

CDAP Assessment Instruments (Final Presentation) - 2016

	Excellent (5-4)	Good (3)	Average (2)	Below Average (1-0)
LO1 5%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • e1. Possibility of being published / patented • e2. Possibility of winning NBQSA / other competition awards • e3. Comparison with all other competing applications 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • g1. Possibility of being published and participating in NBQSA / other competitions • g2. General comparison with other applications 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a1. Develops a complete working solution • a2. Exhibits awareness of other existing applications 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • b1. Partially completed solution • b2. Little/No awareness of existing competing applications
	Excellent (5-4)	Good (3)	Average (2)	Below Average (1-0)
LO2 5%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • e1. Exhibits full awareness of key pillars which are properly applied in the project • e2. Able to express the usage of other key pillars 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • g1. Exhibits some awareness of the key pillars; some of the key pillars have been applied • g2. Demonstrates some understanding of other key pillars 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a1. Solution is limited to improper application of one of two key pillars • a2. Shows limited knowledge of other key pillars. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • b1. Shows poor understanding of the pillars • b2. No application of the key pillars
	Excellent (45-36)	Good (35-27)	Average (26-18)	Below Average (17-0)
LO3 45%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • e1. Uses latest techniques and tools and fully confident on the usage • e2. Prepares, uses, and references a coding standard document • e3. Provides test case results documents for all the most important functional and non-functional requirements • e4. Uses logging mechanisms based on access level controls • e5. Applies access level controls • e6. Uses a code repository • e7. Applies version controlling • e8. Agile methodologies or any other development methodology is applied and supporting tools have been used. • e9. All the deliverables are well planned and achieved within the given 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • g1. Uses some of the latest techniques and tools and able to properly justify the tools and techniques used • g2. Separate coding standard document not prepared but applies coding standards practised in the industry • g3. Provides test case results to a few of the most important functional and non-functional requirements • g4. Exhibits limited use of logging mechanisms, access level controls • g5. Uses a code repository but without version controlling 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a1. Uses some of the latest techniques and tools but unable to properly justify the tools and techniques used • a2. Applies a few practices of a coding standard in limited instances • a3. Shows test case results to a few of the requirements of the choice, which do not cover the required level • a4. Uses access level controls but no implementation of a logging mechanism 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • b1. Doesn't use appropriate technologies and also can not justify the choices made and the reasons behind them • b2. Does not apply coding standard • b3. Does not provide test case results • b4. Does not implement access level controls and logging mechanism • b5. Doesn't use code repository • b6. Doesn't apply proper methodology

	<p>time frame.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • e10. Concentrated on due considerations to professional/ ethical, security/ social responsibility/ legal issues pertaining to the solution 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • g6. Applies a suitable methodology, but doesn't practice any supporting tools • g7. Properly planned deliverables with a few milestone slips with proper justification of the reasons behind the late deliveries • g8. Shows some concentration on due considerations to professional, ethical, security, social responsibility, legal issues pertaining to the solution 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a5. Uses a simple code repository without supporting tools, version controlling or any other relevant facilities • a6. The methodology applied is outdated but has managed to build the system using few best practices. • a7. Poor planning of deliverables seen. More than 50% of the milestones are achieved but could justify only limited milestone slips. 	<p>and is unaware of the methodologies to use</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • b7. Poor planning of deliverables • b8. Achieves less than 50% of the milestones but could justify only limited milestone slips
	Excellent (25-20)	Good (19-15)	Average (14-10)	Below Average (9-0)
LO4 25%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • e1. Speaker provides an overview, outline, or agenda and organizes the contents logically • e2. Content is interesting, compelling, and relevant to the system developed • e3. Presentation is integrated; does not look like a sequence of unique individual presentations; effective and smooth transitions between speakers • e4. Uses more than one type of technology and visual aids to enhance the presentation of key points • e5. Presentation fits in the time period assigned covering all the aspects of the system 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • g1. No overview but the material is organized in a logical sequence that makes it easy for the audience to follow • g2. Content is relevant to the system developed but not presented in an interesting or compelling manner • g3. Presentation is integrated but dominated by one or two speakers • g4. Uses one type of technology and few ineffective visual aids (for example, graphics, animation and colour) • g5. Presentation fits in the time period assigned but does not cover all the aspects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a1. No overview or a logical sequence of contents but the speaker manages to explain the system fully • a2. Content is partially relevant to the system developed • a3. Presentation is integrated but no visible share of ownership among speakers who contradict each other's arguments • a4. Presentation is not developed using good techniques; limited use of visual aids or visual aids used are overly cluttered or cannot be clearly seen by the audience • a5. Speakers rush presentations to finish on time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • b1. Unable to explain the system fully and no awareness of what is expected • b2. Content is unoriginal and not relevant to project • b3. No coordination between members • b4. Uses irrelevant visual aids and techniques—speaker is unaware of this fact • b5. Difficult to understand the main features of proposed system • b6. Presenter has very poor time management

	Excellent (20-16)	Good (15-12)	Average (11-8)	Below Average (7-0)
LO5 20%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • e1. Uses a clear roadmap for commercialization • e2. Provides documents as proof of market research. After product development, has reviewed market research and identified specific opportunities and threats for the product • e3. Has carried out and gives results of a client satisfaction survey • e4. Provides a documentary comparison of features of the developed product with other alternate products in the market 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • g1. Has developed a simple plan for commercialization • g2. Provides a proper market research document but not reviewed after product development • g3. Submits a few client satisfaction documents without carrying out a proper survey • g4. Does a limited comparison of product features with other existing products in the market 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a1. Shows a good understanding of the prospective client but fails to submit documentary evidence from real clients • a2. Presents an analysis of literature and own suggestions but without any real client surveys • a3. Provides poor market research document • a4. Has conducted a poor comparison of product features with other existing products in the market 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • b1. No understanding of business proposition • b2. No comparison of product features with other existing products in the market • b3. No market research document provided