.

4. ANGOB, MICO E.
   DELLA, PRIVI B.
   LEJESTA, SHANE MAE R.
   TUDTUD, RIANNE CELONE P.

5. BULLO, LYLE GOLDYMIRA G.
   DELOLA, YHEI SHEINE P.
   LUMANCAS, JEMAN C.
   VALLOZO, KRIS M.

6. BUSLON, HONEY LOU B.
   EDRADAN, JAN DHANIEL M.
   LUMAPGUID, WELBERT C.
   VERTICAL, JANICE P.

7. CABABAO, JHON MICHAEL M.
   ESCATRON, SEAN EARL R.
   MACEREN, JAIME ELYSERGS.
   YACON, JOFRED GIL N.
8. CABALAN, LOREMIE O.
   ESPANTO, RHEY CHRISTIAN O.
   PARAGAT, JUNUEL M.
   VALLES, FEBEA MARIZ P.

9. CABALLEJOS, LOUE G.
   ESTRELLA, ANNIEBEL N.
   PASCULADO, APRIL BERNADITH E.

10. CAITUM, JOANNE A.
    FIDELES, JOANNA ROSE.
    PATAGAN, AERON M.

11. CENTINO, JEMAICA JHADE O.
    GESTA, IRENE PAZ R.
    PLAZA, ELMO JR. L.

12. CONSIGNA, CHARLES NIKKOS J.
    GUIRITAN, CESAR U.
    SALEM, GABRIEL O.

Make sure to print your corresponding rubric for your ratings during presentation: At least 15 raters per presentation.