

CDAP Assessment Instruments (Project Proposal Report) -2016

	Excellent (35-28)	Good (27-21)	Average (22-14)	Below Average (13-0)	Comments	Marks
LO1 35%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> e1. Clearly argued the existence of knowledge gap using credible sources e2. Demonstrated evidence that project group has referred material from various sources to gather requisite background knowledge e3. Compared research problem in the present context of the research domain e4. Compared and contrasted with similar products / services / research e5. Justified problem / project as having novelty and creativity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> g1. Demonstrated use of a few sources and justified requirement of the proposed solution g2. Mentioned gap 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a1. Has demonstrated partial solution. a2. Demonstrated awareness of other existing applications 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b1. Has demonstrated little/no solution. b2. Demonstrated little/no awareness of existing competing applications 		
	Excellent (25-20)	Good (21-15)	Average (14-10)	Below Average (9-0)	Comments	Marks
LO2 25%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> e1. Demonstrated full awareness of technologies to be used and a critical evaluation of technologies proving selection of the best technologies e2. Problem / project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> g1. Demonstrated awareness of the technologies to be used and evaluation of technologies g2. Problem / project has a proper scope and is divided among members 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a1. Justified technologies that can be used a2. Demonstrated awareness that selected technologies can be used to develop a coherent system a3. Scope of the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b1. No justification of technologies or ad hoc selection of technologies 		

	has a proper scope and is divided equally among members • e3. Each component has a considerable workload	• g3. Each component has an appropriate workload	project is known			
	Excellent (5-4)	Good (4-3)	Average (3-2)	Below Average (2-0)	Comments	Marks
LO3 5%	• e1. Justifiable framework with proper understanding • e2. Excellent understanding about individual functionality and clear work breakdown structure	• g1. Framework with good understanding. • g2. Good understanding about individual functionality	• a1. Acceptable framework with understanding • a2. Some understanding of the individual functions but requires revision	• b1. No framework • b2. Can't satisfy with the individual functionality		
	Excellent (15-12)	Good (13-9)	Average (8-6)	Below Average (5-0)	Comments	Marks
LO4 15%	• e1. Explained proposed system* in context, with logical discussion of the system's features. Clearly explained connections between the features and user requirements or problem • e2. Discussed literature in context and drew arguments from credible facts • e3. Excellent	• g1. Explained proposed system in context, with a discussion of the system's features. Explained connections between the features and user requirements or problem • g2. Discussed literature in context • g3. Good structure and style. Logically ordered chapters	• a1. Explained proposed system • a2. Used literature to develop report • a3. Report has a structure. Chapters exist. • a4. Good language usage but with grammatical and typographical errors • a5. Has followed a referencing style	• b1. Failed to clearly describe proposed system • b2. Didn't give literature or background information • b3. Report shows no structure or flow • b4. No referencing, only few web links		

	structure and style; meaningful chapters with logical flow <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • e4. Excellent language usage with grammatical or typographical errors • e5. Has followed a correct referencing style *System / process / method	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • g4. Good language usage with has 4-5 grammatical or typographical errors • g5. Has followed a referencing style 				
	Excellent (20-16)	Good (15-12)	Average (11-8)	Below Average (7-0)	Comments	Marks
LO5 20%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • e1. Demonstrated sound evidence to prove business proposition of the proposed system with the appropriate areas • e2. Clearly demonstrated the system's achievable user benefits • e3. Evaluated proposed system against alternative / similar systems • e4. Demonstrated a proper marketing plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • g1. Demonstrated good evidence to prove business proposition of the proposed system with the appropriate areas • g2. Demonstrated some evidence to evaluate proposed system against alternative systems 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a1. Demonstrated acceptable evidence to prove business proposition of the proposed system with the appropriate areas • a2. Demonstrated little awareness of alternatives resulting in a poor evaluation against these 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • b1. Demonstrated no understanding of business proposition 		