**SRM INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY**

**SCHOOL OF COMPUTING**

**VII SEMESTER – August 2024**

**18CSP107L- Minor Project / 18CSP108L- Internship**

**Review Date: 31st August 2024**

**INSTRUCTIONS TO STUDENTS FOR FIRST REVIEW**

1. The First Review will be conducted on **31st August 2024**
2. Students are required to present their project with a demonstration in front of the panel.
3. Students must submit a Review ppt, review report, Project book, and Initial research article/ patent document during the review.
4. For Research Projects, the students are instructed to prepare a presentation for 10 minutes with the following contents:

* Students should identify the objectives of their research projects, with each objective considered an "Epic." They need to create a product backlog related to the epics and write relevant user stories with acceptance criteria using MS Planner. Additionally, they must implement one or two objectives (epics) based on the complexity of the projects. Additionally, they have to prepare the following documents:
* Daily Scrum (Daily call progress of the list of activities – otherwise called updates of standup meeting)
* Functional Document (For Each user story)- Template will be shared
* Architecture Document (High-level Design)- Template will be shared
* Outcome of objectives/ Result Analysis
* Sprint Retrospective document

1. For Research Projects, Students have to report their progress to the respective guides weekly once without fail.
2. For Research Projects, an Initial Research Article in IEEE format must be submitted during review.
3. All the research projects must be submitted for research day presentation.
4. For Product Development projects, the students are instructed to prepare a presentation for 10 minutes with the following contents:

* Product Backlog Refinement – Construction of Product backlog using MS planner with Complete user stories and acceptance criteria (Format attached)
* Sprint Backlog refinement - Commit User Stories to be done in a sprint and develop the list of tasks 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

1. 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.
2. For Product Development, Students must submit the patent form during the review
3. Students have to attend the review in person without fail.
4. It is mandatory to follow the proper dress code as per the norms for all the reviews.
5. Absence will be viewed seriously.
6. All the projects must be published/patented within this academic year.
7. Publishing or patenting of project work is the responsibility of the students and guide.
8. Though students work in groups, the evaluation will be done on an Individual basis only.
9. The detailed documents of Points no. 4 and 8 are considered Review Reports.
10. 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>

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

**Rubrics for Review**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Review #** | **Agenda** | **Assessment** | Review Assessment Weightage | **Over all 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 #R1: First term Minor project Evaluation**

**Maximum Marks\*: 30**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PI / Performance Criteria** | | **Level of Achievement** | | | | | |
| **Excellent(10)** | **Good (8)** | **Average(6)** | **Acceptable (4)** | **Unacceptable (2)** | **Score** |
| a | **2.6.2** Identification of Problem Domain and Detailed Analysis | Detailed and extensive explanation of the purpose and need of the project | Good explanation of the purpose and need of the project | Average explanation of the purpose and need of the project | Moderate explanation of the purpose and need of the project | Minimal explanation of the purpose and need of the project | 10 |
| b | **2.6.3** Study of the Existing Systems and Feasibility of Project  Proposal | Detailed and extensive explanation of the specifications and the limitations of the existing systems | Collect a great deal of information and good study of existing systems | Moderate study of existing systems; collects some basic information | Explanation of the specifications and the limitations of the existing systems not very satisfactory; limited information | Minimal explanation of the specifications and the limitations of the existing systems not very satisfactory; Incomplete information | 10 |
| c | **4.4.1** Objectives and Methodology of the Proposed Work | All objectives of the proposed work are well defined; Steps to be followed to solve the defined problem are clearly specified | Good justification to the objectives; Methodology to be followed is specified but detailing is not done | Incomplete justification to the objectives proposed; Steps are mentioned but unclear; without justification to objectives | Only Some objectives of the proposed work are well defined; Steps to be followed to solve the defined problem are not specified properly | Objectives of the proposed work are either not identified or not well defined; Incomplete and improper specification | 10 |

**18CSP108L - INTERNSHIP**

**INSTRUCTIONS TO STUDENTS FOR FIRST REVIEW**

1. The first review will take place on August 31, 2024.
2. Students can showcase their completed industry work and demonstrate it 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 #R1: Design Methodology (from Industrial case study) Evaluation**

**Maximum Marks\*: 30**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PI / Performance Criteria** | | **Level of Achievement** | | | | | |
| **Excellent(10)** | **Good (8)** | **Average(6)** | **Acceptable (4)** | **Unacceptable (2)** | **Score** |
| a | **2.6.2** Identification of Problem Domain and Detailed Analysis | Detailed and extensive explanation of the purpose and need of the industrial case study | Good explanation of the purpose and need of the industrial case study | Average explanation of the purpose and need of the industrial case study | Moderate explanation of the purpose and need of the industrial case study | Minimal explanation of the purpose and need of the industrial case study | 10 |
| b | **2.6.3** Objectives and Methodology for the Industrial Case Study | All objectives of the proposed work are well defined; Steps to be followed to solve the defined problem are clearly specified | Good justification to the objectives; Methodology to be followed is specified but detailing is not done | Incomplete justification to the objectives proposed; Steps are mentioned but unclear; without justification to objectives | Only Some objectives of the proposed work are well defined; Steps to be followed to solve the defined problem are not specified properly | Objectives of the proposed work are either not identified or not well defined; Incomplete and improper specification | 10 |
| c | **10.5.2** Presentation | i) Contents of presentation are well arranged  ii) Good spoken language | i) Contents of presentation are not well arranged  ii) Good spoken language | i) Contents of presentation are not well arranged  i) Average spoken language | i) Contents of presentation are not well arranged  ii) Moderate spoken language | i) Contents of presentation are inappropriate  ii) Poor spoken language | 10 |

**REVIEW SCHEDULE**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **REVIEW** | **DATES** |
| **Project Review – 0** | 3 August 2024 [Saturday] |
| **Project Review I** | 31 August 2024 [Saturday] |
| **Project Review II** | 28 September 2024 [Saturday] |
| **Project Review III with final report submission** | 26 October 2024[Saturday] |

Project Coordinators

Dr.T.S.Shiny Angel/ CINTEL

Dr.G.Senthil Kumar/CINTEL