CDAP Assessment Instruments (Prototype Presentation) - 2016

	Excellent (5-4)	Good (3)	Average (2)	Below Average (1-0)
LO1 5%	• **e1.** Successfully demonstrates proof of concept of the novel ideas	• **g1.** Partial demonstration of novel ideas	• **a1.** No demonstration of new ideas	• **b1.** No demonstration of new ideas
	Excellent (10-8)	**Good (7-6)**	**Average (5-4)**	**Below Average (3-0)**
LO2 10%	• **e1.**Extensive use of techniques related to key pillar areas • **e2.**Successfully integrates advanced subject matter to prototype	• **g1.** All major functionalities use technologies related to key pillar areas • **g2.** Significant integration of different subject matter successfully	• **a1.** Low usage of technologies in key pillar area • **a2.** Poor integration among different areas	• **b1.** Very limited use of subject matter learnt • **b2.** No integration between different technologies
	Excellent (40-32)	**Good (31-24)**	**Average (23-16)**	**Below Average (15-0)**
LO3 40%	• **e1.**Prototype shows exceptional design excellence • **e2.**Prototype is flexible and extensible • **e3.**All major functional and non-functional capabilities have been have been successfully demonstrated	• **g1.** Industry standard prototype • **g2.** Prototype possesses the ability to provide flexibility in the solution • **g3.** Demonstrates most of the key requirements	• **a1.** Prototype lacks design brilliance • **a2.** Shows little flexibility in meeting requirements • **a3.** Minimal demonstration of how requirements will be catered	• **b1.** Poor design concept of the product • **b2.** Rigid execution of functional requirements • **b3.** Demonstrates only a few solution features

	Excellent (40-32)	Good (31-24)	Average (23-16)	Below Average (15-0)
LO4 40%	• **e1.** Prototype transmits a very clear idea of the overall solution • **e2.** Clearly demonstrates methods of implementation of functionalities and features • **e3.** Presenter demonstrates exceptional ability to communicate solution idea to audience • **e4.** Presenter uses attractive and appropriate communication methods • **e5.** Team member possesses very clear idea about individual roles and responsibilities	• **g1.** Successfully communicates basic principle of the solution implementation has been successfully communicated • **g2.** Successfully prototypes all major functionality implementation • **g3.** Presenter demonstrates sufficient communication skills to explain the idea to audience • **g4.** Presenter takes adequate measures to use various communication methods • **g5.** Team member possesses fair idea about individual roles and responsibilities	• **a1.** The prototype lacks capability to demonstrate overall idea of the solution • **a2.** Successfully prototypes only few of the functionality implementation • **a3.** Presenter demonstrates average communication skills to explain the idea to audience • **a4.** Presenter uses some communication methods to transmit the solution idea • **a5.** Team member has no clear idea about individual roles and responsibilities	• **b1.** Poor prototype effort to pass the idea of the solution • **b2.** Many key functionalities are missing in the prototype • **b3.** Presenter demonstrates very poor communication skills • **b4.** Team member lacks knowledge on project objectives and approach
	Excellent (5-4)	Good (3)	Average (2)	Below Average (1-0)
LO5 5%	• **e1.** Prototype possesses sound justification to prove business proposition of the proposed system • **e2.** Successfully demonstrates key marketable functionalities	• **g1.** Achieves most of the justification to prove the business proposition • **g2.** Prototypes most of the marketable functionalities	• **a1.** Achieves little business justification • **a2.** Implements only a few or no marketable functionalities	• **b1.** The solution has no marketability