Sc	maiva	Vidys	wihar	Uni	versity
3(maiva	viuva	ıvınar	UIII	versitv

Name of the College:

Examiner / Expert

	Ref. No
_	

	ire of the
	dent
TW Oral	Oral
	Orai
Date of intermediate exam: / / 20 Time: Venue:	
Denie of Title	
Project Title:	
Work done:	
work done	
Deposit of Ducinet Evenineum Ovelity of World Deposit Evenillant / Cond. / Assessed / Control / Cond.	
Report of Project Examiners: Quality of Work Done: Excellent / Good / Average / Satisfactory / Unsatisfactory	/
Specific Remarks of the examiners:	
Examiner / Expert Examiner / Guide / Co-Guide	
Date of semester VIII exam: / / 20_ Time: Venue:	
Project Title	
Project Title:	
Work done:	
THE COLUMN TO TH	
Details of Dublications/Doutisination in Duciost Commetition etc.	
Details of Publications/Participation in Project Competition etc.:	
Details of Publications/Participation in Project Competition etc.:	
Details of Publications/Participation in Project Competition etc.:	
Details of Publications/Participation in Project Competition etc.:	
Details of Publications/Participation in Project Competition etc.:	
Details of Publications/Participation in Project Competition etc.: Roll No. Name of the student TW Marks Oral Marks	
Max. Marks Max. Marks	
Roll No. Name of the student TW Marks Oral Marks	E Total
Roll No. Name of the student TW Marks Oral Marks Max. Marks Max. Marks	E Total
Roll No. Name of the student TW Marks Oral Marks Max. Marks Max. Marks	E Total
Roll No. Name of the student TW Marks Oral Marks Max. Marks Max. Marks	E Total
Roll No. Name of the student TW Marks Oral Marks Max. Marks Max. Marks	E Total
Roll No. Name of the student TW Marks Oral Marks Max. Marks Max. Marks	E Total
Roll No. Name of the student TW Marks Oral Marks Max. Marks Max. Marks	E Total
Roll No. Name of the student TW Marks Oral Marks Max. Marks Max. Marks	E Total
Roll No. Name of the student TW Marks Oral Marks Max. Marks Max. Marks	

Examiner / Guide / Co-Guide

Somaiya Vidyavihar University

Rubri	Rubrics for Term Work (TW) Examination / Evaluation				
#Level of evaluation	Level 1 Level 2		Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
	Grade: L1	Grade: L2	Grade: L3	Grade: L4	Grade: L5
&Intermediate evaluation	90% or 100%	70 % or	60% of I	40% or 50%	0%, 10%, 20%,
I = 100% of Max. marks	of I	80% of I		of I	30% of I
@Literature Survey	90% or 100%	70 % or	60% of A	40% or 50%	0%, 10%, 20%,
A = 20% of max marks	of A	80% of A		of A	30% of A
@Development of Concept / Block	90% or 100%	.70 % or	60% of B	.40% or 50%	0%, 10%, 20%,
diagram B = 20% of max marks	of B	80% of B		of B	30% of B
@Teamwork C = 20% of max	90% or 100%	70 % or	60% of C	40% or 50%	0%, 10%, 20%,
marks	of C	80% of C		of C	30% of C
@Report: Technical contents,	90% or 100%	70 % or	. 60% of D	40% or 50%	0%, 10%, 20%,
coherence and organization D =	of D	80% of D		of D	30% of D
20% of max marks					
@Overall opinion about report	90% or 100%	70 % or	60% of E	40% or 50%	0%, 10%, 20%,
E = 20% of max marks	of E	80% of E		of E	30% of E

[&]amp; Department level decision can be: grade/marks/no evaluation

Attribute	Level	Description / Guidelines for level assessment
B	Level 1	Concept of the project is systematically developed with due considerations to all objectives, functions and
Б	LCVCII	constraints relevant to the problem taken up. Resources and feasibility is also considered. Deliverables and
		demonstration is well thought of.
	Level 2	Concept of the project is developed with consideration to all objectives, functions. Feasibility, deliverables
	Level 2	and constraints is given due attention only after follow up from guide
	Level 3	Concept of the project is developed with consideration to all objectives, functions. Feasibility, deliverables
		and constraints are not considered even after follow up
	Level 4	Concept of the project is developed wherein some of the functions / objectives are not fulfilled. Feasibility,
		deliverables and constraints is given due attention only after follow up from guide
	Level 5	Concept developed is a vague idea without proper consideration to its objectives and functions.
С	Level 1	There is proper distribution of work with understanding of concepts. Team succeeds in communicating
		important aspects to each other for proper execution of any task.
	Level 2	Distribution of work is with some overlapping among team members. Team communicates concepts / work
		done to each other fairly well
	Level 3	Distribution of work is approximately done among team members. Team tries to communicate concepts /
		work done to each other which may lead to reallocation of work.
	Level 4	The work allotment and coordination of the team is bare minimum. Guides intervention needed sometimes
		for coordination.
	Level 5	The work allotment and coordination of the team is very poor. Guides intervention also may not lead to
		proper coordination.
D	Level 1	The report is organized as per the standard template given. An accurate and complete explanation of
		technical concepts and work done is given, with reference to relevant literature. The work reported is
		original and convincing.
	Level 2	The report is organized somewhat with standard template given. Some explanation of technical concepts
		and work done is given, with reference to relevant literature. The work reported is not very clear.
	Level 3	The report is organized somewhat with standard template given. Some explanation of technical concepts is
		given without proper referencing. The work reported is not very clear
	Level 4	The report is organized somewhat with standard template given. Some explanation of technical concepts is
		given without proper referencing. The work reported is with lots of lacuna
	Level 5	The report does not follow standard template. Explanation of technical concepts and the work done is vague.
		Proper references / table and figure numbers etc. are missing

Somaiya Vidyavihar University

Rubrics for Oral Examination / Evaluation					
// T 1 0 1 1		1	1		T
#Level of evaluation	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
	Grade: L1	Grade: L2	Grade: L3	Grade: L4	Grade: L5
@Presentation skills and	90% or 100%	70 % or 80%	60% of A	40% or 50%	0%, 10%, 20%, 30%
participation	of A	of A		of A	of A
A = 20% of max marks					
@Understanding of domain	90% or 100%	70 % or 80%	60% of B	40% or 50% of	0%, 10%, 20%, 30%
area	of B	of B		В	of B
B = 20% of max marks					
@Concept development and	90% or 100%	70 % or 80%	60% of C	40% or 50%	0%, 10%, 20%, 30%
feasibility of work proposed	of C	of C		of C	of C
C = 20% of max marks					
@Demonstration, analysis	90% or 100% of	70 % or 80%	. 60% of D	40% or 50%	0%, 10%, 20%, 30%
and interpretation of work	D	of D		of D	of D
done					
D = 20% of max marks					
@Overall opinion about	90% or 100% of	70 % or 80%	60% of E	40% or 50%	0%, 10%, 20%, 30%
work presented	Е	of E		of E	of E
E = 20% of max marks					

Attribute	Level	Description / Guidelines for level assessment
A	Level 1	Quality of Slides in Presentation is excellent. Contents are very relevant for explaining the work done. The flow
		of presentation is excellent with smooth transition among members.
	Level 2	Quality of Slides in Presentation is good. Contents are fairly good for explaining the work done. The flow of
		presentation is good but coordination amongst members need improvement
	Level 3	Slides in Presentation are having some drawbacks like too much text / colour or transitions etc.
		Contents are slightly insufficient for explaining the work done. The flow of presentation is fair but coordination amongst members need improvement
	Level 4	Slides in Presentation are having drawbacks like too much text / colour or transitions etc.
		Contents are insufficient for explaining the work done. The flow of presentation is fair but there is mis-
		coordination amongst members
	Level 5	Slides in Presentation are having many drawbacks like too much text / colour or transitions etc.
		Contents are insufficient and are not able to explain work. The flow of presentation and but coordination
		amongst members is missing
В	Level 1	All Concepts in the project are very well understood. Any questions in the domain area are confidently answered
	Level 2	Most Concepts in the project are understood. Most of the questions in the domain area are answered
	Level 3	Fundamental Concepts in the project are understood. But some confusion on questions in the domain area
	Level 4	Fundamental Concepts in the project are not understood. Only few questions in the domain area are answered.
	Level 5	Even fundamental Concepts in the project are not understood. Almost no / Very few questions in the domain
		area are answered
С	Level 1	Concept of the project is systematically developed with due considerations to all objectives, functions and constraints relevant to the problem taken up. Resources and feasibility is also considered. Deliverables and
		demonstration is well thought of.
	Level 2	Concept of the project is developed with consideration to all objectives, functions. Feasibility, deliverable and
		constraints is given due attention only after follow up from guide.
	Level 3	Concept of the project is developed with consideration to all objectives, functions. Feasibility, deliverable and constraints are not considered even after follow up.
	Level 4	Concept of the project is developed wherein some of the functions / objectives are not fulfilled. Feasibility, deliverable and constraints is given due attention only after follow up from guide.
	Level 5	Concept developed is a vague idea without proper consideration to its objectives and functions.
D	Level 1	Implementation of project is demonstrated very convincingly. Detailed analysis of the results and excellent
		interpretation of the work is presented.
	Level 2	Very good demonstration of the work done. The results produced are analysed and interpretation of the work is presented
	Level 3	Good demonstration of the work done. The results produced are analysed but interpretation of the work is not very convincing.
	Level 4	Demonstration of the work done is partial. The results are gathered but its analysis and interpretation is not very convincing
	Level 5	Demonstration of the work done is incomplete. The result gathered are not very consistent. The analysis and
	Level 5	interpretation is incomplete. The result gathered are not very consistent. The analysis and