King Saud University
College of Computer and Information Sciences
Department of Computer Engineering

Graduation Project Self Assessment

CLO	Report and Presentation	<=25%	25%> and <= 50%	50%> and <= 75%	75%> and <= 100%
1	Problem formulation and motivation	Unclear or missing formulation; relation to requirements not mentioned.	Mostly clear but relation to some original requirements not mentioned and/or rationale for scope not clear.	Satisfactory formulation; Relation to few original Requirements not mentioned, changes in scope and rationale mostly clear with some gaps.	Excellent problem formulation; Relation to all original requirements and changes in the scope, if any, explained and justified.
2	Solution design and choices justification	Poor design; No exploration of alternative approaches; No attention to effective use of available resources.	Fair design; alternative design presented without a careful analysis of their advantages/disadvantages; Team picked an approach based on superficial comparisons.	Good design; careful consideration of alternative design approaches and their resource requirements; Not all trade-offs fully analyzed.	Excellent design, Thorough consideration and evaluation of a good set of design approaches; Careful analysis of resource requirements of each and the resulting trade-offs; Where appropriate, potential client's input sought before making final choice.
6	Implementation and experiments	Poor implementation and experiment, Not even basic consideration of resource requirements; System is very buggy. No systematic testing, nor use of standard approaches.	Limited amount of attention to resource usage; Team has followed a standard process but not consistently. Team has put some effort into systematic testing, but some bugs remain.	Careful attention to resource usage and how system might scale with increased demand for services; The team adopted and mostly followed a standard process in its	Meticulous attention to resource usage and to user interface factors; Ensured that system can evolve to deal with increased demand for services. Team has consistently followed a standard process in its work;

				work; The team used a systematic approach to testing and the system seems bug-free.	Adopted a suitable testing approach, followed it systematically, and thoroughly tested the system.
3	Effective communication in report writing	Documentation consisted of little more than (poorly commented) system code; Hardly any mention of system's scope, design rationale, implementation choices, etc.	Documentation mostly effective at conveying main aspects of project including scope and design/ implementation choices (but not the rationale behind the choices); Inadequate user manual; Lacking Information for future development.	Team's documentation clearly presented all important aspects of project: original scope, changes made, implementation choices, processes used etc. Test scripts and important parts of design/code explained; Lessons learned were summarized; further developments well presented. Well-written user manual.	Excellent documentation; Project's original scope, design choices, relevant code details, processes and tools used, and test models all described in a structured and integrated manner; Information to enable future designers to evolve system included; Well-designed user manual provided all necessary information; Illustrations, graphics, and layout executed to excellent effect.
3	Effective communication in presentation	Presentations not effective; Failed to present information about some essential aspects of project; Team members ineffective in responding to even simple questions.	Presentations adequate at conveying main ideas behind project including design choices, etc., but not engaging or inspiring.	Presentations were well done and presented all important aspects of project; Team explained rationale behind its choices and summarized important lessons learned;	Team's presentations were elegant, informative and engaging. In answering questions, the team provided the right level and type of detail for questions ranging from

			Team responded appropriately to specific questions about specific aspects of project but some responses were unclear.	Responses to questions were reasonable although some went into too much technical detail, compromising their effectiveness.	implementation detail to test methodology to future evolution of project.
4	Ethical and professional responsibilities: understanding during presentation	Little attention paid to factors beyond minimal functional requirements; No systematic use of professional tools; Ethical issues related to system and impact on society not considered.	Some use of common tools seen in earlier courses; Modest effort to ensure basic reliability and security properties; Mostly ignored ethical issues and potential impact on society of systems of this kind.	Good use of professional tools going beyond ones previously seen; System designed to be reliable/ secure under normal operation and under stress; Some consideration of impact of system on society including potential harm the system may cause in some situations.	Excellent use of professional tools and systems, identified by careful research; Detailed analysis of security holes with implementation designed to deal with ones that can be reasonably handled and documentation of rest; Analysis of ethical issues related to system and its impact on society including implications of IEEE Code as it applies to the system, in consultation with potential client if applicable.
4	Ethical and professional responsibilities: Plagiarism report	Similarity percentage >20%	20% > Similarity percentage >15%	15% >Similarity percentage >10%	10% >Similarity percentage

	During the Semester				
5	Effective team member: weekly meeting to report project status	Poor Attendance and participation	Fair Attendance and little participation	Good Attendance and participation	Excellent Attendance and participation
5	Effective team member: cooperative behavior	Dysfunctional team; Members blamed each other for problems in project; Team spirit completely lacking.	Team functioned at minimal level of effectiveness; Members concentrated on distinct parts of system without concern for impact on other members' work. In presentations, individual members did not make any attempt to help other members address audience questions.	Generally effective team; Members interested in presenting a positive picture of the team's work; Members helped each other during team presentations. Team members had a general idea of other members' work.	Very effective team; Team members went out of the way to describe how each member contributed to various aspects of project. Team worked as a cohesive unit during presentations, with members seamlessly handing over the conversation from one to another to answer questions, etc.
7	Applying new knowledge as needed	No application of new knowledge is provided	Fair application of new knowledge with minimum added value to the project.	Good application of new knowledge that contribute to the project	Excellent application of new knowledge that improve the overall project