

Department of Electrical and Information Engineering
EE7802 Undergraduate Project
Academic year 2022/2023

Project Proposal Report, Presentation, and VIVA evaluation Rubrics

| Project Proposal Report [10 Marks] | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | Weak [0-39] (Grade: E) | Satisfactory [40-54] (Grade: C- to C+) | Good [55-69] (Grade: B- to B+) | Excellent [70-100] (Grade: A- to A+) |
| Introduction/Back ground and Problem statement [10%] | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Importance/purpose of the project is not clear. Major gaps in interested area are not identified. Problem statement is not formulated well. Introduction and problem statement are not supported with appropriate references. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Importance/purpose of the project is stated to some extent. Gaps in interested area are identified to some extent. Problem statement is formulated but missing some information. Introduction and problem statement are supported with a few references. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Importance/purpose of the project is well stated. Major gaps in interested area are identified. With selected gap(s), problem statement is formulated. Introduction and problem statement are supported with adequate number of references. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Importance/purpose of the project is clearly stated. Major gaps in interested area are clearly identified. With selected gap(s), problem statement is well formulated. Introduction and problem statement are supported with good number of appropriate references. |
| Knowledge on related existing work [20%] | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Show limited knowledge of the previous work in the field through a few numbers of references and/or literature review. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Show adequate knowledge of the previous work in the field through adequate number of references and/or literature review. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates good knowledge of the previous work in the field through good number of references and/or literature review. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates a strong familiarity with the previous work in the field through good number of references and/or literature review. |
| Objectives, Scope, and Methodology [20%] | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal's objectives are listed but not clear or otherwise lacking. Scope of identified objectives are not described. Proposed methodology is not workable for this project. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal's objectives are adequately defined. Scope of several objectives are described but limitations are not justified. Proposed methodology has some flaws. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal's objectives are properly defined. Scope of all identified objectives are described but certain limitations are not justified. Proposed methodology is well designed. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal's objectives are well-defined and articulated. Scope of all identified objectives are described with justified limitations. |

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed methodology is well designed to achieve objectives under the selected scope. |
| Resource required and time plan [10%] | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resource required and time plan are present but not adequate to support the project. Time plan lacks sufficient detail or is overly ambitious. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resource required and time plan are present but not very well defined, not easy to understand. Feasible time plan but lacks sufficient detail. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resource required are available and appropriate in relation to the objectives of the project. Feasible time plan but with few parallel tasks (reflecting group work) and milestones. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resource required are available and appropriate in relation to the objectives of the project. Feasible time plan with parallel tasks (reflecting group work) and clear milestones. |
| Examiner's overall assessment on the feasibility of the project [30%] | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Processes and procedures are vaguely stated, or do not relate to the project proposed. The project as designed has little chance of being successful. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Procedures for executing the project appear management, but there is some uncertainty. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project completion is probable. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project has every reasonable expectation of being completed with goals that are discipline specific and achievable. |
| Mechanics of writing [10%] | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Below average/poor writing style lacking in elements of appropriate standard English. Frequent errors in spelling, grammar, punctuation, spelling, usage, and/or formatting. Proposal missing more than half of the key sections (Title Page, TOC, List of Figures/Tables, Abstract, Introduction, Problem Statement, Objectives and Scope, Lit Review, Methodology, Resources Required, Time Plan). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An average and/or casual writing style using standard English. Some errors in spelling, grammar, punctuation, usage, and/or formatting. Proposal missing only key section from the title Page, TOC, List of Figures/Tables, Abstract, Introduction, Problem Statement, Objectives and Scope, Lit Review, Methodology, Resources Required, Time Plan. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Above average writing style and clarity in writing using standard English. Minor errors in grammar, punctuation, spelling, usage, and/or formatting. Proposal contains all standard sections (Title Page, TOC, List of Figures/Tables, Abstract, Introduction, Problem Statement, Objectives and Scope, Lit Review, Methodology, Resources Required, Time Plan). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report is well written using standard English characterized by elements of a strong writing style. Free from grammar, punctuation, spelling, usage, or formatting errors. Proposal contains all standard sections (Title Page, TOC, List of Figures/Tables, Abstract, Introduction, Problem Statement, Objectives and Scope, Lit Review, Methodology, Resources Required, Time Plan). |

| Project Proposal Presentation [3 Marks] | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | Weak [0-39] (Grade: E) | Satisfactory [40-54] (Grade: C- to C+) | Good [55-69] (Grade: B- to B+) | Excellent [70-100] (Grade: A- to A+) |
| Organization [50%] | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hard to follow because information presented not in sequence. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most of information presented in sequence. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information presented in logical sequence; easy to follow. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information presented as interesting story in logical sequence, easy to follow. |
| Effective Communication [50%] | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student is not prepared. Lose audience attention frequently. Delivered content is not understood. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student is reasonably prepared. Keeps audience attention. Delivered content is generally understood. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student is prepared. Keeps audience attention. Delivered content is understood. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student is well prepared. Keeps audience attention throughout. Delivered content is well understood. |
| Project Proposal Viva [7 Marks] | | | | |
| | Weak [0-39] (Grade: E) | Satisfactory [40-54] (Grade: C- to C+) | Good [55-69] (Grade: B- to B+) | Excellent [70-100] (Grade: A- to A+) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Knowledge on fundamentals of relevant engineering concepts Knowledge of the existing related works/solutions and gaps Knowledge on the problem and proposed methodology. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very poor knowledge of relevant engineering concepts and basic research findings related to the core area. Minimal understanding of the problem and methodology. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sufficient knowledge of the relevant engineering concepts and basic research findings related to the core area. Basic understanding of the problem and methodology. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good knowledge of relevant engineering concepts and basic research findings related to the core area. Good understanding of the problem and methodology. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Full understanding of the related engineering concepts and knowledge of research findings by answering all question, able to defend arguments well, presented accurate and logical facts with supporting examples/proof. Very clear understanding of the problem and methodology. |