



## EVALUATION OF EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING

### EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING PHASE - I

#### Rubrics for evaluation of Problem Definition

Criteria	Excellent (10-8)	Very Good (7-6)	Good (5-4)	Satisfactory (3-2)	Needs Improvement (1-0)
Clarity	Problem is clearly and concisely defined with specific focus.	Problem is clearly defined but could be more concise.	Problem is defined but lacks specificity or focus.	Problem is vaguely defined.	Problem is not clearly defined.
Relevance	Highly relevant and significant to the field.	Relevant and significant to the field.	Somewhat relevant but not entirely significant.	Relevance to the field is unclear.	Not relevant or significant to the field.
Context	Provides thorough background and context.	Provides adequate background and context.	Provides some background and context.	Provides little background and context.	No background or context provided.

#### Rubrics for evaluation of Objectives

Criteria	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Satisfactory (2)	Needs Improvement (1)
Specificity	Objectives are clear, specific, and measurable.	Objectives are clear but could be more specific.	Objectives are somewhat clear but not entirely specific or measurable.	Objectives are unclear or vague.	No objectives or very unclear.
Alignment	Objectives are well-aligned with the problem definition.	Objectives are mostly aligned with the problem definition.	Objectives have some alignment with the problem definition.	Objectives are poorly aligned with the problem definition.	No alignment with the problem definition.
Achievability	Objectives are realistic and achievable.	Objectives are realistic but may be challenging to achieve.	Objectives are somewhat realistic but could be more achievable.	Objectives are unrealistic or difficult to achieve.	Objectives are not achievable.



## EVALUATION OF EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING

### Rubrics for evaluation of Methodology

Criteria	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Satisfactory (2)	Needs Improvement (1)
Appropriateness	Methodology is highly appropriate for objectives.	Methodology is appropriate for objectives.	Methodology is somewhat appropriate.	Methodology is somewhat inappropriate.	Methodology is inappropriate or not provided.
Detail	Methodology is detailed and well-documented.	Methodology is mostly detailed and documented.	Methodology lacks some detail or documentation.	Methodology is poorly detailed or documented.	No methodology or very poorly documented.
Flow chart	Flow chart design is accurate, with all details, initial and final steps are clearly presented	Flow chart is accurate, but some components are not clearly defined	Flow chart lacks precision with respect to the stated objectives	Flow chart is incomplete and not well framed	Flow chart lacks interpretation



## EVALUATION OF EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING

### EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING PHASE -II

#### Rubrics for evaluation of Project Execution

Criteria	Excellent (15-12)	Very Good (11-8)	Good (7-4)	Satisfactory (3-2)	Needs Improvement (1-0)
Adherence	Closely follows the defined methodology.	Generally follows the methodology with minor deviations.	Follows methodology with some deviations.	Deviates significantly from the methodology.	Does not follow the methodology.
Timeliness	Completed on time and within scope.	Completed on time with minor scope issues.	Completed with some delays or scope issues.	Significant delays or scope issues.	Not completed on time or within scope.
Quality	High quality work with attention to detail.	Good quality work with minor issues.	Satisfactory quality with noticeable issues.	Poor quality work with significant issues.	Very poor quality or incomplete work.

#### Rubrics for evaluation of Tools and Techniques Used

Criteria	Excellent (10-8)	Very Good (7-6)	Good (5-4)	Satisfactory (3-2)	Needs Improvement (1-0)
Selection	Tools and techniques are highly appropriate and cutting-edge.	Tools and techniques are appropriate and effective.	Tools and techniques are somewhat appropriate.	Tools and techniques are inappropriate or outdated.	No tools and techniques or very inappropriate.
Application	Tools and techniques are expertly applied and utilized.	Tools and techniques are effectively applied.	Tools and techniques are adequately applied.	Tools and techniques are poorly applied.	Tools and techniques are not applied or misapplied.
Integration	Tools and techniques are seamlessly integrated into the project.	Tools and techniques are well integrated with minor issues.	Tools and techniques are somewhat integrated.	Tools and techniques are poorly integrated.	No integration or very poorly integrated.



---

## EVALUATION OF EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING

---

**Rubrics for evaluation of Partial Results**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Excellent (5)</b>	<b>Very Good (4)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Needs Improvement (1)</b>
Clarity	Partial results are clearly presented and well-documented.	Partial results are clear but could be more detailed.	Partial results are somewhat clear but lack detail.	Partial results are unclear or poorly documented.	Partial results are not presented or very unclear.
Progress	Shows significant and meaningful progress.	Shows good progress but could be more significant.	Shows some progress but lacks significance.	Shows little progress.	Shows no progress or regress.
Analysis	Partial results are thoroughly analyzed and interpreted.	Partial results are analyzed but interpretation could be improved.	Partial results are somewhat analyzed but lack interpretation.	Partial results are poorly analyzed or interpreted.	No analysis or interpretation of partial results.



## EVALUATION OF EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING

### EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING PHASE -III

#### Rubrics for evaluation of Complete Prototype Demonstration

Criteria	Excellent (20-16)	Very Good (15-11)	Good (10-6)	Satisfactory (5-3)	Needs Improvement (2-0)
Functionality	Prototype functions perfectly as intended.	Prototype functions well with minor issues.	Prototype functions but with noticeable issues.	Prototype has significant functionality issues.	Prototype does not function as intended.
Innovation	Prototype shows high levels of innovation and creativity.	Prototype shows good levels of innovation.	Prototype shows some innovation.	Prototype shows little innovation.	Prototype shows no innovation or is very basic.
Usability	Prototype is highly user-friendly and intuitive.	Prototype is user-friendly with minor usability issues.	Prototype is somewhat user-friendly but needs improvement.	Prototype is not user-friendly.	Prototype is very difficult to use or not usable.

#### Rubrics for evaluation of Results and Discussion

Criteria	Excellent (10-8)	Very Good (7-6)	Good (5-4)	Satisfactory (3-2)	Needs Improvement (1-0)
Clarity	Results are clearly presented and well-explained.	Results are clear but explanation could be improved.	Results are somewhat clear but need more explanation.	Results are unclear or poorly explained.	Results are not presented or very unclear.
Analysis	Thorough and insightful analysis of results.	Good analysis with some insights.	Adequate analysis with basic insights.	Limited analysis with few insights.	No analysis or very poor analysis.
Interpretation	Interpretation is logical and well-supported by data.	Interpretation is mostly logical and supported by data.	Interpretation has some logic and support.	Interpretation is weak or poorly supported.	No interpretation or illogical interpretation.



## EVALUATION OF EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING

### Rubrics for evaluation of Report

Criteria	Excellent (10-8)	Very Good (7-6)	Good (5-4)	Satisfactory (3-2)	Needs Improvement (1-0)
Organization	Report is well-organized and flows logically.	Report is organized but could improve in flow.	Report has basic organization but lacks flow.	Report is poorly organized.	Report is not organized.
Clarity	Report is clear, concise, and free of errors.	Report is mostly clear with minor errors.	Report has some clarity but contains errors.	Report is unclear with many errors.	Report is very unclear or contains numerous errors.
Completeness	All necessary sections are complete and thorough.	Most sections are complete and thorough.	Some sections are complete but lacking detail.	Several sections are incomplete or lacking detail.	Many sections are missing or incomplete.

### Rubrics for evaluation of Poster and PPT demonstration

Criteria	Excellent (10-8)	Very Good (7-6)	Good (5-4)	Satisfactory (3-2)	Needs Improvement (1-0)
Visual Appeal	Visually appealing and professionally designed.	Visually appealing with minor design issues.	Somewhat visually appealing but with design issues.	Poor visual appeal or design.	Very poor visual appeal or design.
Clarity	Information is clearly presented and easy to understand.	Information is mostly clear but could be more concise.	Information is somewhat clear but needs more clarity.	Information is unclear or confusing.	Information is very unclear or missing.
Content	Poster includes all key components and relevant information.	Poster includes most key components and information.	Poster includes some key components but misses details.	Poster is missing several key components or details.	Poster is missing many key components or details.



**RV College of Engineering®**

Mysore Road, RV Vidyaniketan Post,  
Bengaluru - 560059, Karnataka, India

---

## EVALUATION OF EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING

---