CDAP Assessment Instruments (Project Proposal Presentation) -2016

	Excellent (35-28)	Good (28-21)	Average (21-14)	Below Average (14-0)
LO1 35%	 e1. Identified a clear gap via a thorough literature survey e2. Has drawn literature survey from various sources, such as books, journal papers, conference proceedings, magazines, and websites e3. Demonstrated a very clear understanding about the problem, methodology, and the solution 	 g1. Identified a gap via a literature survey g2. Has drawn a literature survey from limited resources, such as conference papers, magazines, and websites g3. Demonstrated a clear idea about the problem, methodology, and the solution 	 a1. Well aware of the features of current systems a2. Has based literature survey on a few conference papers and websites 	• b1. Awareness of the poor features of current systems
	Excellent (30-24)	Good (24-18)	Average (18-12)	Below Average (12-0)
LO2 30%	 e1. Demonstrated a very good understandin about the domain of the problem, for which the project is trying to find a solution (e.g. NLP, mobile, knowledge representation, augmented reality etc.) e2. Already has background knowledge of and familiarity with the specified area e3. Has evaluated different tools and techniques that can be used in the solution e4. A clear system overview exists with justified tools and techniques that are used 	 g1. Demonstrated a good idea about the area they use (eg. NLP, mobile, knowledge representation, augmented reality etc.) g2. Exhibited knowledge of and familiarity with the area g3. Demonstrated awareness of a few different tools and techniques that can be used in the solution g4. A system overview exists with tools and techniques 	 a1. Demonstrated a good knowledge of the area a2. Demonstrated knowledge of the tools and techniques that are going to be used in the solution a3. A system overview exists 	 b1. Demonstrated knowledge of the area but is unable to comprehend how it is used b2. Unable to comprehend the tools and techniques used in the system b3. System overview has gaps that student is unable to describe

	Excellent (5-4)	Good (4-3) Average (3-2)		Below Average (2-0)	
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 (12-9)	Average (9-6)	Below Average (6-0)	
LO4 15%	 e1. Explained proposed system in context, with logical discussion of the topic and clear connections between individual presentations e2. Did not speak too long, managed time effectively e3. Used expressive, appropriate body language and maintained eye contact with the audience e4. The presentation allowed each member an equal opportunity to shine 	 g1. Clear well-structured and accurate explanation of proposed system g2. Managed time effectively; however minimal audience engagement 	 a1. Proposed system was explained in brief a2. Lack of confidence or read from script a3. Some professional practice shown, sources were cited and referenced a4. Lack of coordination between presenters caused time management issues 	 b1. Unclear explanation of proposed system; audience confused b2. Slides unoriginal and not relevant to project b3. Difficult to understand the main features of proposed system b4. No coordination between presenters 	
	Excellent (15-12)	Good (12-9)	Average (9-6)	Below Average (6-0)	
LO5 15%	 e1. Demonstrated sound evidence to prove business proposition of the proposed system with the appropriate areas e2. Clearly demonstrated the achievable user benefits of the systems e3. Evaluated proposed system against alternative / similar systems e4. Proper marketing plan 	 g1. Demonstrated good evidence to prove business proposition of the proposed system with the appropriate areas g2. Presented some evidence to evaluate proposed system against alternative systems 	 a1. Demonstrated acceptable evidence to prove business proposition of the proposed system with the appropriate areas a2. Demonstrated little awareness of alternatives and poor evaluation against these 	b1. Demonstrated no understanding of business proposition	