

MALAYSIA CDIO PRACTITIONERS CONFERENCE 2025 SPECIAL AWARDS

4A. MOST CONSISTENT CDIO PRACTITIONER BY ACADEMIC PROGRAMME AWARD

For programmes that consistently apply CDIO in teaching and learning.

The applicant may be the Head of Programme or any designated individual representing the academic programme.

Criteria:

1. **Consistency of Application** – Clear and sustained use of CDIO standards in the programme.
2. **Active Learning Strategies** – Demonstration of project-based and experiential learning practices.
3. **Quality of Student Output** – Evidence of student work aligned with CDIO outcomes.
4. **Programme Monitoring & Improvement** – Mechanisms to evaluate and enhance CDIO practices yearly.
5. **Faculty Engagement** – Percentage of academic staff involved in CDIO initiatives.
6. **Evidence of Impact** – Testimonials, industry feedback, or graduate employability linked to CDIO practices.

4B. RUBRIC - MOST CONSISTENT CDIO PRACTITIONER BY ACADEMIC PROGRAMME AWARD

Criterion	Weightage	1 – Poor	2 – Fair	3 – Good	4 – Very Good	5 – Excellent
1. Consistency of Application	4	No consistency; CDIO standards rarely applied in the programme.	Minimal consistency; CDIO applied sporadically in isolated courses.	Moderate consistency; CDIO partially applied in the curriculum.	Strong consistency; CDIO applied across most courses in the programme.	Full consistency; CDIO standards integrated across all programme elements with clear evidence of long-term application.
2. Active Learning Strategies	3	No active learning strategies; teaching is lecture-based.	Minimal active learning; occasional project-based tasks.	Some active learning strategies evident; moderate use of experiential activities.	Strong use of project-based and experiential learning in most courses.	Exemplary active learning; students consistently engaged in hands-on, project-based, and reflective learning practices.
3. Quality of Student Output	3	Student outputs are weak; little evidence of CDIO outcomes.	Outputs show minimal alignment with CDIO standards.	Moderate quality; some student works demonstrate CDIO relevance.	High quality outputs; majority of student work reflects strong CDIO alignment.	Outstanding quality outputs; innovative, impactful, and recognised by external stakeholders (e.g., awards, publications).
4. Programme Monitoring & Improvement	3	No monitoring or improvement mechanisms in place.	Minimal efforts to review and improve CDIO practices.	Some monitoring and occasional improvements made.	Strong monitoring systems; regular updates and improvements implemented.	Exemplary monitoring and improvement; data-driven enhancements with

Criterion	Weightage	1 – Poor	2 – Fair	3 – Good	4 – Very Good	5 – Excellent
						significant positive outcomes over time.
5. Faculty Engagement	5	No faculty involved in CDIO; resistance to participation.	Minimal engagement; a few staff involved in CDIO initiatives.	Moderate engagement; some staff participate actively in CDIO.	Strong faculty participation; majority involved in CDIO practices.	Full faculty engagement; CDIO champions at all levels fostering a collaborative and innovative environment.
6. Evidence of Impact	2	No evidence of positive impact from CDIO practices.	Minimal impact; isolated success stories.	Moderate impact; some evidence from testimonials, feedback, or graduate outcomes.	Strong impact; multiple sources (students, industry, community) validating programme's CDIO success.	Outstanding impact; clear evidence of programme's transformative influence on students, industry, and community.

4c. DOCUMENTS TO BE SUBMITTED - MOST CONSISTENT CDIO PRACTITIONER BY ACADEMIC PROGRAMME AWARD

Criterion	Suggested Supporting Documents
1. Consistency of Application	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Course/module outlines showing CDIO standards applied over years- Photos of recurring CDIO activities- Annual programme reports
2. Active Learning Strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Lesson plans with active learning methods- Photos/videos of project-based learning- Student feedback forms
3. Quality of Student Output	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Samples of student projects or portfolios- Awards won by students- Testimonials from industry partners
4. Programme Monitoring & Improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Annual monitoring reports- Minutes from curriculum review meetings- Evidence of changes made based on feedback
5. Faculty Engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Attendance list of faculty workshops- Photos of staff in CDIO activities- Memos assigning roles to faculty members
6. Evidence of Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Graduate employment data- Industry feedback letters- Testimonials from students/alumni

Note: Other relevant supporting documents can be considered.

4D. TABLE OF SUMMARY TO BE SUBMITTED BY APPLICANT - MOST CONSISTENT CDIO PRACTITIONER BY ACADEMIC PROGRAMME AWARD

Criterion	Explanation Based on the Project	List of Supporting Documents Attached
1. Consistency of Application		
2. Active Learning Strategies		
3. Quality of Student Output		
4. Programme Monitoring & Improvement		
5. Faculty Engagement		
6. Evidence of Impact		