Sri Venkateswara College of Engineering, Sriperumbudur

(An Autonomous Institution, Affiliated to Anna University, Chennai)

Department of Electrical and Electronics Engineering

EE 22811 Project Work Zeroth Review Circular (AY:2025-26)

Date: 07.01.2026

The UG Project work (EE 22811) Zeroth-review will be conducted for both EEE 'A' and 'B' section students in the department Seminar Room on 09.01.2026 (Friday). **It is mandatory to submit EEE/Project 2025-26/PZ form and Proof of Mini-project outcome (certificate, published paper) on 09.01.2026 for appearing in zeroth review.**

Students are expected to present the following slides through power point presentation.

I. Technical Area of Project, Title, Students Name with Roll No. and Supervisor details, Place of Project – College/Industry (Details).

II. Motivation and Application

III. Literature Survey in Tabular Form and submission of base reference paper. (To describe Existing work and justifying proposed work)

IV. Problem Gap Identification (What is missing in existing work? / Why existing solutions are insufficient? / Technical or practical limitations)

V. Objectives of the project (should address identified gap) and SDG Mapping (only one primary SDG) and its relevance to project.

VI. Broad methodology (Block diagram / Algorithm / Simulation / Hardware details)

VII. Gantt chart

VIII. Project outcome: Either **Publication (atleast Scopus/IEEE Xplore)** or **Patent** or **Product development.**

IX. References, Minimum **FIVE Q1 or Q2 Journals** (from year 2020 to 2025)

Presentation time allowed is 10 minutes.; Maximum number of slides: 9 (Slide numbering is mandatory); Maximum Marks: 50

Requirements:

1. All students must be present in the department on the review day. Students failing to be available during their call will be marked absent.
2. Students have to submit the Form: **Project 2025-26/PZ on/before 09.01.2026 (Mandatory for appearing in Zeroth Review).**
3. HOD/Project Coordinator/Reviewers will approve the Area/Title of the project.

4. Students willing to do project in Industry, have to get prior permission from HOD/EEE. They have to submit the industry acceptance letter as earlier as possible.
5. **Review Schedule (Tentative):**

   First Review: 12.02.2026 to 14.02.2026

   Second Review: 18.03.2026 and 19.03.2026

   Third Review: 22.04.2026 to 24.04.2026

To Reviewers:

1. Marks should be awarded as per the rubrics and the comments has to be entered in the Google spreadsheet during the project review.
2. Reviewers should check the form Project 2025-26/PZ before allowing a batch for the presentation.
3. Reviewers are allotted based on their specialization and Time table.

UG Project Coordinators
(Dr S Arulmozhi)
(Dr T Annamalai)

HOD/EEE 8.1.26

Rubrics for Project Work Zeroth Review Evaluation:

S. No.	Evaluation Component	Performance Level	Description	Marks
1	**Defined Objective & Title** (10 Marks)	Excellent	Title is precise and technical. Objectives are clear, measurable, and directly aligned with the identified problem and gap.	9–10
		Good	Title is relevant but broad. Objectives are clear but not fully measurable or tightly scoped.	7–8
		Average	Generic title. Objectives are vague, overlapping, or partially aligned with the problem.	5–6
		Poor	Title unclear/misleading. Objectives missing, copied, or unrelated to the problem.	0–4
2	**SDG Mapping** (5 Marks)	Excellent	Correct primary SDG identified with strong justification linked to problem and application.	5
		Good	Correct SDG identified but justification is generic or weak.	3–4
		Poor	Incorrect SDG, multiple SDGs, or no justification.	0–2
3	**Methodology Description** (15 Marks)	Excellent	Logical, feasible methodology mapped clearly to objectives. Correct block diagram/flow included.	13–15
		Good	Methodology mostly clear but lacks depth or justification in some steps.	10–12
		Average	Superficial or partially incorrect methodology. Weak linkage to objectives.	7–9
		Poor	Unclear, unrealistic, copied, or technically incorrect methodology.	0–6
4	**Literature Review** (10 Marks)	Excellent	Minimum 5 quality papers in tabular form. Clear comparison, gap identified, base paper (reference) submitted.	9–10
		Good	Relevant papers included but gap identification is weak or analysis is shallow.	7–8
		Average	Fewer/low-quality papers. Mostly summary, little comparison.	5–6
		Poor	Irrelevant, copied, or missing literature. No gap identification.	0–4
5	**Presentation Quality** (10 Marks)	Excellent	Logical flow, readable slides, technical clarity, confident explanation, within time.	9–10
		Good	Minor issues in slide design, clarity, or sequencing.	7–8
		Average	Cluttered slides, weak explanation, poor flow.	5–6
		Poor	Unstructured, unreadable slides, poor communication.	0–4

8/1/26.

8.1.26
(HOD/EEE)