

# SRM INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

## SCHOOL OF COMPUTING


VII SEMESTER – August 2024

18CSP107L- Minor Project / 18CSP108L- Internship

Review Date: 28 September 2024

### INSTRUCTIONS TO STUDENTS FOR SECOND REVIEW

1. The Second Review will be conducted on **28 September 2024**
2. Students are required to present their project with a demonstration in front of the panel.
3. Students are required to submit a Review PPT, a Review report, and an updated research article or patent document during the review process.
4. For **Research Projects**, the students are instructed to prepare a presentation for 10 minutes with the following contents:
  - From their research objectives, the students must refine the product backlog and create relevant user stories with acceptance criteria using MS Planner, treating each objective as an epic. Additionally, they must implement one or two objectives (epics) based on the complexity of the projects. Additionally, they have to prepare the following documents for the second review
  - Daily Scrum (Daily call progress of the list of activities – otherwise called updates of standup meeting)
  - Functional Document (For Each user story)
  - Architecture Document (High-level Design)
  - Outcome of objectives/ Result Analysis
  - Sprint Retrospective document
5. For Research Projects, Students have to report their progress to the respective guides weekly once without fail.
6. For Research Projects, an Updated Research Article in IEEE format must be submitted during review.
7. All the research projects must be submitted for research day presentation.

- 
8. For **Product Development projects**, the students are instructed to prepare a presentation for 10 minutes with the following contents:
    - Product Backlog Refinement – Refinement of Product backlog using MS Planner with Complete user stories and acceptance criteria
    - Sprint Backlog refinement – Committed User Stories for Sprint 2 with acceptance criteria, and a list of tasks developed based on the User Story.
    - Sprint Activities
      - Daily Scrum (Daily call progress of the list of activities – otherwise called updates of standup meeting)
      - Functional Documents
      - UI Design
      - Architecture Document (highlight current sprint features)
      - Demo of the Deliverables (internal/external) of the first Sprint
      - Sprint retrospective document
  9. For product development, students are required to report their progress to their respective guides during the daily standup meeting and update the details in MS Planner using One Note with daily scrum reports.
  10. For Product Development, Students must submit the updated patent form during the review
  11. Students have to attend the review in person without fail.
  12. It is mandatory to follow the proper dress code as per the norms for all the reviews.
  13. Absence will be viewed seriously.
  14. All the projects must be published/patented Before February 2025.
  15. Publishing or patenting of project work is the responsibility of the students and guide.
  16. Though students work in groups, the evaluation will be done on an Individual basis only.
  17. The detailed documents of Points no. 4 and 8 are considered Review Reports.
  18. Refer to the link for report formatting guidelines and follow all the instructions.

[https://webstor.srmist.edu.in/web\\_assets/srm\\_mainsite/files/2018/manual\\_for\\_preparation\\_of\\_phd-thesis-2018.pdf](https://webstor.srmist.edu.in/web_assets/srm_mainsite/files/2018/manual_for_preparation_of_phd-thesis-2018.pdf)



## RUBRICS FOR 18CSP107L - MINOR PROJECT EVALUATION

### Rubrics for Review

Review #	Agenda	Assessment	Review Assessment Weightage	Overall Weightage
Review 1	First term Minor project Evaluation	Rubric R1	30	30%
Review 2	Mid-Term Minor Project Evaluation	Rubric R2	30	30%
Review 3	Minor Project Report Evaluation	Rubric R3	20	20%
	End Semester Minor Project Evaluation	Rubric R4	20	20%
Total			100	100%

## Rubric #R2: Mid-Term Minor Project Evaluation

Maximum Marks\*: 30

PI / Performance		Level of Achievement					
Criteria		Excellent (10)	Good (8)	Average (6)	Acceptable (4)	Unacceptable (2)	Score
a	<b>4.5.1</b> Design Methodology of Proposed work	i) Division of problem into modules and good selection of computing framework ii) Appropriate design methodology and proper justification	i) Division of problem into modules and good selection of computing framework ii) Design methodology not properly justified	i) Division of problem into modules but inappropriate selection of computing framework ii) Design methodology not properly justified	i) Partial division of the problem into modules and inappropriate selection of computing framework ii) Design methodology not defined properly	i) Modular approach not adopted ii) Design methodology not defined	10
b	<b>5.4.1</b> Planning of Project Work and Team Structure	i) Time frame properly specified and being followed ii) Appropriate distribution of project work	i) Time frame properly specified and being followed ii) Inappropriate distribution of project work	i) Time frame properly specified, but not being followed ii) Distribution of project work uneven	i) Time frame properly specified, but not being followed ii) Uneven distribution of project work and no synchronization	i) Time frame not properly specified ii) Inappropriate distribution of project work	10

c	<b>10.5.2</b> Demonstration and Presentation	i) Objectives achieved through implementation and good demonstration ii) Contents of presentation are well arranged iii) Good spoken language	i) Objectives achieved through implementation and good demonstration ii) Contents of presentation are not well arranged iii) Good spoken language	i) Objectives achieved through implementation and average demonstration ii) Contents of presentation are not well arranged iii) Average spoken language	i) Partial objectives are achieved through implementation and moderate demonstration ii) Contents of presentation are not well arranged iii) Moderate spoken language	i) No objectives are achieved through implementation ii) Contents of presentation are inappropriate iii) Poor spoken language	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

### 18CSP108L - INTERNSHIP

#### INSTRUCTIONS TO STUDENTS FOR SECOND REVIEW

1. The second review is scheduled on September 28, 2024, for the Internship students
2. Students can demonstrate their completed industry work to the panel.
3. Students have the option to attend the review either online or in person.
4. Students are required to submit a report detailing the work they have completed.

**Rubric #R2: Industry Supervisor Evaluation** (The review panel should conduct the review, and the supervisor should also gather input on the student's performance from the industry mentor.)

**Maximum Marks\*: 30**

PI / Performance	Level of Achievement					
Criteria	Excellent(10)	Good (8)	Average(6)	Acceptable (4)	Unacceptable (2)	Score

a	<b>2.6.4</b> Ability to Learn and Creativity	i) Quickly understood new concepts, ideas, and work assignments ii) Frequently proposed innovative and creative ideas, solutions, and/or options	i) Good understanding of new concepts, ideas, and work assignments ii) Proposed innovative and creative ideas, solutions, and/or options	i) Understanding of new concepts, ideas, and work assignments ii) Adapt to innovative and creative ideas, solutions, and/or options	i) Slow understanding of new concepts, ideas, and work assignments ii) Adapt to innovative and creative ideas, solutions, and/or options	i) Poor understanding of new concepts, ideas, and work assignments ii) No innovative and creative ideas, solutions, and/or options	10
b	<b>11.6.1/11.6.2</b> Quality of Work	i) Very good performance in all work requirements ii) submitted all work assignments on time without mistakes	i) Good performance in all work requirements ii) Most work assignments submitted in a timely manner and made occasional errors	i) With a few minor exceptions, adequately performed most work requirements ii) Most work assignments submitted in a timely manner and made occasional errors	i) With a few minor exceptions, adequately performed most work requirements ii) Work assignments were usually late and required review and made numerous errors	i) Work was done in a careless manner and was of erratic quality ii) Work assignments were usually late and required review and made numerous errors	10
c	<b>9.4.2</b> Response to Supervision and Organizational Fit	i) Always receptive to constructive criticism and advice, successfully implemented supervisor suggestions when offered ii) Completely understood and fully supported the organization's mission, vision, and goals	i) Generally receptive to constructive criticism and advice, implemented supervisor suggestions in most cases ii) Completely understood and fully supported the organization's mission, vision, and goals	i) Generally receptive to constructive criticism and advice, implemented supervisor suggestions in most cases ii) Adequately understood and supported the organization's mission, vision, and goals;	i) Generally receptive to constructive criticism and advice, implemented supervisor suggestions in few cases ii) Unwilling or unable to understand and support the organization's mission, vision, and goals	i) Unwilling to accept constructive criticism and advice ii) Unwilling or unable to understand and support the organization's mission, vision, and goals	10

### REVIEW SCHEDULE

REVIEW	DATES
Project Review – 0	3 August 2024 [Saturday]

<b>Project Review I</b>	31 August 2024 [Saturday]
<b>Project Review II</b>	28 September 2024 [Saturday]
<b>Project Review III with final report submission</b>	26 October 2024[Saturday]

Project Coordinators

Dr.T.S. Shiny Angel/ CINTEL

Dr.G. Senthil Kumar/CINTEL

