CDAP Assessment Instruments (Final Report) - 2016

	Excellent (5-4)	Good (3)	Average (2)	Below Average (1-0)
LO1 5%	• **e1.** Shows exceptional work of highest quality, demonstrating an outstanding knowledge • **e2.** Sets very demanding project objectives and a wide range of convincingly justified project extensions • **e3.** Clearly states project outcomes • **e4.** Exhibits proof of achievement of objectives • **e5.** Shows a carefully tested, proved, or rigorously evaluated system • **e6.** Shows work of publishable quality in a peer-reviewed national conference • **e7.** Shows possibility of being patented	• **g1.** Shows high quality work, demonstrating good knowledge and understanding • **g2.** Sets and sully achieves reasonably demanding project objectives • **g3.** Shows a tested or evaluated system • **g4.** Shows work that is of publishable quality in a peer-reviewed faculty level conference	• **a1.** Shows work of limited quality, demonstrating some relevant knowledge and understanding • **a2.** Sets not very demanding project objectives which are achieved to a reasonable standard • **a3.** Shows some attempt at explaining and interpreting the results • **a4.** Develops a working solution	• **b1.** Shows limited work towards the project objectives • **b2.** Partially completed solution
	Excellent (5-4)	**Good (3)**	**Average (2)**	**Below Average (1-0)**
LO2 5%	• **e1.** Exhibits full awareness of key pillars and to what extent they are employed in the project • **e2.** Able to fully express the usage of other key pillars	• **g1.** Applies some of the key pillars and shows awareness of their usage • **g2.** Exhibits some understanding of other pillars	• **a1.** Exhibits a solution limited to one or two key pillars • **a2.** Limited knowledge of other key pillars	• **b1.** Shows poor understanding of key pillars
	Excellent (50-40)	**Good (39-30)**	**Average (29-20)**	**Below Average (19-0)**
LO3 50%	• **e1.** Uses latest tools, technology and design techniques in development • **e2.** Follows standard reference • **e3.** Developed a framework / Referenced a framework which confidently expresses the choice and the reasons behind the choice of - Development environment - Techniques in maintaining coding	• **g1.** Uses formal design techniques and tools in development • **g2.** Shows good understanding on the choice and the reasons behind the choice of - Development environment - Techniques in maintaining coding standards and best practices	• **a1.** Uses design techniques and tools appropriately • **a2.** Shows an acceptable understanding on the choice and the reasons behind the choice of - Development environment - Techniques in maintaining coding standards and best practices • **a3.** Lack of framework to	• **b1.** Does not use design and development techniques appropriately • **b2.** No justification for the choice and the reasons behind the choice of - Development environment - Techniques in maintaining coding standards are poor

	Excellent	Good	Average	Below Average
	standards and best practices - Framework to consider professional, legal, social, security, and ethical aspects of the system • **e4.** Exhibits carefully thought non-functional requirements • **e5.** Meaningful timeline; scope matches with timeline	• **g3.** Able to express the framework to consider professional, legal, social, security, and ethical aspects of the system • **g4.** Lack of evidence of non-functional requirements • Project is well within the timeline	consider professional, legal, social, security, and ethical aspects of the system • **a4.** Project is within timeline; however with scope for improvement	• **b1.** No evidence of application of professional, legal, social, security, and ethical aspects of the system • **b2.** Insufficient work for the timeline
	Excellent (25-20)	**Good (19-15)**	**Average (14-10)**	**Below Average (9-0)**
LO4 25%	• **e1.** Well organized, presented, and lucidly written report • **e2.** Clear, well structured, and accurate explanation of proposed system • **e3.** High quality of report should be high (content, language, presentation, clarity) • **e4.** Follows document format	• **g1.** Reasonably clear presentation and organization of report • **g2.** Clear, well structured, and explanation of proposed system • **g3.** Reasonable quality of report (content, language, presentation, clarity)	• **a1.** Clear explanation of proposed system • **a2.** Acceptable quality report	• **b1.** Project may contain some correct and relevant material, but most issues are neglected or are covered incorrectly • **b2.** Unclear explanation of proposed system
	Excellent (15-12)	**Good (11-9)**	**Average (8-6)**	**Below Average (5-0)**
LO5 15%	• **e1.** Has sound evidence to prove business proposition of the proposed system • **e2.** Evaluates proposed system against alternative /similar systems • **e3.** Carries out a basic SWOT (Strengths, Opportunities, Weaknesses and Threats) analysis	• **g1.** How's good evidence to prove business proposition of the proposed system • **g2.** How's some evidence to evaluate proposed system against alternative systems	• **a1.** Shows acceptable evidence to prove business proposition of the proposed system • **a2.** Shows little evidence to evaluate proposed system against alternative systems	• **b1.** No understanding of business proposition