

# SRM INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

## SCHOOL OF COMPUTING

VII SEMESTER – October 2024

18CSP107L- Minor Project / 18CSP108L- Internship

Review Date: 26 October 2024

### INSTRUCTIONS TO STUDENTS FOR THIRD REVIEW

1. The Third Review will be conducted on **26 October 2024**
2. Students are required to present their project with a demonstration in front of the panel.
3. Students are required to submit a Project book, Review PPT, a Final report, and an updated research article or patent document with Publication or filing status during the review process.
4. **For Research Projects, the students are instructed to prepare a presentation for 20 minutes along with a complete demonstration of the project 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 the remaining objectives (epics). Also, they have to prepare the following documents for the Third 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 20 minutes along with a complete demonstration of the project 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 3 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)
    - Functional Test case Document
    - Demo of the Deliverables (internal/external) of the Third 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.

# **RUBRICS FOR 18CSP107L - MINOR PROJECT EVALUATION**

## **Rubrics for Review**

<b>Review #</b>	<b>Agenda</b>	<b>Assessment</b>	<b>Review Assessment Weightage</b>	<b>Overall Weightage</b>
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 #R3: Minor Project Report Evaluation

Maximum Marks\*: 20

PI / Performance Criteria		Level of Achievement					Score
		Excellent(10)	Good (8)	Average(6)	Acceptable (4)	Unacceptable (2)	
a	<b>2.5.3</b> Description of Concepts and Technical Details	i) Complete explanation of the key concepts ii) Strong description of the technical requirements of the project	i) Complete explanation of the key concepts ii) Insufficient description of the technical requirements of the project	i) Complete explanation of the key concepts but little relevance to literature ii) Insufficient description of the technical requirements of the project	i) All key concepts are not explained and very little relevance to literature ii) Insufficient description of the technical requirements of the project	i) Inappropriate explanation of key concepts ii) Poor description of the technical requirements of the project	10
b	<b>9.6.1</b> Discussion on outcomes/Result Analysis and Project Report	i) Results are presented in very appropriate manner ii) Report is according to specified format and citations are well mentioned	i) Results are presented in good manner ii) Report is according to specified format but references and citations are not well mentioned	i) Results presented are not much satisfactory ii) Report is according to specified format but with mistakes, insufficient references and citations	i) Results presented are not satisfactory ii) Report is not according to specified format, insufficient references and citations	i) Results presented are not satisfactory ii) Report is not according to specified format, mistakes are found, insufficient references and citations	10

## Rubric #R4: End Semester Minor Project Evaluation

Maximum Marks\*: 20

PI / Performance Criteria		Level of Achievement					Score
		Excellent(10)	Good (8)	Average(6)	Acceptable (4)	Unacceptable (2)	
a	<b>12.4.2</b> Incorporation of Suggestions	Changes are made as per the modifications suggested during Mid-Term Minor Project Evaluation and new innovations added	Changes are made as per the modifications suggested during Mid-Term Minor Project Proposal Evaluation and good justification	All major changes are made as per the modifications suggested during Mid-Term Minor Project Proposal Evaluation	Few changes are made as per the modifications suggested during Mid-Term Minor Project Proposal Evaluation	Suggestions during Mid-Term Minor Project Proposal Evaluation are not incorporated	10
b	<b>10.5.2</b> Project Demonstration and Presentation	i) All defined objectives are achieved ii) Each module are well demonstrated and system working is good iii) Contents are appropriate and well delivered	i) All defined objectives are achieved ii) Each module are properly demonstrated and system working is not very satisfactory iii) Contents are appropriate and good delivery	i) All defined objectives are achieved ii) Module are working well in isolation but not properly integrated and demonstrated iii) Contents are not appropriate and delivered properly	i) Some of the defined objectives are achieved ii) Module are working well in isolation but not properly integrated and demonstrated iii) Contents are not appropriate and delivered properly	i) Defined objectives are not achieved ii) Modules are not in proper working that leads to failure of integrated system iii) Contents are not appropriate and delivered properly	10

## 18CSP108L - INTERNSHIP

### INSTRUCTIONS TO STUDENTS FOR THIRD REVIEW

1. The Third review is scheduled on October 26, 2024, for the Internship students
2. Students can demonstrate their completed industry work to the panel.
3. Students have to attend the review in person without fail.
4. Students are required to submit a report detailing the work they have completed.

### Rubrics for Review

Review #	Agenda	Assessment	Review Assessment Weightage	Over all Weightage
Review 1	Design Methodology (from Industrial case study) Evaluation	Rubric R1	30	30%
Review 2	Industry Supervisor Evaluation	Rubric R2	30	30%
Review 3	Internship Report Evaluation	Rubric R3	20	20%
	End Semester Internship Evaluation	Rubric R4	20	20%

### Rubric #R3: Internship Report Evaluation

Maximum Marks\*: 20

PI / Performance Criteria		Level of Achievement					Score
		Excellent(10)	Good (8)	Average(6)	Acceptable (4)	Unacceptable (2)	
a	<b>2.5.3</b> Description of Concepts and Technical Details	i) Complete explanation of the key concepts ii) Strong description of the technical requirements industrial case study	i) Complete explanation of the key concepts ii) Insufficient description of the technical requirements of the industrial case study	i) Complete explanation of the key concepts but little relevance to literature ii) Insufficient description of the technical requirements of the industrial case study	i) All key concepts are not explained and very little relevance to literature ii) Insufficient description of the technical requirements of the industrial case study	i) Inappropriate explanation of key concepts ii) Poor description of the technical requirements of the industrial case study	10
b	<b>9.6.1</b> Discussion on Result Analysis and Internship Report	i) Results are presented in very appropriate manner ii) Report is according to specified format and citations are well mentioned	i) Results are presented in good manner ii) Report is according to specified format but references and citations are not well mentioned	i) Results presented are not much satisfactory ii) Report is according to specified format but with mistakes, insufficient references and citations	i) Results presented are not satisfactory ii) Report is not according to specified format, insufficient references and citations	i) Results presented are not satisfactory ii) Report is not according to specified format, mistakes are found, insufficient references and citations	10

## Rubric #R4: End Semester Internship Evaluation

Maximum Marks\*: 20

PI / Performance Criteria		Level of Achievement					Score
		Excellent(10)	Good (8)	Average(6)	Acceptable (4)	Unacceptable (2)	
a	<b>10.5.2</b> Incorporation of Suggestions and Presentation	i) Changes are made as per the modifications suggested ii) Contents are appropriate and well delivered	i) Changes are made as per the modifications suggested ii) Contents are appropriate but adequate delivery	i) All major changes are made as per the modifications suggested ii) Contents are appropriate but not delivered properly	i) Few changes are made as per the modifications suggested ii) Contents are not appropriate and delivered properly	i) Suggestions are not incorporated ii) iii) Contents are not appropriate and delivered properly	10
b	<b>12.4.2</b> Implementation and Demonstration of Industrial Case Study	i) All defined objectives are achieved ii) Each module are well demonstrated and system working is good	i) All defined objectives are achieved ii) Each module are properly demonstrated but system working is not very satisfactory	i) All defined objectives are achieved ii) Module are working well in isolation but not properly integrated and demonstrated	i) Some of the defined objectives are achieved ii) Module are working well in isolation but not properly integrated and demonstrated	i) Defined objectives are not achieved ii) Modules are not in proper working that leads to failure of integrated system	10



### **REVIEW SCHEDULE**

<b>REVIEW</b>	<b>DATES</b>
<b>Project Review – 0</b>	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]
<b>Zeroth Review of Major Project</b>	16 <sup>th</sup> November 2024[Saturday]

Project Coordinators

Dr.T.S. Shiny Angel/ CINTEL

Dr.G. Senthil Kumar/CINTEL