

RUBRIC (Evaluation – Industrial and Software Training)

S.No.	Criterion	Excellent (100%)	Good (80 %)	Average (60%)	Poor (40%)
1	Presentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate to the topic • Well designed with good flow and appropriate use of pictures and graphs • Confident delivery style with clear voice • Good spoken English 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate to the topic • Well designed with appropriate use of pictures and graphs, but uniformity in the slides absent • Confidence in delivery, although voice is not audible • Good spoken English 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate to the topic • Not so well designed. Uniformity in the slides absent. Inappropriate use of pictures and graphs • Low confidence and voice not clear. • Spoken English not so good 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not appropriate to the topic • Poor design without use of any pictures and graphs. Only written slides • No confidence in delivery. Voice not audible. No eye contact with the audience • Poor spoken English
2	Content	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well defined problem with clear cut objectives and methodology • Sufficient number of latest and appropriate references cited • Key concepts clearly specified and explained technically • Results are relevant and presented in appropriate manner • Work is well summarised and concluded 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well defined problem with clear objectives and methodology • Latest and appropriate references cited but not sufficient in number • Key concepts specified and explained technically • Results are relevant but not presented in appropriate manner • Work is well summarised and concluded 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well defined problem with clear objectives but not so appropriate methodology • Latest and appropriate references cited but not sufficient in number • Key concepts specified but not explained technically • Results are somewhat relevant but not presented in appropriate manner • Work is summarised and concluded 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poorly defined problem with un-clear objectives and methodology • inappropriate and insufficient references • Key concepts not clearly specified and explained • Results are neither relevant nor presented appropriately • Work is not summarised and concluded properly

S.No.	Criterion	Excellent (100%)	Good (80 %)	Average (60%)	Poor (40%)
3	Viva-voce	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good understanding of the relevance of the project • Extensive knowledge of not only the project but domain around • Technically correct and confident answers • Crisp to-the-point answers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fair understanding of the relevance of the project • Extensive knowledge of the project but not of the domain around • Most of the answers are technically correct but confidence not very good • Crisp to-the-point answers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fair understanding of the relevance of the project • Fair knowledge of the project and the domain around • Few of the answers are technically correct but confidence is not good • answers not to-the-point 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor understanding of the relevance of the project • Lacks sufficient knowledge of project • Poor technical knowledge of the subject and low on confidence • Vague answers