

FINAL YEAR PROJECT EVALUATION RUBRIC BASED COURSE OUTCOME

Department of Mechanical Engineering, Jorhat Engineering College, Jorhat-7

At the end of the course, the students will be able to

CO1 **Apply** engineering knowledge and modern engineering and IT tools and techniques to **investigate** complex system, **analyze** data to produce useful information and **draw** conclusion and also **develop** system or system components

CO2 **Communicate** results, concepts, analyses and ideas in written and oral form through report preparation, project presentation and paper publication

CO3 **Develop** the attributes of the capability of working in team, project management through information, knowledge and skill sharing to achieve the goal of the project assigned.

- External evaluation: CO1 and CO2 :(Total 50 Marks) Internal Evaluation: CO3 : (Total 50 Marks)

Name of Student:				Semester:		
Roll No.:				Batch:		
CO & Weightage in (%)	Evaluation Criterion/tools	Evaluation Option			Marks corresponding to Evaluation Option	Marks awarded against Criteria
FOR EXTERNAL EVALUATOR (Total 50 Marks)						
CO1 (50% Marks =25)	Objectives and noveltyof the Work (40% marks of CO1 =10)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All objectives of the proposed work are well defined; Steps to be followed to solve the defined problem are clearly specified. • Novelty of work is fully justified. 			100% (10)	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good justification to the objectives be followed is specified but detailing is notdone. • Novelty of work is partially justified. 			75% (7.5)	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objectives of the proposed work are either not identified or not well defined. • Novelty of work is not justified. 			50% (5)	
	Design Methodology (40% marks of CO1 =10)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Division of problem into modules and good selection of computing framework • Appropriate design methodology andproperly justification • Sufficient Data are generated from experimental work 			100% (10)	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Division of problem into modules but inappropriate selection of computingframework • Less amount of data is generated fromexperimental work • Design methodology not defined properly 			75% (7.5)	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modular approach not adopted • Insufficient Data are generated fromexperimental work • Design methodology not defined 			50% (5)	
Results and discussion (20 % marks of CO1 =5)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results are fully validated and discussed in detailed. 			100% (5)		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results are acceptable but not discussed in detailed. 			75% (3.75)		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results are not validated and improper explanation of results is presented. 			50% (2.5)		

CO2 (50% Marks) =25	Project Report (60% marks =15)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project report is according to the specified format • References and citations are appropriate and well mentioned • Complete explanation of the key concept's Strong description of the technical requirements of the project. • Results are presented in very appropriate manner Project work is well summarized and concluded Future extensions in the project are well specified 	100% (15)	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project report is according to the specified format • References and citations are appropriate but not mentioned well • Complete explanation of the key concepts In-sufficient description of the technical requirements of the project. • Results are presented in good manner • Project work summary and conclusion not very appropriate Future extensions in the project are specified 	75% (11)	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project report is not fully according to the specified format In-sufficient references and citations. • All key concepts are not explained and very little relevance to literature In- sufficient description of the technical requirements of the project. • Results presented are not much satisfactory Project work summary and conclusion not very appropriate Future extensions in the project are not specified 	50% (7.5)	
	Presentation (50 % marks of CO2 =10)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slides are precise sequential, clear and distinct with an adequate number of slides to complete the presentation within the time specified. • Insignificant spelling and grammatical errors. • The images are proper in size, distinct and pleasant to the eye • The presentation is smooth, and lucid. • Voice modulation and articulation and body language are proper. The images are proper in size, distinct and pleasant to the eye 	100% (10)	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slides are precise but not sequential, clear and distinct with not adequate number of slides to complete the presentation within the time specified. • A few spelling and grammatical errors are observed. Size of most of the images is proper • The presentation is smooth, and not lucid. • Voice modulation and articulation and body language are proper. Size of most of the images is proper 	75% (7.5)	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slides are not precise, not sequential, not clear and distinct with adequate number of slides to complete the presentation within the time specified. • Spelling and grammatical errors are significant. Size of images is not proper • The presentation is ineffective (fail to draw attention). • However, presentation is within the physical parameters set. Size of images is not proper. 	50% (5)	
Name and Signature of External Evaluator:			Total Marks: (Maximum Marks: 50)	
FOR INTERNAL EVALUATOR (Total 50 Marks)				
CO3 (100%; Marks =50)	Observation/ discussion with the team members by the supervisor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensive knowledge related to the project • Good Relationship with team members, highly confidence, and very much aware about the study • Complete Involvement in the execution of the project. • Regular and consistent in work 	100% (50)	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fair knowledge related to the project • Good Relationship with team members, highly confidence, and very much aware about the study • Completely Involvement in execution of the project. • Regular and consistent in work 	75% (35)	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lacks sufficient knowledge • Good Relationship with team members, low confidence, and not aware about the working • Involvement of the member in the execution of the project is very less. • Irregular and inconsistent in work 	50% (25)	
Name and Signature of Internal Evaluator:			Total Marks: (Maximum Marks: 50)	
OFFICE USE				
External Evaluation:			Internal Evaluation:	
Signature of Project Coordinator			Signature of HOD	