# NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF TECHNICAL TEACHERS TRAINING AND RESEARCH, CHANDIGARH

(ELECTRONICS & COMMUNICATION ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT)

## **RUBRICS FOR M.E. RESEARCH SEMINAR EVALUATION**

#### **Rubrics Review**

ASSESSMENT PARAMETER (AP)	CRITERIA	REVIEW ASSESSMENT WEIGHTAGE
AP1	Literature Review	8
AP2	Subject Knowledge	14
AP3	Presentation	20
AP4	Conclusions and Future Scope	8
	Total Weightage	50

		ECE Departn	nent, NITTTF
<b>Rubrics for</b>	M.E Resea	rch Seminar	I Evaluation

Name of Candidate	Roll No
Date of Evaluation	
Topic:	
•	

# RUBRICS FOR M.E. RESEARCH SEMINAR I EVALUATION Marks\*: 100

### Maximum

Ass	sessm	ent Parameter	Excellent (7-8)	Very Good (5-6)	Fair (3-4)	Poor (1-2)	Score
AP1	a	Literature Review	Thoroughly, concisely, describes previous and related work; clearly explains how current work fits into broader field	Describes previous and related work; makes connection to current work	Mentions other work done in field; connections to current work not as clear	Unaware of other work done in the field; little or no context for current work	
Ass	sessm	ent Parameter	Excellent (14-11)	Very Good (7-10)	Fair (6-4)	Poor (1-3)	Score
AP2	a	Subject Knowledge	Demonstrates deep knowledge; answer the questions with explanations and elaboration	Adequate knowledge of most topics; answer the questions, but fails to elaborate	Superficial knowledge of topic; only able to answer basic questions	Does not have grasp of information; cannot answer questions about subject	
Ass	sessm	ent Parameter	Excellent (5-4)	Very Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Score
AP3	a	Speaking Skills	Entire audience can hear presentation; maintains eye contact with audience; clear, expressive voice; poised, good posture, no distracting mannerisms	Most of audience can hear presentation; eye contact most of the time; clear voice, but not as expressive; a little nervous, not as polished	Difficult to hear; occasional eye contact; some mumbling, little or no expression; nervous, some distracting mannerisms; reads much of slides	Audience can't hear presentation; no eye contact; hard to understand, monotone; speaker uncomfortable and uninterested; reads slides word for word	
	b	Audience Interaction	Held audience's attention throughout, points made in creative way; listened carefully to audience questions and responded directly to question asked	Held audience attention most of the time; polite in answering questions, but not as directly	Difficulty in holding audience attention, facts presented with little or no imagination; lengthy answers but with less relevance.	Completely lost audience attention; started responding before questions finished; answers often unrelated to the question asked	

Signature of Evaluator(s) .....

Name of Candidate	ROH NO
Date of Evaluation	
Topic:	
1 opic	

	С	Visuals	Visually pleasing and easy to read; good use of white space, color,	Adequate layout, but with some fonts, colors, backgrounds	Difficult to read, cluttered appearance; images improperly sized; some	Confusing layout, text extremely difficult to read; many graphics,	
			backgrounds; images and graphics	difficult to read	distracting graphics or animations	sounds, animations distract from	
			support and enhance content			the presentation	
	d	Organization	Presented in logical sequence;	Most information presented in	Some problems with sequencing,	Little or no organization, difficult	
			introduction and background give	logical sequence; clear	lacks clear transitions; incomplete or	to follow; missing or ineffective	
			proper context; key points and	introduction; adequate	overly detailed introduction;	introduction; confusing or no	
			conclusions are clear and well	background; some irrelevant	emphasis given to less important	background; key points unclear	
			developed	information	information		
As	sessm	ent Parameter	Excellent (7-8)	Very Good (5-6)	Fair (3-4)	<b>Poor</b> (1-2)	Score
AP4	a	Conclusions	Insightful conclusions supported by	Conclusions supported by	Conclusions could be supported by	Conclusions not supported	
		and Future	evidence; discusses implications	evidence; some discussion of	stronger evidence; minimal	by evidence; no discussion of	
		Scope	and application; recommends future	implications and future	discussion of implications and future	implications and future work	
			directions for research	directions	work		
As	ceccm	ent Parameter	Excellent (15)	Very Good (12)	Fair (8)	Poor (4)	Score
	3033111	ciit i ai ainetei	Executive (13)	(61) 3004 (12)	(-)	2 002 (1)	

Signature of Evaluator(s) .....