

ECA/ECE/2022/4276
10/05/2022

Engineering College, Ajmer

Department of Electronics & Communication Engineering

Rubrics Developed to Validate the POs

B. Tech. Project

Sr. No.	Component	Marks Assigned	
		Guide	Coordinator
1	Synopsis content/ Topic	25	25
2	Progress Report	15	15
3	Pre Demonstration	20	20
4	Mid Demonstration	35	35
5	Paper Submission	10	10
Total(Sessional Component)		210	
6	Final Demonstration- (External Component - 140)	File/ Report	25
		Presentation	25
		Accomplishment	15
		Viva Voce	20
		Chart/Poster	15
		Proto Type/ Physical Modal of Project	40
Total(External)		140	

Head, ECE

For faculty circulation

M. J. 25/4/2022

Beers

Das

Engineering College Ajmer

Department of Electronics & Communication Engineering

Rubrics: Project

Components for Rubric Evaluation	Outstanding (100 % to 76%)	Admirable (75 % to 51%)	Average (50 % to 26%)	Inadequate (Less than 26%)
<p>Report (Synopsis / Progress / Final Report)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Format is consistent throughout including heading styles and captions. • Figures and tables are presented logically and reinforce the text. • Significant number of papers reviewed. • Experimental Setup is very well described • All possible system and Input/ Output variables are taken into account • Performance measures are properly defined • Experimental scenarios are very well defined • Abstract and Conclusion is very well discussed. • Results are very well presented. • Similarity of the report is below 20 % . 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Format is generally consistent including heading styles and captions. • Figures and tables are neatly done and provide intended information. • Moderate number of papers reviewed • Experimental Setup is described • Most of the system and Input/ Output variables are taken into account • Most of the Performance measures are properly defined • Experimental scenarios are defined correctly • Abstract and Conclusion is moderately well discussed. • Results are moderately well presented. • Similarity of the report is below 30 %. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mostly consistent format. • Figures and tables are legible, but not convincing. • Less number of papers reviewed • Experimental Setup is given but not clearly described • Some of the system and Input/ Output variables are taken into account • Some of the Performance measures are properly defined • Experimental scenarios are defined but not sufficient • Abstract and Conclusion is well discussed. • Results are well presented. • Similarity of the report is below 40 % . 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work is illegible, format changes throughout, e.g. font type, size etc. • Figures and tables are sloppy and fail to provide intended information. • Number of papers reviewed is inadequate. • Experimental Setup is not described • System and Input/ Output variables are not defined • Performance measures are not properly defined • Experimental scenarios not defined • Abstract and Conclusion is poorly discussed. • Results are poorly presented. • Similarity of the report is above 40 % .

<p>Demonstration</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sequence of presentation is excellent & as per report • Font Size is same throughout and the contents are clearly visible • Speaker's voice is excellent • Delivery is excellent • Language is very good • Experimental Setup is shown systematically and explained very well • Demonstration has been excellent • Conceptual explanation was excellent • Could Answer all the queries very well 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sequence of presentation is fairly matching with report • Font Size is fixed and contents are fairly visible • Speaker is fairly audible • Delivery is good • Language is good • Experimental Setup is shown & explained • Demonstration of experimentation given well • Conceptual explanation was good • Could Answer most of the queries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sequence of presentation is somewhat matching with report • Font Size is little varying and contents are visible to some extent • Speaker is somewhat audible • Delivery is average • Language has few errors • Experimental Setup given but not so clear • Demonstration of experimentation given but not systematic • Conceptual explanation was somewhat good • Could Answer Some of the queries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sequence of presentation is random and not as per report • Font Size is varying and contents not visible • Speaker is not audible at all • Delivery is very poor • Language has so many errors • Experimental Setup not clear • Demonstration is poor • Conceptual explanation was Poor • Could not Answer queries
----------------------	--	---	---	--