CDAP Assessment Instruments (Mid Review Presentation) – 2016

	Excellent (15-12)	Good (11-9)	Average (8-6)	Below Average (5-0)
LO1 15%	• **e1.** Achieved 75% or more of the agreed novel features of the model introduced at the prototype • **e2.** Sound justification of how the prototype model transferred into a functional unit • **e3.** Evidence can be produced to justify the novelty of the functional unit	• **g1.** Achieved 60%-75% out of the agreed novel features of the model introduced at the prototype • **g2.** Fair justification of how the prototype model transferred into a functional unit • **g3.** Acceptable evidence can be produced to justify the novelty of the functional unit	• **a1.** Achieved 40%-60% out of the agreed novel features of the model introduced at the prototype • **a2.** Poor justification of how the prototype model transferred into a functional unit • **a3.** No evidence of novelty in the functional unit	• **b1.** Achieved below 40% out of the agreed novel features of the model introduced at the prototype • **b2.** No justification of how the prototype model transferred into a functional unit • **b3.** The functional unit does not support any novelty

	Excellent (25-20)	Good (19-15)	Average (14-10)	Below Average (9-0)
LO2 25%	• **e1.** Has clearly used the tools and technologies in the functional unit • **e2.** Applied 75% or more of the components of the domains followed during the degree programme to add new knowledge	• **g1.** Has used the tools and technologies at an acceptable level for the functional unit • **g2.** Applied 60%-75% or more of the components of the domains followed during the degree programme to add new knowledge	• **a1.** Has used to a low extent the tools and technologies in the functional unit • **a2.** Applied 40%-60% or more of the components of the domains followed during the degree programme to add new knowledge	• **b1.** Limited awareness of the tools selected and technologies implemented in the functional unit • **b2.** Difficult to understand the main features of the components which formulate the functional unit

	Excellent (30-24)	Good (23-18)	Average (17-12)	Below Average (11-0)
LO3 30%	**e1.** During a demonstration of a working component or module, the student is able to confidently defend (MUST know most of the alternative solutions and their strengths to compare) the choice and the reasons behind the choice of: • **e2.** Development environment • **e3.** Techniques in maintaining coding standards and best practices	**g1.** During a demonstration of a working component or module, the student shows (knows some of the alternative solutions and their strengths to compare) a good understanding on the choice and the reasons behind the choice of: • **g2.** Development environment • **g3.** Techniques in maintaining coding standards and best practices • **g4.** Able to express the framework to consider professional, legal, social, security, and ethical aspects of the system	**a1.** During a demonstration of a working component or module, the student is able to show (knows a little about alternative solutions and their strengths to compare) acceptable understanding on the choice and the reasons behind the choice of: • **a2.** Development environment • **a3.** Techniques in maintaining coding standards	**b1.** During a demonstration of a working component or module, the student is not able to defend oes the not know the alternative solutions and their strengths to compare) No justification for the choice and the reasons behind the choice of: • **b2.** Development environment • **b3.** Techniques in maintaining coding standards are poor • **b4.** No evidence of application of professional, legal, social, security, and ethical aspects of the

	Excellent	Good	Average	Below Average
	• **e4.** Framework to consider professional, legal, social, security and ethical aspects of the system • **e5.** Carefully thought non-functional requirements • **e6.** Meaningful timeline, scope matches with timeline	• **g5.** Lack of evidence of non-functional requirements • **g6.** Project is well within the timeline	and best practices • **a1.** Lack of framework to consider professional, legal, social, security and ethical aspects of the system • **a2.** Project is within the timeline; however there is scope to improve	system • **b5.** Project is behind schedule
	Excellent (20-16)	**Good (15-12)**	**Average (11-8)**	**Below Average (7-0)**
LO4 20%	• **e1.** Explained proposed system in context, with logical discussion of the topic and clear connections between individual presentations • **e2.** Presenter did not speak too long, managed her/his time effectively • **e3.** Presenter used expressive, appropriate body language and maintained eye contact with the audience • **e4.** Presentation allowed each member an equal opportunity to shine	• **g1.** Clear, well-structured, and accurate explanation of proposed system • **g2.** Presenters managed time effectively; however minimal audience engagement	• **a1.** Explained proposed system in brief • **a2.** Lack of confidence or read from script • **a3.** Some professional practice shown; sources are cited and referenced • **a4.** Lack of coordination between team members caused time management issues	• **b1.** Explanation of proposed system was unclear, audience confused • **b2.** Slides unoriginal and not relevant to project • **b3.** Difficult to understand the main features of proposed system • **b4.** No coordination between members
	Excellent (10-8)	**Good (7-6)**	**Average (5-4)**	**Below Average (3-0)**
LO5 10%	• **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.** Demonstrates good evidence to prove business proposition of the proposed system • **g2.** Demonstrates some evidence to evaluate proposed system against alternative systems	• **a1.** Demonstrates acceptable evidence to prove business proposition of the proposed system • **a2.** Demonstrates little awareness of alternatives leading to poor evaluation against these	• **b1.** Demonstrates no understanding of business proposition