

## Network Security Proposal Part 1 Rubric

Criteria	Excellent	Good	Acceptable (Minimally Proficient)	Needs Improvement	Needs Significant Improvement	Missing or Unacceptable
Assessed the appropriate vulnerability assessment tools to support the requirements of the organization	Provided an excellent description of the technical requirements, proposal, and justification for the vulnerability assessment.	Provided an outstanding description of the technical requirements, proposal, and justification for the vulnerability assessment.	Provided a description of the technical requirements, proposal, and justification for the vulnerability assessment.	Provided a description of the technical requirements and proposal for the vulnerability assessment, but lacked an appropriate justification.	Identified technical requirements for the vulnerability assessment, but the proposal and justification lacked detail and/or was not well supported.	The technical requirements, proposal, and justification for the vulnerability assessment of the paper were off topic or failed to provide required level of detail.
Identified the appropriate security policy for the organization	Provided an excellent description of the technical requirements, proposal, and justification for the security policy.	Provided an outstanding description of the technical requirements, proposal, and justification for the security policy.	Provided a description of the technical requirements, proposal, and justification for the security policy.	Provided a description of the technical requirements and proposal for the security policy, but lacked an appropriate justification.	Identified a technical requirement for the security policy, but the proposal and justification lacked detail and/or was not well supported.	The technical requirements, proposal, and justification for the security policy of the paper were off topic or failed to provide required level of detail.
Describe the proper risk management solution to reduce risk to an acceptable level	Provided an excellent description of the technical requirements, proposal, and justification for the proper risk management solution.	Provided an outstanding description of the technical requirements, proposal, and justification for the proper risk management solution.	Provided a description of the technical requirements, proposal, and justification for the proper risk management solution.	Provided a description of the technical requirements and proposal for the proper risk management solution, but lacked an appropriate justification.	Identified a technical requirement for the proper risk management solution, but the proposal and justification lacked detail and/or was not well supported.	The technical requirements, proposal, and justification for the proper risk management solution of the paper were off topic or failed to provide required level of detail.
Assessed the appropriate business continuity plan to enable critical organizational functions to continue	Provided an excellent description of the technical requirements, proposal, and justification for the business continuity plan.	Provided an outstanding description of the technical requirements, proposal, and justification for the business continuity plan.	Provided a description of the technical requirements, proposal, and justification for the business continuity plan.	Provided a description of the technical requirements and proposal for the business continuity plan, but lacked an appropriate justification.	Identified a technical requirement, but the proposal and justification for the business continuity plan lacked detail and/or was not well supported.	The technical requirements, proposal, and justification for the business continuity plan of the paper were off topic or failed to provide required level of detail.
Assessed the proper access control models for the organization	Provided an excellent description of the technical requirements, proposal, and justification for the access control model(s) selected.	Provided an outstanding description of the technical requirements, proposal, and justification for the access control model(s) selected.	Provided a description of the technical requirements, proposal, and justification for the access control model(s) selected.	Provided a description of the technical requirements and proposal for the access control model(s) selected, but lacked an appropriate justification.	Identified a technical requirement for the access control model(s) selected, but the proposal and justification lacked detail and/or was not well supported.	The technical requirements, proposal, and justification for the access control model(s) were off topic or failed to provide required level of detail.

Use of Authoritative Sources / Resources	Work contains a reference list containing entries for all cited sources. Reference list entries and in-text citations are correctly formatted using the appropriate IEEE style for each type of resource. The description appropriately used information from 3 or more authoritative sources, i.e. journal articles, industry or trade publications, news articles, industry or government white papers and authoritative Web sites.	Work contains a reference list containing entries for all cited sources. One or two minor errors in IEEE format for in-text citations and/or reference list entries. The description appropriately used information from 3 or more authoritative sources, i.e. journal articles, industry or trade publications, news articles, industry or government white papers and authoritative Web sites.	Work contains a reference list containing entries for all cited sources. No more than 5 minor errors in IEEE format for in-text citations and/or reference list entries. The description appropriately used information from 2 or more authoritative sources, i.e. journal articles, industry or trade publications, news articles, industry or government white papers and authoritative Web sites.	Work contains a reference list containing entries for cited sources. Work contains no more than 5 minor errors in IEEE format for in-text citations and/or reference list entries. The description appropriately used information from 2 or more authoritative sources, i.e. journal articles, industry or trade publications, news articles, industry or government white papers and authoritative Web sites.	Work attempts to credit sources but demonstrates a fundamental failure to understand and apply the IEEE formatting standard.  The description appropriately used information from 1 or more authoritative sources, i.e. journal articles, industry or trade publications, news articles, industry or government white papers and authoritative Web sites.	Reference list is missing. Work demonstrates an overall failure to incorporate and/or credit authoritative sources for information used in the paper.
Satisfy standards of writing style and grammatical correctness	No formatting, grammar, spelling, or punctuation errors.	Work contains minor errors in formatting, grammar, spelling or punctuation which do not significantly impact professional appearance.	Errors in formatting, spelling, grammar, or punctuation which detract from professional appearance of the submitted work.	Submitted work has numerous errors in formatting, spelling, grammar, or punctuation. Work is unprofessional in appearance.	Submitted work is difficult to read / understand and has significant errors in formatting, spelling, grammar, punctuation, or word usage.	No work submitted for this assignment.
<b>Overall Score</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Acceptable (Minimally Proficient)</b>	<b>Needs Improvement</b>	<b>Needs Significant Improvement</b>	<b>No Submission</b>

## Network Security Proposal Part 2 Rubric

Criteria	Excellent	Good	Acceptable (Minimally Proficient)	Needs Improvement	Needs Significant Improvement	Missing or Unacceptable
Assessed the appropriate physical security for the organization	Provided an excellent description of the requirements, proposal, and justification for the physical security solution.	Provided an outstanding description of the requirements, proposal, and justification for the physical security solution.	Provided a description of the requirements, proposal, and justification for the physical security solution.	Provided a description of the requirements and proposal for the physical security solution, but lacked an appropriate justification.	Identified requirements for the physical security solution, but the proposal and justification lacked detail and/or was not well supported.	The requirements, proposal, and justification for the physical security solution were off topic or failed to provide required level of detail.
Identified the appropriate mobile device security to implement	Provided an excellent description of the technical requirements, proposal, and justification for mobile device security.	Provided an outstanding description of the technical requirements, proposal, and justification for mobile device security.	Provided a description of the technical requirements, proposal, and justification for mobile device security.	Provided a description of the technical requirements and proposal for mobile device security, but lacked an appropriate justification.	Identified a technical requirement for mobile device security, but the proposal and justification lacked detail and/or was not well supported.	The technical requirements, proposal, and justification for mobile device security were off topic or failed to provide required level of detail.
Assessed the proper perimeter defenses to defend the organization	Provided an excellent description of the technical requirements, proposal, and justification for the perimeter defenses.	Provided an outstanding description of the technical requirements, proposal, and justification for the perimeter defenses.	Provided a description of the technical requirements, proposal, and justification for the perimeter defenses.	Provided a description of the technical requirements and proposal for the perimeter defenses, but lacked an appropriate justification.	Identified a technical requirement for the perimeter defenses, but the proposal and justification lacked detail and/or was not well supported.	The technical requirements, proposal, and justification for the perimeter defenses were off topic or failed to provide required level of detail.
Assessed the proper network defense devices to defend the organization	Provided an excellent description of the technical requirements, proposal, and justification for the network defense devices.	Provided an outstanding description of the technical requirements, proposal, and justification for the network defense devices.	Provided a description of the technical requirements, proposal, and justification for the network defense devices.	Provided a description of the technical requirements and proposal for the network defense devices, but lacked an appropriate justification.	Identified a technical requirement, but the proposal and justification for the network defense devices lacked detail and/or was not well supported.	The technical requirements, proposal, and justification for the network defense devices were off topic or failed to provide required level of detail.
Assessed the proper host defense to defend the organization	Provided an excellent description of the technical requirements, proposal, and justification for the host defenses.	Provided an outstanding description of the technical requirements, proposal, and justification for the host defenses.	Provided a description of the technical requirements, proposal, and justification for the host defenses.	Provided a description of the technical requirements and proposal for the host defenses, but lacked an appropriate justification.	Identified a technical requirement for the host defenses, but the proposal and justification lacked detail and/or was not well supported.	The technical requirements, proposal, and justification for the host defenses were off topic or failed to provide required level of detail.
Use of Authoritative	Work contains a reference list containing	Work contains a reference list containing	Work contains a reference list containing	Work contains a reference list containing	Work attempts to credit sources but	Reference list is missing. Work demonstrates

Sources / Resources	entries for all cited sources. Reference list entries and in-text citations are correctly formatted using the appropriate IEEE style for each type of resource. The description appropriately used information from 3 or more authoritative sources, i.e. journal articles, industry or trade publications, news articles, industry or government white papers and authoritative Web sites.	entries for all cited sources. One or two minor errors in IEEE format for in-text citations and/or reference list entries. The description appropriately used information from 3 or more authoritative sources, i.e. journal articles, industry or trade publications, news articles, industry or government white papers and authoritative Web sites.	entries for all cited sources. No more than 5 minor errors in IEEE format for in-text citations and/or reference list entries. The description appropriately used information from 2 or more authoritative sources, i.e. journal articles, industry or trade publications, news articles, industry or government white papers and authoritative Web sites.	entries for cited sources. Work contains no more than 5 minor errors in IEEE format for in-text citations and/or reference list entries. The description appropriately used information from 2 or more authoritative sources, i.e. journal articles, industry or trade publications, news articles, industry or government white papers and authoritative Web sites.	demonstrates a fundamental failure to understand and apply the IEEE formatting standard.  The description appropriately used information from 1 or more authoritative sources, i.e. journal articles, industry or trade publications, news articles, industry or government white papers and authoritative Web sites.	an overall failure to incorporate and/or credit authoritative sources for information used in the paper.
Satisfy standards of writing style and grammatical correctness	No formatting, grammar, spelling, or punctuation errors.	Work contains minor errors in formatting, grammar, spelling or punctuation which do not significantly impact professional appearance.	Errors in formatting, spelling, grammar, or punctuation which detract from professional appearance of the submitted work.	Submitted work has numerous errors in formatting, spelling, grammar, or punctuation. Work is unprofessional in appearance.	Submitted work is difficult to read / understand and has significant errors in formatting, spelling, grammar, punctuation, or word usage.	No work submitted for this assignment.
<b>Overall Score</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Acceptable (Minimally Proficient)</b>	<b>Needs Improvement</b>	<b>Needs Significant Improvement</b>	<b>No Submission</b>

## Network Security Proposal Part 3 Rubric

Criteria	Excellent	Good	Acceptable (Minimally Proficient)	Needs Improvement	Needs Significant Improvement	Missing or Unacceptable
Assessed the appropriate public key infrastructure implementation	Provided an excellent description of the technical requirements, proposal, and justification for public key infrastructure (PKI).	Provided an outstanding description of the technical requirements, proposal, and justification for public key infrastructure (PKI).	Provided a description of the technical requirements, proposal, and justification for public key infrastructure (PKI).	Provided a description of the technical requirements and proposal for public key infrastructure (PKI), but lacked an appropriate justification.	Identified technical requirements for public key infrastructure (PKI), but the proposal and justification lacked detail and/or was not well supported.	The technical requirements, proposal, and justification for public key infrastructure (PKI) were off topic or failed to provide required level of detail.
Identified the secure protocol implementation given the network design	Provided an excellent description of the technical requirements, proposal, and justification for the secure protocol implementation.	Provided an outstanding description of the technical requirements, proposal, and justification for the secure protocol implementation.	Provided a description of the technical requirements, proposal, and justification for the secure protocol implementation.	Provided a description of the technical requirements and proposal for the secure protocol implementation, but lacked an appropriate justification.	Identified a technical requirement for the secure protocol implementation, but the proposal and justification lacked detail and/or was not well supported.	The technical requirements, proposal, and justification for the secure protocol implementation were off topic or failed to provide required level of detail.
Assessed the appropriate file encryption implementation	Provided an excellent description of the technical requirements, proposal, and justification for file encryption.	Provided an outstanding description of the technical requirements, proposal, and justification for file encryption.	Provided a description of the technical requirements, proposal, and justification for file encryption.	Provided a description of the technical requirements and proposal for file encryption, but lacked an appropriate justification.	Identified a technical requirement for file encryption, but the proposal and justification lacked detail and/or was not well supported.	The technical requirements, proposal, and justification for file encryption were off topic or failed to provide required level of detail.
Assessed the appropriate implementation for hashing method	Provided an excellent description of the technical requirements, proposal, and justification for the hashing method.	Provided an outstanding description of the technical requirements, proposal, and justification for the hashing method.	Provided a description of the technical requirements, proposal, and justification for the hashing method.	Provided a description of the technical requirements and proposal for the hashing method, but lacked an appropriate justification.	Identified a technical requirement, but the proposal and justification for the hashing method lacked detail and/or was not well supported.	The technical requirements, proposal, and justification for the hashing method were off topic or failed to provide required level of detail.
Assessed the proper backup and restoration implementation for the organization	Provided an excellent description of the technical requirements, proposal, and justification for the backup and restoration system and processes.	Provided an outstanding description of the technical requirements, proposal, and justification for the backup and restoration system and processes.	Provided a description of the technical requirements, proposal, and justification for the backup and restoration system and processes.	Provided a description of the technical requirements and proposal for the backup and restoration system and processes, but lacked an appropriate justification.	Identified a technical requirement for the backup and restoration system and processes, but the proposal and justification lacked detail and/or was not well supported.	The technical requirements, proposal, and justification for the backup and restoration system and processes were off topic or failed to provide required level of detail.

Use of Authoritative Sources / Resources	Work contains a reference list containing entries for all cited sources. Reference list entries and in-text citations are correctly formatted using the appropriate IEEE style for each type of resource. The description appropriately used information from 3 or more authoritative sources, i.e. journal articles, industry or trade publications, news articles, industry or government white papers and authoritative Web sites.	Work contains a reference list containing entries for all cited sources. One or two minor errors in IEEE format for in-text citations and/or reference list entries. The description appropriately used information from 3 or more authoritative sources, i.e. journal articles, industry or trade publications, news articles, industry or government white papers and authoritative Web sites.	Work contains a reference list containing entries for all cited sources. No more than 5 minor errors in IEEE format for in-text citations and/or reference list entries. The description appropriately used information from 2 or more authoritative sources, i.e. journal articles, industry or trade publications, news articles, industry or government white papers and authoritative Web sites.	Work contains a reference list containing entries for cited sources. Work contains no more than 5 minor errors in IEEE format for in-text citations and/or reference list entries. The description appropriately used information from 2 or more authoritative sources, i.e. journal articles, industry or trade publications, news articles, industry or government white papers and authoritative Web sites.	Work attempts to credit sources but demonstrates a fundamental failure to understand and apply the IEEE formatting standard.  The description appropriately used information from 1 or more authoritative sources, i.e. journal articles, industry or trade publications, news articles, industry or government white papers and authoritative Web sites.	Reference list is missing. Work demonstrates an overall failure to incorporate and/or credit authoritative sources for information used in the paper.
Satisfy standards of writing style and grammatical correctness	No formatting, grammar, spelling, or punctuation errors.	Work contains minor errors in formatting, grammar, spelling or punctuation which do not significantly impact professional appearance.	Errors in formatting, spelling, grammar, or punctuation which detract from professional appearance of the submitted work.	Submitted work has numerous errors in formatting, spelling, grammar, or punctuation. Work is unprofessional in appearance.	Submitted work is difficult to read / understand and has significant errors in formatting, spelling, grammar, punctuation, or word usage.	No work submitted for this assignment.
<b>Overall Score</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Acceptable (Minimally Proficient)</b>	<b>Needs Improvement</b>	<b>Needs Significant Improvement</b>	<b>No Submission</b>