EVALUATION 2 : EVALUATOR

| CLO1-20% | |
|----------|--|
| CLO2-15% | |
| CLO3-5% | |

| | | _ | | | | | | | | |
|------------------|---|---|----------------------|---|----------------------|--|--------------------|-----------|------------|-----------|
| | | COMPETENCY SCALE 5 II A Cond Madage Manage | | | | | | | | |
| | Leaves-reserve | Excellent | Good | Moderate | Weak | Very Weak | Fail | Weightage | Mark Given | FINAL 40% |
| NUM | COMPETENCY | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | | | |
| PROJECT PROPOSAL | | | | | | | | | | |
| CLO1 | INTRODUCTION - explanation should consist of domain background, importance of the subject and current issues according to proposed topic | Clearly written with all necessary elements | <in between=""></in> | Satisfactorily written with most necessary elements | <in between=""></in> | Poorly written and missing most necessary elements | No explanation | 0.4 | 5 | 2.00 |
| CLO1 | PROBLEM STATEMENT - explanation of problem should be related to the domain / knowledge or solution gap | Clearly stated and explained with supporting citation | <in between=""></in> | Stated with explanation without supporting citation | <in between=""></in> | Poorly stated with insufficient or irrelevant explanation | Problem not stated | 0.4 | 5 | 2.00 |
| CLO1 | OBJECTIVE - MUST be 3 Objectives (reflecting SMART concept) and must be aligned with Problem Statement | All objectives are clearly stated reflecting SMART concept and aligned with problem statement | <in between=""></in> | Objectives are stated and aligned with problem statement but not all reflecting SMART concept | <in between=""></in> | Objectives are poorly stated | No objectives | 0.4 | 5 | 2.00 |
| CLO1 | SCOPE - Whichever relevant: Features/functions, limitations/constraints, boundaries, stakeholders, resources (equipment, software, hardware etc). | Clearly defined incorporating all necessary elements | <in between=""></in> | Partially defined incorporating some of the elements | <in between=""></in> | Poorly defined with many missing elements | Scope not defined | 0.4 | 5 | 2.00 |
| CL01 | LITERATURE REVIEW (description and analysis) - Well organised and clearly structured - Minimum 3 existing works relevant to the project/research must be well described and properly cited - The existing works must be critically analysed and evaluated via OOAD and Structural Approach: flow chart/activity diagram for every compared system | Clearly written and fulfil all criteria | <in between=""></in> | Satisfactorily written and fulfil some criteria | <in between=""></in> | Poorly written and does not fulfil most criteria | No explanation | 1 | 5 | 5.00 |
| CLO1 | PROJECT/RESEARCH LIFECYCLE - should describe on the implementation of project/research lifecycle Project Based: SDLC (Agile,RAD etc) Research Based: Research Framework/ Model/ Methodology/ Research Activities | The described lifecycle is practical and applicable to the project | <in between=""></in> | The described lifecycle is somewhat practical and applicable | <in between=""></in> | The described lifecycle is neither practical nor applicable to the project | No description | 0.4 | 5 | 2.00 |

| CLO1 | PROJECT REQUIREMENT - should describe the requirement related to the project comprehensively, clearly, and must be aligned with the OBJECTIVES of the project/research Project Based: Functional and Non-Functional Requirement, Constraints and limitations etc. OOAD:Use Case Use case Description, sequence diagram Strutural: Context, Dfd-0N, Flow chart / Description Research Based: Input, Output, Process description, Constraints and limitations, Case Study etc. | Clearly explained incorporating all required elements | <in between=""></in> | Satisfactorily explained but missing some elements | <in between=""></in> | Poorly explained and missing most elements | No explanation | 0.6 | 5 | 3.00 |
|------|--|--|----------------------|--|----------------------|---|----------------------------|-----|---|------|
| CLO2 | PROPOSED DESIGN[CRITERIA BASED ON RG]- should describe the proposed design related to project requirement. Project Based: Context Diagram, Use Case Diagram & description, Activity diagram Project Based: OOAD (Object-oriented): 1. General Architecture 2. Package Diagram + Class with relationships (Class name without att/ method) SSAD (Structured): 1. Package Structural/ dialogue diagram/ GUI Research Based: Pseudocode/Algorithm/Flowchart/Model | Clearly explained incorporating all required elements | <in between=""></in> | Satisfactorily explained but missing some elements | <in between=""></in> | Poorly explained and missing most elements | No explanation | 0.6 | 5 | 3.00 |
| CLO2 | DATA DESIGN [CRITERIA BASED ON RG] - should describe the data related to the project Project Based: ERD, Database Design (PK, FK) / Data Model / Input data, Output data. Research Based: Dataset description | Clearly explained incorporating all required elements | <in between=""></in> | Satisfactorily explained but missing some elements | <in between=""></in> | Poorly explained and missing most elements | No data design provided | 0.6 | 5 | 3.00 |
| CLO2 | PROOF OF CONCEPT/PROTOTYPE [CRITERIA BASED ON RG] - prototype with design that is up to the standard Project based: - Complete/detail prototype design - Sequence of interaction/system flow (SERG this not prototype) Project Based: OOAD: Package Structure in Implementation+API Use Framework Environment setup SSAD (Structured): Package Structure in Implementation+API Use Framework Environment setup Research based: - Evidence of early work as defined by RG (e.g., initial model/algorithm/framework etc) - Functions/library/data are well described | Excellently done and fulfil all defined criteria | ≺in between> | Satisfactorily done and fulfil most defined criteria | <in between=""></in> | Poorly done and does not fulfil most defined criteria | No explanation | 1.2 | 5 | 6.00 |

| CLO2 | TESTING PLAN/VALIDATION PLAN [CRITERIA BASED ON RG] - should describe the relevant and comprehensive testing strategy/approach eg: UAT, Usability Testing present the simple set of input, processes and output and comparison of results. eg: Testing Report | Testing approach is relevant, comprehensive and well described | <in between=""></in> | Testing approach is relevant but not comprehensive, satisfactorily described | <in between=""></in> | Insufficiently explained. | Testing approach is irrelevant and poorly described | 0.6 | 5 | 3.00 |
|------|---|---|----------------------|--|----------------------|---|---|-----|---|-------|
| CLO1 | POTENTIAL USE OF PROPOSED SOLUTION - explanation of potential use of proposed solution in real time situation | Well explained with relevant/valid potential use | <in between=""></in> | Satisfactorily explained with relevant/valid potential use | <in between=""></in> | Poorly explained and potential use is hardly relevant | No explanation | 0.2 | 5 | 1.00 |
| | REFERENCE -Minimum 10 references related to the project must be stated Must follow the proposal format | All references provided are related to the content and correctly formatted | <in between=""></in> | Some references are not related to the content but mostly in correct format | <in between=""></in> | All references are not related to the content | No references | 0.2 | 5 | 1.00 |
| | | | AFFI | ECTIVE-PLO5 | | • | | | | |
| | Oral Communication The ability to deliver ideas clearly and effectively through verbal. | Excellent communication skills demonstrated | <in between=""></in> | Satisfactory communication skills demonstrated | <in between=""></in> | Poor communication skills demonstrated | No oral communication. | 0.2 | 5 | 1.00 |
| CLOS | Written Communication The ability to write an academic discourse (project proposal) which has a coherent flow that is clear and easy to comprehend. | Project proposal is excellently written | <in between=""></in> | Project proposal is satisfactorily written | <in between=""></in> | Project proposal is poorly written | No written communication. | 0.2 | 5 | 1.00 |
| CLO3 | Responding to Question The ability to respond to questions using appropriate language. | Accurate response with proper language | <in between=""></in> | Satisfactory response with proper language | <in between=""></in> | Poor response | No respond to question. | 0.6 | 5 | 3.00 |
| | | | | 1 | | | | | | 40.00 |