

CDAP Assessment Instruments (SRS Document) - 2016

	Excellent (10-8)	Good (7-6)	Average (5-4)	Below Average (3-0)
LO1 10%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> e1. Novel software solution e2. Practical implementation goes beyond common practices e3. Provides functional capability beyond business requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> g1. Includes some novel features g2. Incorporates industry best practices g3. Caters to all the business requirements as per proposal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a1. No novel thinking a2. Proposed methodologies lack common knowledge in software development a3. Partly addresses business requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b1. Incomplete solution b2. Inability to meet business requirements successfully
	Excellent (30-24)	Good (23-18)	Average (17-12)	Below Average (11-0)
LO2 30%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> e1. Extensive application of advanced subject matter e2. Integration of multiple disciplines e3. Application of new and emerging technologies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> g1. Adequate usage of subject matter related to key pillars of area of specialization g2. Awareness of applications and limitations of the technologies used 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a1. Limited application of knowledge related to key pillar areas a2. Low awareness of the application of subject knowledge 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b1. Lacking usage of basic concepts of key pillars b2. Inappropriate selection of tools and technologies
	Excellent (50-40)	Good (39-30)	Average (29-20)	Below Average (19-0)
LO3 50%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> e1. Solution design exceeds expectations set in proposal e2. Flexible and dynamic solution design, sensitive to emerging needs e3. Covers every aspect of solution domain in development of test cases e4. Clearly specifies all functional and non-functional requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> g1. Design meets expectations set in proposal g2. Solution is less flexible to changes g3. Covered all key areas in development of test cases g4. Identified all key functional and non-functional requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a1. Design lacks capabilities to provide necessary functionalities a2. No flexibility a3. Has not identified all scenarios have in test case development a4. Absence of some of the key functional and non-functional requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b1. Design is below par and incapable of delivering the expected results b2. Highly inflexible solution b3. Few or no test cases identified b4. Most of the key requirements have not been identified
	Excellent (10-8)	Good (7-6)	Average (5-4)	Below Average (3-0)
LO4 10%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> e1. Clearly expresses all requirements e2. Report complies with specified format e3. Follows standard practices e4. Uses accurate referencing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> g1. Satisfactorily specifies requirements g2. Report mostly adhere to guidelines g3. Wide use of standard practices g4. Satisfactory referencing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a1. Specifies some requirements a2. Partial fulfillment of guidelines a3. Lacks standard practices a4. Poor referencing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b1. Major lapses in specifying requirements b2. Guidelines have not been followed b3. Very little or no use of standard practices b4. No references

LO5 0%	• Not applicable	• Not applicable	• Not applicable	• Not applicable
-----------	------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------