Rubrics for Evaluation of FYP Report

Criteria	1	2	3	4	5
R1 Abstract	Abstract is not written or written in a vague form	Abstract is written in an ordinary way. The important results are not clear to a reader who is unfamiliar.	Abstract provides a reasonable description of the project but can be improved	The abstract provides a good overview of the project and results in two pages or less.	Abstract is excellently written according to the scientific writing standards and provides a good summary in two pages or less
R2 Literature Review, References	Literature Review is not written or written in a vague form. The list of references is clearly inadequate.	Ligature Review is written in an ordinary way. The review material i.e. research papers or web material is not at all clear to a reader who is unfamiliar. The list of references should be expanded	Literature review provides a reasonable description of the project background and its significance but can be improved. Number of research papers/ web material needs to be added more. The list of references appears reasonable but citation does not follow standard format.	The review provides a good background and details of the literature. However, it is not written in scientific writing standards for review. The list of references appears reasonable and citation follow standard format	Literature review is excellently written according to the scientific writing standards and covers maximum of the research papers/web material related to project. A comprehensive list of references is cited using a standard format
R3 Problem Statement	Problem statement is not stated at all or vaguely stated	Problem statement is stated but not entirely clear.	Problem statement is stated but lacks necessary justification in light of the literature review.	Problem statement is stated and covers necessary justification with reference to the literature review.	Problem statement is stated and covers sufficient justification. New reader can clearly understand its value and context
R4 Methodology	The approach taken to solve the problem is not discussed.	Some aspects of the solution are discussed briefly but much of the description is left out.	The methods, approaches, tools, techniques, algorithms, or other aspects of the solution are discussed but not is a convincing manner. Much is left to the readers' imagination.	The methods, approaches, tools, techniques, algorithms, or other aspects of the solution are sufficiently discussed.	The methods, approaches, tools, techniques, algorithms, or other aspects of the solution are sufficiently discussed with sufficient details and supporting figures.
R5 System Architecture	System architecture is not included at all or vaguely stated	System architecture is included but entirely poor way. No architecture design approach is stated. Subsystem architecture is not	System architecture is included in ordinary way. Architecture design approach is stated. However, it is missing the required details. Subsystem architecture is also not clear and missing few	System architecture is included in good way. Architecture design approach is stated and clear. Subsystem architecture is also clear. Functional description or object oriented description is	System architecture is included in excellent way. Architecture design approach is stated and clear. Subsystem architecture is also added in excellent way. Functional description or object oriented description is included

		mentioned. Neither functional description nor object oriented description is included	important information. Functional description or object oriented description is included; however, required diagrams are missing	included along with required diagrams. However, there is still need to add more details and further improvements are required	along with required diagrams. There is no need for further improvements
R6 Detailed system design	System design is not included at all or vaguely stated	System design is included but entirely in poor way. No low-level components and subcomponents are stated. Also class diagram and ER diagrams are missing	System design is included in ordinary way. Low-level components and subcomponents are described but, it is missing the required details. Also class diagram and ER diagram are ordinary designed	System design is included in good way. Low-level components and subcomponents are described with adequate details. Also class diagram and ER diagram are good. Subcomponents are described according to software component attributes i.e. classification, definition and responsibilities etc. However, does not cover all the ten attributes	System design is included in excellent way. Low-level components and subcomponents are described with very good details. Also class diagram and ER diagram are drawn according to UML standards. Subcomponents are described according to software component attributes i.e. classification, definition and responsibilities etc. And it cover all the ten attributes
R7 Implementation and Testing	System implementation and testing is not included at all or vaguely stated	System implementation is included but entirely in poor way. Very little description is added. No system testing is performed	System implementation is included in ordinary way. However, Testing is not adequate enough to test the entire system	System implementation is added in good way and provides all the necessary details for the reader. System testing is performed in good way. Various test cases are generated and details are included; however, further improvements are required regarding the number and quality of test cases	System implementation is added in excellent way and provides all the necessary details for the reader. System testing is performed in very good way. Various test cases are generated and details are included. No further improvements are required regarding the number and quality of test cases
R8 Results	Results and evaluation of the solution are not provided.	Results and Evaluation of the solution are briefly discussed without supporting figures and graphics.	Results and Evaluation of the solution are discussed with few supporting figures and graphics	Results and Evaluation of the solution are discussed with supporting figures and graphics.	A comprehensive evaluation of the solution is presented with supporting figures and graphics.

		Evaluation test cases do not cover all the use cases.	Evaluation performed using weak testing strategy.	Evaluation test cases cover all the use cases. Deployment plan is presented	System testing is performed through a strong testing strategy and the test cases cover all the use cases. Their results are added properly
R9 **Conclusion and future work**	Conclusion does not present the essential project contribution and results. No recommendations for follow-up work given.	Essential project results are not clearly stated. Recommendation for future work is incomplete.	Conclusions are largely qualitative rather than quantitative. The discussion of strengths and limitation could be expanded. Recommendations for future work are given but not clearly thought-out.	Most important results and contribution are presented. Strengths and limitations of the final design are discussed. Some cost information is included. A good set of recommendations for future work is provided. Reflections on the design process are included.	Conclusions provide a succinct summary of all essential results. Results are summarized quantitatively as well as qualitatively. The discussion of strengths and limitations is insightful and objective. Useful final cost information is provided. A clear and complete set of recommendations for follow-up work is provided. A succinct evaluation of the design process is provided.
R10 **Language and Grammar, Formatting Style**	A lot of spelling and grammatical mistakes Writing is not understandable. Improper format and style. Table of content missing.	Frequent spellings and grammatical errors that impede the reading flow. Writing is in need of significant editing and improvement. The formatting of the chapters may need improvement.	Occasional spellings and grammatical errors Writing is acceptable but not entirely clear. Formatting style is proper but figures and tables don't follow standard practice (caption figure number etc.)	Occasional spellings and grammatical errors that have only minor impact on flow of reading. Writing is overall clear. Organization is good. Content is supported by good number of figures and tables. Formatting style of chapters, table of contents, title page, references and appendices are proper.	Almost no spelling or grammatical mistake. Writing is easy to read. Excellent organization. Writing is concise yet all necessary content is included. Content is supported by good number of figures and tables. Formatting style of chapters, table of contents, title page, references and appendices are proper and relevant.

FYP Report Evaluation Form

Project Title _____

Student Names _____

PLO	S No	Description	Weight	Performance (1 – 5)	Marks
PLO-10: Communication	R1	**Abstract**	**1**	**1** ☐ **2** ☐ **3** ☐ **4** ☐ **5** ☐	
PLO-2: Problem Analysis	R2	**Literature Review, References**	**1**	**1** ☐ **2** ☐ **3** ☐ **4** ☐ **5** ☐	
PLO-2: Problem Analysis	R3	**Problem Statement**	**1**	**1** ☐ **2** ☐ **3** ☐ **4** ☐ **5** ☐	
PLO-4: Investigation	R4	**Methodology**	**1**	**1** ☐ **2** ☐ **3** ☐ **4** ☐ **5** ☐	
PLO-3: Design/ Development of Solution	R5	**System Architecture**	**1**	**1** ☐ **2** ☐ **3** ☐ **4** ☐ **5** ☐	
PLO-3: Design/ Development of Solution	R6	**Detailed system design**	**1**	**1** ☐ **2** ☐ **3** ☐ **4** ☐ **5** ☐	
PLO-5: Modern Tool Usage	R7	**Implementation and Testing**	**1**	**1** ☐ **2** ☐ **3** ☐ **4** ☐ **5** ☐	
PLO-4: Investigation	R8	**Results**	**1**	**1** ☐ **2** ☐ **3** ☐ **4** ☐ **5** ☐	
PLO-4: Investigation	R9	**Conclusion and future work**	**1**	**1** ☐ **2** ☐ **3** ☐ **4** ☐ **5** ☐	
PLO-10: Communication	R10	**Language and Grammar, Formatting Style**	**1**		

Evaluator Name: _____ Signature (Date): _____

Comments _____

Rubrics for Evaluation of FYP Demonstration

Criteria	1	2	3	4	5
R1 Completeness and Accuracy	The system failed to produce the right accurate results	The system execution led to inaccurate or incomplete results. It was not correctly functional or not all the features were implemented.	The system was correctly functional and most of the features were implemented	The system was correctly functional and all of the features were implemented	The system was correctly functional and all of the features were implemented. It was demonstrated how the real world problem was solved
R2 Coding Standards	Coding standards, best programming practices are not followed. Students cannot understand the code.	Coding standards, best programming practices are not followed.	Coding standards, best programming practices are rarely followed.	Coding standards, best programming practices are followed appropriately	Coding standards, best programming practices are followed extensively
R3 Ways of Demonstration	The system does not fulfill the functional requirements.	It is not clearly demonstrated how the system fulfills its functional requirements	It is demonstrated how the system fulfills some of its functional requirements	It is demonstrated how the system fulfills most of its functional requirements	It is clearly and effectively demonstrated how the system fulfills all of its functional requirements
R4 Quality	Student is unaware of System's non-functional requirements	System's non-functional requirements (as mentioned in SRS) are not demonstrated	Some of the system's non-functional requirements are demonstrated	Most of the system's non-functional requirements are demonstrated	All of the system's non-functional requirements are clearly demonstrated
R5 Originality	Most part of the working product is copied.	Working product is uninspired and straightforward work with little to no creative potential.	Working product has some potential for making a creative contribution.	Working product has some creative /original /inventive element and a potential for making a creative contribution	Working product has several creative /original /inventive /innovative elements and a clear potential for making a creative contribution.
R6 Modern Tool Usage	Modern engineering software were not used, where applicable, to solve complex engineering problems.		Computer-based tools and technical software were used, but more could have been used to solve the problem.		Modern computer-based tools and software were used extensively in the project. New software/language was learned as needed

FYP Demonstration Evaluation Form

Project Title _____

Student Names _____

PLO	S No	Description	Weight	Performance (1 – 5)	Marks
PLO-11: Project Management	R1	**Completeness and Accuracy**	**1**	**1** ☐ **2** ☐ **3** ☐ **4** ☐ **5** ☐	
PLO-3: Design/ Development of Solution	R2	**Coding Standards**	**1**	**1** ☐ **2** ☐ **3** ☐ **4** ☐ **5** ☐	
PLO-10: Communication	R3	**Ways of Demonstration**	**1**	**1** ☐ **2** ☐ **3** ☐ **4** ☐ **5** ☐	
PLO-3: Design/ Development of Solution	R4	**Quality**	**1**	**1** ☐ **2** ☐ **3** ☐ **4** ☐ **5** ☐	
PLO-8: Ethics	R5	**Originality**	**1**	**1** ☐ **2** ☐ **3** ☐ **4** ☐ **5** ☐	
PLO-5: Modern Tool Usage	R6	**Modern Tool Usage**	**1**	**1** ☐ **2** ☐ **3** ☐ **4** ☐ **5** ☐	

Evaluator Name: _____ Signature (Date) : _____

Comments _____

_____

Rubrics for Evaluation of FYP Defence Oral Presentation

Criteria	1	2	3	4	5
R1 **Subject Knowledge**	Student has no knowledge of both problem and solution. Cannot answer basic questions.	Student does not have grasp of information; student cannot answer questions about subject	Student is uncomfortable with information and is able to answer only rudimentary questions	Student has competent knowledge and is at ease with information. Can answer questions but fails to elaborate.	Student has presented full knowledge of both problem and solution. Answers to questions are strengthen by rationalization and explanation
R2 **Organization and Content of Presentation**	Student is clueless about the content of his presentation.	Information is arranged in confused and unstructured way. Key points are not covered. The contents are hard to understand and interpret.	Information articulated clearly but it is difficult to follow the presentation. All key points are covered but no use of charts, graphs, figures etc., to explain salient points.	Information articulated clearly and the flow is reasonable All key points are covered but limited use of charts, graphs, figures etc., to explain salient points.	Information articulated clearly and is organized in a structured way with logical flow between parts. All key points are covered. Enhances presentation and keeps interest by effective use of charts, graphs, figures etc., to explain salient points.
R3 **Delivery & Presentation Skills**	Presentation was not clear at all. Language was not appropriate	Holds no eye contact with audience, as entire report is read from notes Speaks in low volume and/ or monotonous tone, which causes audience to disengage	Displays minimal eye contact with audience, while reading mostly from the notes Speaks in uneven volume with little or no inflection	Consistent use of direct eye contact with audience, but still returns to notes Speaks with satisfactory variation of volume and inflection	Holds attention of entire audience with the use of direct eye contact, seldom looking at notes Speaks with fluctuation in volume and inflection to maintain audience interest and
R4 **Completeness of Project, Timeline**	The project could not be completed.	Some of the major features are complete but the timeline for project was not followed.	Major features of the project are completed. However, the timeline was not followed	Most features of the project were completed and timeline as defined in the proposal was followed	The project is completed in the timely manner with all features implemented according to the timeline defined in project proposal.

R5 **Professional ethical values**	The student never reported to his supervisor	Student reported occasionally to his supervisor. The student did not follow the timeline.	Student had few meetings. More are required. Some time he came prepared, other times he was not prepared.	Student held regular meetings with his supervisor.	Student held regular meetings with his supervisors and committee members. He reported his progress regularly
R6 **Team Work**	Only one member did all the work. Conflicts between the group members were clearly visible.	Only one member did all the work. Other members could not answer basic questions about the project.	Not all members contributed to the project. Work division is not mentioned.	All members contributed to the project. Cooperation between group members was reasonable. Work division is mentioned	All members contributed to the project. Any conflicts within the group members were amicably resolved. Work division is clearly mentioned.

FYP Defence Oral Presentation Evaluation Form

Project Title _____

Student Names _____

PLO	S No	Description	Weight	Performance (1 – 5)	Marks
PLO-1: Engineering Knowledge	R1	**Subject Knowledge**	**1**	**1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐**	
PLO-10: Communication	R2	**Organization and Content of Presentation**	**1**	**1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐**	
PLO-10: Communication	R3	**Delivery & Presentation Skills**	**1**	**1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐**	
PLO-11: Project Management	R4	**Completeness of Project, Timeline**	**1**	**1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐**	
PLO-8: Ethics	R5	**Professional ethical values**	**1**	**1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐**	
PLO-9: Individual & Team Work	R6	**Team Work**	**1**	**1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐**	

Evaluator Name: _____ Signature (Date): _____

Comments _____

_____

PROJECT EVALUATION FORM (Open House)

Project Name _____ Table # _____

	S No	Description	Weight	Performance (0 – 10)	Marks
PLO-6	1	How well does the project solve an industry/social/local problem?	**2**	**Fail ☐ Below Average ☐ Average ☐ Good ☐ Excellent ☐**	
PLO-3	2	Quality of the System level design work?	**1**	**Fail ☐ Below Average ☐ Average ☐ Good ☐ Excellent ☐**	
	3	Commercialization potential of the project	**2**	**Fail ☐ Below Average ☐ Average ☐ Good ☐ Excellent ☐**	
PLO-10	4	**DEMONSTRATION** How well are the interactions between Software & Hardware defined and implemented?	**1**	**Fail ☐ Below Average ☐ Average ☐ Good ☐ Excellent ☐**	
	5	**POSTER** Creativity, Clarity, layout	**1**	**Fail ☐ Below Average ☐ Average ☐ Good ☐ Excellent ☐**	
PLO-3	6	**END PRODUCT QUALITY** H/W Projects: Physical Design, Finishing S/W Projects: UI Design, Completeness Research Project: Results, Completeness	**2**	**Fail ☐ Below Average ☐ Average ☐ Good ☐ Excellent ☐**	
PLO-1	7	Did the student understand and answer your questions completely and appropriately?	**1**	**Fail ☐ Below Average ☐ Average ☐ Good ☐ Excellent ☐**	

Name (judge) _____ Company _____ Signature (with Date)_____

Comments _____