NGEE ANN
SCHOOL OF INFOCOMM TECHNOLOGY

Student Name:_____   **Group:** _____

Assessment Criteria (SSD): Project Report – 15%

	Criteria	Weight	Rating				Mark
			8,9,10 - Excellent	6, 7 – Good	4, 5 – Fair	0,1, 2, 3 - Unsatisfactory	
1	Evidence of work put into the project	5%	Very good discussion on the relevant features/characteristics of the tools. Very clear explanation on how the features handle the security issues. Detailed screenshots of website security features. Zipped project solution embedded.	Good discussion on the relevant features/characteristics of the tools. Clear explanation on how the features handle the security issues, though still quite hazy. Screenshots of website security features. Zipped project solution embedded.	Reasonable discussion on the relevant features/characteristics of the tools. Hazy explanation on how the features handle the security issues. Poor screenshots of website security features. Zipped project solution embedded.	Weak discussion on the relevant features/characteristics No or very minimal explanation on how the features handle the security issues and not clear at all. No screenshots of website security features. No zipped project solution embedded.	
2	Application Architecture	10%	Very good illustration of 3-tier architecture used in developing the secure software/web application. Very clear explanation of security measures derived from analyzing the 3-tier architecture. Discussion of the benefits of the 3-Tier architecture.	Good illustration of 3-tier architecture used in developing the secure software/web application. Clear explanation of security measures derived from analyzing the 3-tier architecture.	Reasonable illustration of 3-tier architecture used in developing the secure software/web application. Clear explanation of security measures derived from analyzing the 3-tier architecture.	Poor illustration of 3-tier architecture used in developing the secure software/web application. Minimal or no explanation of how security measures are derived from analyzing the 3-tier architecture.	

2	Relevance and clear explanation on developing a secure web application/software - **Secure Software Requirements**	20%	Very detail discussion on the secure software requirements of the website. Very clear explanation on how it relates to the security issues.	Good detail discussion on the secure software requirements of the website. Clear explanation on how it relates the security issues, though still quite hazy.	Reasonable discussion on the secure software requirements of the website. Hazy explanation on how it relates to the security issues.	Weak discussion on the secure software requirements of the website. No or very minimal explanation on how it relates to the security issues and not clear at all.	
3	Relevance and clear explanation on developing a secure web application/software - **Secure Software Design**	20%	Very good discussion on the secure software design of the website.	Good discussion on the secure software design of the website.	Reasonable discussion on the secure software design of the website.	Weak discussion on the secure software design of the website.	
4	Relevance and clear explanation on developing a secure web application/software - **Secure Software Development**	20%	Very good and clear discussion on how development of the website provides the intended security and the role it plays	Good and clear discussion on how development of the website provides the intended security and the role it plays	Fair discussion on how development of the website provides the intended security and the role it plays	No or minimal discussion on how development of the website provides the intended security and the role it plays	
5	Relevance and clear explanation on developing a secure web application/software - **Secure Software Testing**	20%	Very good and clear discussion on how testing of the website could provide and enhance security to the organization.	Good and clear discussion on how testing of the website could provide and enhance security to the organization.	Fair discussion on how testing of the website could provide and enhance security to the organization.	No or minimal discussion on how testing of the website could provide and enhance security to the organization.	

| 6 | Professionalism in report (eg; Neatness and professionalism of report, TOC, introduction, conclusion, references, etc) | 5% | Show and submitted a professional report which is clear and ease of reading. Report documentation provides all the requirements as stated in the assignment. | Show and submitted a near professional report which is clear and ease of reading. Report documentation provides all the requirements as stated in the assignment. | Submitted a report with minimal professionalism which is quite hazy and no easy to follow. Report documentation provides some of the requirements as stated in the assignment. | Overall very weak report. Report documentation did not provide all the requirements as stated in the assignment | |

Assessment Criteria (SSD): Working Secure Website – 15%

	Criteria	Weighting	Rating				Mark
			8,9,10 - Excellent	6, 7 – Good	4, 5 – Fair	0,1, 2, 3 - Unsatisfactory	
1	A working Secure Website	100%	Very good and solid working secure website developed using Asp.Net Razor Pages platform (or otherwise), with reasonable amount of website complexity. Extensive and effective security controls in place. Strong evidence of code originality (i.e. majority of codes written by the team)	Good working secure website developed using Asp.Net Razor Pages platform (or otherwise), with some form of website complexity. Extensive and effective security controls in place. Evidence of originality (i.e. some parts of codes written by the team)	Working secure website developed using Asp.Net Razor Pages platform (or otherwise), with minimal website complexity. Effective security controls in place. Lacking evidence of originality. (i.e. All or most part of the coding are taken from source wholly)	No or minimal working secure website developed using Asp.Net Razor Pages platform (or otherwise). No or minimal security controls in place with little or no effectiveness. Not much complexity. No evidence of originality (i.e. Codes are mere copy and paste from source)	

Assessment Criteria (SSD) – Presentation – 10%

	Criteria	Weighting	Rating				Marks
1	**Presentation/Demo**		8,9,10 – Excellent	6, 7 – Good	4, 5 – Fair	0,1, 2, 3 - Unsatisfactory	
	• Clarity	30%	Extensive and very clear security countermeasures in place. Clear in the explaining of the security features, purposes, operations, strength & weaknesses.	Reasonable and clear security countermeasures in place. Clear in the explaining of the security features, purposes, operations, strength & weaknesses.	Fairly and not so detail security countermeasures in place. Clear in the explaining of the security features, purposes, operations, strength & weaknesses.	Not able to explain clearly and no or minimal detail provided of the security features, purposes, operations, strength & weaknesses.	
	• Understanding	30%	Demonstrate excellent understanding of the security measures/findings and concepts.	Demonstrate good understanding of the security measures/findings and concepts.	Demonstrate fair understanding of the security measures/findings and concepts.	Did not demonstrate understanding of the security measures/findings and concepts.	
	• Confidence	20%	Very confidence and very well prepared.	Confidence and well prepared.	Average but not too sure of certain areas and seemingly not well prepared.	Below average and poorly prepared	
2	**Teamwork & Effort**		8,9,10 - Excellent	6, 7 – Good	4, 5 – Fair	0,1, 2, 3 - Unsatisfactory	
	• Efforts • Teamwork	20%	Very good efforts and teamwork observed	Good efforts and teamwork observed	Reasonable efforts and teamwork observed	Little efforts and teamwork observed.	