***Video* (6)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | ***Poor*** | | ***Needs improvement*** | ***Satisfactory*** | ***Good*** |
| **Duration of video and audio quality** | The duration of video is deviated from the proposed duration and audio quality is poor. | | Duration of the video is near to proposed duration and voice is not clear. | Duration of the video is close to proposed duration, however, for the better audio quality no external to tool has been used | The duration of video is between 3-5 minutes. The quality of audio is excellent as for the modification of audio external tool has been used. |
| **Subject Content** | Content is video is not related to the proposed work. | | Subject knowledge is not evident. Information is confusing, incorrect,  or flawed. | Subject knowledge is evident in much of the video. Most information is clear, appropriate, and correct. | Subject knowledge is evident throughout the video. All information is clear, appropriate and correct. |
| **Video content and**  **organization** | There is no theme in the video. | | The video lacks a central theme, clear point of view, and logical sequence of information. Much of the information is irrelevant to the overall message. | Information is connected to a theme. Details are logical and information is relevant throughout  most of the video. | Video includes a clear statement of purpose. Events and messages are presented in a logical order, with relevant information that supports the video’s main ideas. |
| **Production** | The video quality is in poor shape due to lots of noise in audio and video. | | The quality of video is satisfactory and is unedited. There are no transitions added or transitions are used so frequently that they detract from the video. There are no graphics. | Tape is edited. A variety of transitions are used and most transitions help tell the story. Most of video has good pacing and timing. Graphics are used appropriately. | Tape is edited. Video runs smoothly from shot to shot. A variety of transitions are used to assist in communicating the main idea. Shots and scenes work well together. Graphics explain and reinforce key  points in the video. |
|  | |  | | | |

**Blog (4)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | ***Poor*** | | ***Needs improvement*** | ***Satisfactory*** | ***Good*** | ***Score/ Marks*** |
| **Content and Creativity** | Postings show no evidence of insight, understanding or reflective thought about the topic. | | Postings provide minimal insight, understanding and reflective thought about the topic | Postings provide moderate insight, understanding and reflective thought about the topic. | The post is having a good quality of content with creativity. Appropriate tags have been used to enhance the outreach amongst the user. | /1 |
| **Quality of Writing and Proofreading** | Written responses contain numerous grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors.  The style of writing does not facilitate effective communication. | | Written responses include some grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors that distract the reader. | Written responses are largely free of grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors.  The style of writing generally facilitates communication. | There is no grammatical, spelling or punctuation error. All the statements are properly linked. | /1 |
| **Text Layout, Use of Graphics and Multimedia** | Does not insert any graphics, or uses only low-quality graphics and multimedia, which do not enhance the content. | | Selects and inserts many low-quality graphics and multimedia which do not enhance the content. | Selects and inserts graphics and multimedia that are mostly high quality and enhance and clarify the content. | To explain the project, multimedia tools has been used properly and most of thought has been explained using animation and graphics. | /1 |
| **Citations** | No images, media or text created by others display appropriate copyright permissions and do not include accurate, properly formatted citations. | | Some of the images, media or text created by others does not display appropriate copyright permissions and does not include accurate, properly formatted citations. | Most images, media or text created by others display appropriate copyright permissions and accurate, properly formatted citations. | A good number of citations has been provided. The citations are properly used in the post. | /1 |
|  | | **Total** | | | | **/4** |

**Social Media Post (4)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | ***Poor*** | ***Needs improvement*** | ***Satisfactory*** | ***Good*** | ***Score/ Marks*** |
| **Point of view** | Little thought and detail was put into developing a point of view. The post was rushed and needed to better communicate their assigned character’s point of view. | The students put some thought and details into creating the character, but more critical thinking could have made the final product more interesting and could have explored the great deportation a little more. | The student creatively and thoughtfully took on the role they were assigned, and explored the great deportation, in details from the role. | In the post, animation, graphics has been used to express the view. | /1 |
| **Persuasive communication** | The post does not get the students point across. | The post is persuasive and thoughtful. However, some critical thinking is required to make the post more appealing in terms of persuasive communication. | The social media posts are creative and persuasive. | The post is creative and covering wide range of audience. Use of appropriate tags to enhance the reachability. | /1 |
| **Manages Information and Ideas** | Lack of planning, brainstorming, revision and time management created a final product that does not meet expectations. | Information provided in the post is not in depth. More information can be added in the post. | The post contains, all the related information about the project. A detailed insight of project is provided using minimum words. | To manage the information in post minimum text contents has been used. Moreover, more graphics and animation has been used to express the views. | /2 |
| **Total** | | | |  | **/4** |

***PPT presentation (7 marks)***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | ***Poor*** | ***Average*** | ***Good*** | ***Excellent*** | ***Score/ Marks*** |
| **Presentation format** | Unclear presentation. No attention to presentation formatting. Space was not used properly. No sentence structure in the presentation. Audience not able to understand. | Attempted to follow the basic formatting but could use the space more in a structured fashion. Partially understandable to audience. | Presentation format was followed but detail was missing. Could have achieved more structured format. Easy to understand for the audience. | A logical presentation was made. Details were given by using space of the slide properly. Self-explanatory slides from audience point of view. | /3 |
| **Content** | Project title was not announced. Difficult to follow the logic/idea or results. Irrelevant content. | Little discussion on results. Some part of the project was not at all described. | Description of the project was easy to follow. Discussion of the results was sufficient. | Well establishment of the concept behind the project. A fruitful discussion including details were observed. | /2 |
| **Authenticity** | No reference was used to acknowledge the content. Inaccurate information. | Lack on information and the real facts presented. Many errors were found. | Hardly any error was found in slides. Acknowledgement of the others work was clear. | The information provided was accurate based on the facts and calculations. Almost no error in content or in writing. | /2 |
| **Total Marks** | | | | | **/7** |

**Poster presentation (4)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | ***Poor*** | ***Average*** | ***Good*** | ***Excellent*** | ***Score/ Marks*** |
| **Coverage of the Topic in Poster** | Details on the poster have little or nothing to do with main topic. | Details on the poster relate to the topic but are too general or incomplete. The audience needs more information to understand. | Details on the poster include import ant information but the audience may need more information to understand fully. | Details on the poster capture the important information about the topic and increase the audience’s understanding. | /2 |
| **Use of Graphics in Poster** | Graphics do not relate to the topic. | All graphics relate to the topic. | All graphics are related to the topic and most make it  easier to understand. | All graphics are related to the topic and make it easier to understand. | /1 |
| **Organization and Design of Poster** | The information appears to be disorganized. Sources are not accurately documented.  Much of the information on the poster is unclear or too small. | Information is organized, but titles and subheadings are missing or do not help the reader understand. All sources (information and graphics) are documented, but information is incomplete or many are not in the desired format.  Most of the information on the poster is in focus and the content is easily viewed and identified from 4 ft. away. | Information is organized with titles and subheadings. All sources (information and graphics) are accurately documented, but there are a few errors.  Most of the information on the poster is in focus and the content easily viewed and identified from 6 ft. away. | Information is very organized with clear titles and subheadings. All sources (information and graphics) are accurately documented.  All information on the poster is in focus and can be easily viewed and identified from 6 ft. away. | /1 |
| **Total Marks** | | | | | **/4** |

**Technical report (10)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | ***Poor*** | ***Average*** | ***Good*** | ***Excellent*** | ***Score/ Marks*** |
| **Report writing communication** | The content of the report interfere with communication. Style/format of the report does not give pleasure to read.  No demonstration of the problem. It seems no sentence structure is followed in writing and sequencing of ideas. Very difficult to understand. Figures were bad and not understandable. | The content of the report interfere with communication at some places. Deviation from the Style/format of the report is observed at few places. Only basic concepts were demonstrated and interpreted. Sentence structure is unclear. There is room for improvements. | Good focus on the topic using proper style/format and in line with content of the report. However, minor corrections are needed. Content was elaborated and described to an extent. Sentence are structured properly and sequencing of ideas make sense and easy to follow. | The purpose of writing is fully clear to the reader and completely follows the required style. Hardly any corrections required. Smooth flow of ideas from one to another. Good sentence structure and comfortable to follow the concept by reading the report. Demonstration of the full knowledge of the problem is considered while writing. | /4 |
| **Organization** | Report does not follow the required format. | Deviation from proper format is observed. Paragraphs, font size, equations etc are not in line at many places. | Consistent in report format. However, little room is available for further improvement. | Report followed the required format (i.e. equations, figures, font size, etc) throughout the report. | /2 |
| **Report content** | Content is not sound. Did not include any engineering application. Did not use design standards, literature available on the particular problem or relevant material. Content does not give the pleasure to follow the idea. No production drawing. | Many improvements are needed in selection and use of engineering principles. Tried to include the literature, standards used and codes. Production drawing presented, however not in appropriate format. | Shows effective us of engineering concepts. Production drawing with standards presented. | Shows sufficient use of engineering applications and use of ideas/concepts with proper design standards, literature etc.  Accurate production drawing presented. | /2 |
| **Results, conclusions and learning outcomes achieved** | Figures/results are not used effectively. Little understanding of important features or issues. Conclusions are vague and unacceptable. | Though the idea is good but not convincible evidences. Limited information on the innovation of the project. Many figures/results are not interpreted. Important features are not communicated or understood. Conclusions require significantly more clarity. | Innovative idea is presented very well with detailed evidences. Most figures/results are properly interpreted and important features noted. Conclusions are generally valid. | A complete understanding of the idea is clear in the report with clear and well presented examples and evidences.. All figures/results are effectively interpreted and discussed in the report. Conclusions are relevant and true. | /2 |
| **Total Marks** | | | | | **/10** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | ***Poor*** | ***Average*** | ***Good*** | ***Excellent*** | ***Score / Marks*** |
| **Need Analysis** | Customer and their needs were not assessed or evaluated correctly.  No questionnaire was prepared. Not done proper groundwork. | Customer and their needs were not assessed or evaluated partially.  Insufficient questions for the questionnaire. Improper way of conducting the need analysis. | Provided satisfactory need analysis.  Questionnaire was good but improvements can be done. Need analysis was done with proper method. | Thoroughly assessed or evaluated the customers’ needs. An appropriate method was used to assess or identify the problem. Provided a logical approach for the project. | /2.5 |
| **Problem Definition & Implementation** | Project and its objectives have not been defined properly.  Almost no understanding of the problem. Not at all clear about the objectives and the implementation of the project in real environment. Suitable Time-activity chart not attached. | Project and objectives are defined. However, not feasible as per panel members. ***(Require significant amendments)***  Have some understanding of the problem and objectives are defined but not clear about the implementation part of the problem in real environment. Inappropriate Time-activity chart attached | Project and objectives are defined clearly. However, ***minor amendments are required.***  Clear about the problem definition and its objectives. However, partially clear about the implementation part. Suitable Time-activity chart attached | Project and objectives is self-explanatory and are defined very clearly. ***No amendments are required.***  Complete understanding of the project and its objectives with clear idea about the implementation of the problem in real situations within resource constraint. Well planned Time-activity chart attached | /2.5 |
| **Total Marks** | | | | | **/5** |

**Initial goal report (5):**

**Mid way report (10)**

|  | **Poor** | **Average** | **Good** | **Excellent** | | **Score/ Marks** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Designing process/product/systems:** using engineering knowledge and concepts/codes/literature etc. Application of software/mathematical tools | No or erroneous application of engineering principles yielding unreasonable solution. No or erroneous application of software /mathematical tools. | Serious deficiencies in proper selection and use of engineering principles. Serious deficiencies in application of software/mathematical tools. | Effective application of engineering principles resulting in reasonable solution. Moderate application of software/ mathematical tools. | Critical selection and application of engineering principles ensuring reasonable results. | | /5 |
| **Responsiveness (individual)** | Student is not able to explain the progress of the work. | Student can provide the overall information about the project. However, he lacks in in-depth knowledge of the project. | Conceptually, student can explain the project. But not confident about the tools and techniques used/going to use for the completion of the project. | Conceptually, student can explain the project. He is also able to answer the questions asked related to tools used in the project. | | /5 |
| **Total Marks** | | | | | **/10** | | |

**Final Presentation in front of faculty panel (25):**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | ***Poor*** | ***Average*** | ***Good*** | ***Excellent*** | ***Score/ Marks*** |
| **Responsiveness** | Hardly any interaction with audience. Vary poor response to committee questions. | Reluctant to interact with audience. Vary poor response to committee questions. | Usually response well to the questions. | Very well response to questions from audience and committee. Wherever needed, summarizes the content. | /7 |
| **Demonstration of project** | Very poor and product not working. Failure to meet project objectives | Demonstration of working product with significant deviations from project objectives | Satisfactory Demonstration of the working product and the achievement of project objectives | Excellent demonstration of working product with attainment of the project objectives | /6 |
| **Technical knowledge** | Not able to answer the questions related to project | Able to provide the answer of some of the technical questions. | Able to provide the answer of technical questions related to project but not able to handle to questions to related technologies. | Provide the satisfactory answer to technical questions related to project and related technologies. | /4 |
| **Use of SDLC model** | Student does not use any SDLC model to develop the project | Some of the intermediate steps followed to develop the projects. | SDLC model has been applied but did not calculate the cost of the project. | All the intermediate steps of SDLC model has been followed properly. | /2 |
| **Complexity of the project** | As per timeline provided, functionalities in the project are very less. | Some of the functionalities has been incorporated. | As per the timeline provided, candidate tried to incorporate maximum possible functionalities with achieving all objectives declared in initial submission. | There is no scope to add the functionalities in the project and it meets all the objectives declared in the initial submission. | /4 |
| **Easy to use** | Difficult to use and no help manual associated with the project | Difficult to use but help manual is available. | Easy to use but no help manual available with the project | easy to use and help manual is associated with the project | /1 |
| **Use of latest tools and technologies, User interface** | Student does not use any latest tools and no UI | Project has developed using latest technology but no UI. | Project has been used using latest technology, but UI is not attractive. | The project has been developed using latest technology with attractive UI. | /1 |
| **Total Marks** | | | | | /25 |