

## Part 1: Threshold Concept

**Selected Threshold Concept:** Traversal Order Affects Fault Detection in Circuits

### What Students Know:

- Basic circuit symbols and their meanings
- Reading simple circuit diagrams
- Understanding that current flows from a source through components
- All components/nodes must be checked in a fault-finding exercise

### What Students Don't Know:

- That the order of checking components can affect how quickly faults are found
- How different tracing approaches (level-wise vs. depth-wise) change the fault detection process
- How certain approaches can help detect repetitive loops (feedback paths) in circuits

### Principles:

1. Traversal Order Affects Result
  2. Cycle Detection Capability (feedback/loop detection)
  3. Level-wise vs. Depth-wise Exploration
- 

## Part 2: Case Study

**Case Study Title:** *"The Faulty Amplifier Lab"*

### Context:

In the Basic Electronics lab, a first-year B.Tech student team is troubleshooting a faulty amplifier circuit. The amplifier isn't working as expected, and the task is to locate the problem. The students split into two approaches to test the connections and components.

### Scenario:

You're part of the troubleshooting team. Starting from the power supply, you observe how each student checks the circuit.

- **Student A** begins by checking all components directly connected to the power supply first, then moves on to the next "layer" of components (level-wise).
- **Student B** starts at the power supply, follows one connection deeply through several components, and only comes back to check other paths later (depth-wise).

You notice that the choice of method changes how quickly faults are found and whether certain feedback loops or repeated paths are detected early.

### Your Task:

The lab instructor wants you to explain:

- Why the order in which the components are tested changes the fault detection process.
- Which approach helps identify *all* faults more systematically.
- Which approach is better at spotting feedback loops early.
- Which method works best when you need to find the closest fault to the power source quickly.

You're expected to simulate, observe, compare, and reflect on both approaches.

### Case Study using Bloom's Taxonomy

- **Remember:** Recall the two tracing methods used.
- **Understand:** Explain the difference between level-wise and depth-wise tracing.
- **Apply:** Use the correct tracing method for finding a nearby fault.
- **Analyze:** Compare both methods for their efficiency in finding different types of faults.
- **Evaluate:** Decide which method is better for specific fault scenarios and justify.
- **Create:** Develop a hybrid tracing strategy for maximum efficiency.

### Case Study using Fink's Taxonomy

- **Foundational Knowledge:** Learn the two tracing styles.
- **Application:** Trace a sample amplifier circuit using both methods.
- **Integration:** Connect this learning to other systems (e.g., water flow, traffic routing).
- **Human Dimension:** Reflect on personal problem-solving strategies in lab settings.
- **Caring:** Appreciate the importance of an efficient approach for lab safety and time-saving.
- **Learning How to Learn:** Build a personal decision rule for selecting a tracing method.

### Case Study using SOLO Taxonomy

- **Pre-structural:** Observe tracing without understanding differences.
- **Uni-structural:** Identify one key difference between methods.
- **Multi-structural:** List several differences without linking them.
- **Relational:** Link tracing style to fault detection speed and accuracy.
- **Extended Abstract:** Apply the tracing decision-making to unrelated engineering troubleshooting.

### Comparison Table

Aspect	Bloom's Taxonomy	Fink's Taxonomy	SOLO Taxonomy
Focus	Cognitive skill progression	Holistic learning (includes affective and integration)	Depth and complexity of understanding

<b>Stages</b>	Remember → Understand → Apply → Analyze → Evaluate → Create	Foundational → Application → Integration → Human Dimension → Caring → Learning How to Learn	Pre-structural → Uni-structural → Multi-structural → Relational → Extended Abstract
<b>Strength</b>	Clear hierarchy for cognitive outcomes	Encourages connection to real-world and personal growth	Measures sophistication of understanding
<b>Use in this Case Study</b>	Defines lab tasks at increasing cognitive levels	Adds relevance, self-awareness, and motivation	Shows progress from observation to conceptual transfer

---

### Part 3: Reflection Questions and Learning Outcomes

#### Reflection Questions (Bloom Level: Apply)

1. Which tracing method would you use to find a short circuit near the power source quickly, and why?
2. If the circuit contains a feedback loop, which method would detect it earlier, and how?
3. For checking the entire circuit without missing any component, which method is better and why?

#### Mapped Learning Outcomes:

- Students will be able to apply and compare circuit tracing strategies for fault detection.
- Students will identify which tracing approach detects feedback loops more effectively.
- Students will justify the selection of a tracing method for specific electronics lab fault scenarios.