||Jai Sri Gurudev||

BGS Institute of Technology

(Approved by AICTE, New Delhi & Recognized by Govt. of Karnataka)

BG Nagara – 571448, Nagamangala Taluk, Mandya District, Karnataka, INDIA.

Tel: 08234-288418, Fax: 288419, E-mail: principalbgsit@rediffmail.com, Website:
www.bgsit.ac.in

DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER SCIENCE & ENGINEERING

Project Work Schedule and Assessment Details

Implementation

Timeline	Task	Particulars
SEMESTER SEVEN		
August	Call for formation of project batch& Synopsis Submission	• Students are informed to form their project batch with a maximum of four members and get it registered with the project coordinator. • The batch should submit a project synopsis to the project coordinator.
September	Guide Allotment	• The HOD and project coordinator will allot the guide based on the faculty area of interest. • The allotment of the guide will be displayed on the notice board. • The project coordinator will inform the students to submit the finalized synopsis to the respective guide.
October	Phase I Presentation	• The phase I presentation includes a problem statement, literature survey, and expected outcome. • The students will give PowerPoint presentations in front of the project committee. • Evaluation of phase I will be done according to the rubrics by the project committee.

Shashikant.

H O D
Dept. of Computer Science & Engg.
B G.S. Institute of Technology.
B.G. Nagar - 571 448
Nagamangala Tq, Mandya Dist
Karnataka (INDIA)

SEMESTER EIGHT		
March	Phase II Presentation	• Students are instructed to give a PowerPoint presentation including design & methodologies. • Evaluation of phase II will be done according to the rubrics by the guide.
April	Phase III Presentation	• Students are instructed to give a powerpoint presentation on implementation and overall presentation of the project along with project demo. • Evaluation of phase III will be done according to the rubrics by the project committee.
May	Final Submission of report	• Student are informed to submit the final report (Hard Copy)
	Project internal marks announcement	• The marks for the project work are announced and processed according to the university regulations.

II. Project Evaluation (PHASE-I)

The internal project Phase-I evaluation details are shown below.

Sl. No.	Evaluation Scheme	Marks
1.	Significance and Relevance of work	15
2.	Problem Identification and Definition	10
3.	Phase I Report	25
4.	Presentation and Planning	50
	Total	100

The internal project Phase-II evaluation details are shown below.

Sl. No.	Evaluation scheme	Marks
1.	Design & Methodology, PPT Presentation	15
2.	Progress of Work	10
3.	Plan Execution	15
	Total	40

Chaluvel'

HOD
Dept. of Computer Science & Engg.
P.E.S. Institute of Technology,
P.G. Nagar - 571 448.
Nagamangala Tq. Mandya Dist

The internal project Phase-III evaluation details are shown below.

Sl. No.	Evaluation scheme	Marks
1.	Design &Implementation	20
2.	Overall Presentation	20
3.	Results and Conclusion	10
4.	Report	10
	Total	60

Project Coordinator

Signature of HoD

HOD
Dept. of Computer Science & Engg
B.G.S. Institute of Technology
B.G. Nagar - 571 448.
Nagamangala Tq. Mandya Dist
Karnataka (INDIA)

![BGS Institute of Technology logo]

‖Jai Sri Gurudev‖

BGS Institute of Technology

(Approved by AICTE, New Delhi & Recognized by Govt. of Karnataka)
BG Nagara – 571448, Nagamangala Taluk, Mandya District, Karnataka, INDIA.
Tel: 08234-288418, Fax: 288419, E-mail: principalbgsit@rediffmail.com, Website:
www.bgsit.ac.in

DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER SCIENCE & ENGINEERING

## Project Evaluation Phase I Rubrics

Phase 1: Maximum Marks 100

Criteria	Excellent (100%)	Good (80%)	Satisfactory (60%)	Unacceptable (40%)
Significance and relevance of the work 15	1. All objectives of the proposed work are well defined; Steps to be followed to solve the defined problem are clearly specified.	1 Good explanation of the purpose and need of the project	1. Moderate study of the existing systems; collects some basic information.	1. Explanation of the specifications and the limitations of the existing systems not very satisfactory; limited information.
Problem Identification and Definition 10	1. Detailed and extensive explanation of the purpose and need of the project. 2. Detailed and extensive explanation of the specifications and the limitations of the existing systems.	1. Collects a great deal of information and good study of the existing systems.	1.Incomplete justification to the objectives proposed; Steps are mentioned but unclear; without justification to objectives	1. Only Some objectives of the proposed work are well defined; Steps to be followed to solve the defined problem are not specified properly
Phase I Report 25	1.Format for text, tables, figures, charts, etc. is strictly followed; 2.Organization of the content is in logical order with all sections mentioned in the Guidelines; 3.Explanations are clear with properly placed figures and tables; 4.Contents are properly cited	1.Format for text, tables, figures, charts, etc. is strictly followed; 2.Organization of the content is in logical order with all sections mentioned in the Guidelines; 3.Explanations are adequate with figures and tables properly placed; 4.Most of the contents are properly cited	1.Format is as per the set standards; 2.Organization of the content is somewhat in logical order with all sections mentioned; 3.Explanations are adequate with most of the figures and tables properly placed; 4. Most of the contents are cited.	1.Format is not as per standards; 2.Organization not in logical order; 3.Explanations in the report are not clear; 4.Citations are improper

Shashi key

HOD
Dept. of Computer Science & Engg
B.G.S. Institute of Technology
B. G. Nagar - 571 ..
..addahalli Tq. Mandy
Karnataka (INDIA).

Presentation and Planning 50	1. Contents of presentations are appropriate and well arranged. 2. Proper eye contact with audience and clear voice with good spoken language	1.Contents of presentations are appropriate but not well arranged 2.Satisfactory demonstration, clear voice with good spoken language but eye contact not proper	1. Contents of presentations are appropriate but not well arranged 2.Eye contact with few people and unclear voice	1.Contents of presentations are not appropriate 2. Demonstration not satisfactory

Phase II: Maximum Marks 40

Criteria	Excellent (100%)	Good (80%)	Satisfactory (60%)	Unacceptable (40%)
Design & Methodology, PPT Presentation 15	1.Chooses appropriate computational and information tools for Data collection /techniques and algorithmic solution to model developed for the project or uses tools Effectively. 2. Demonstration (if any) of the developed system in alignment with the objectives.	1. Chooses appropriate computational and information tools for Data collection / techniques and algorithmic solution to model developed for the project. 2. Demonstration (If any) of the developed system in alignment with the objectives.	1. No proper selection of computational tools for Data collection / techniques and algorithmic Data was not collected properly. 2 Demonstrated (if any) the developed system.	1.No computational tools for Data collection/ techniques and algorithmic Was used and Incomplete work. 2. Failed to demonstrate the system (if any).
Progress of Work 10	1. Objectives achieved as per time frame	1. Objectives partially achieved as per time frame.	1. Minimal Objectives achieved as per time frame.	1. Objectives not achieved as per time frame.
Plan Execution 15	1. Time frame properly specified and being followed 2. Appropriate distribution of project work	1.Time frame properly specified and being followed 2. Inappropriate distribution of project work	1.Time frame properly specified and not being followed 2. Uneven distribution of project work	1. Time frame properly specified and not being followed 2. Uneven distribution of project work and no synchronization

Phase III: Maximum Marks 60

Criteria	Excellent (81-100%)	Good (61-80%)	Satisfactory (41-60%)	Unacceptable (20-40%)
Design & Implementation 20	1. Division of problem into modules and good selection of computing framework 2. Appropriate design methodology and proper justification	1. Division of problem into modules and good selection of computing framework. 2. Design methodology not properly justified	1. Division of problem into modules but inappropriate selection of computing framework 2. Design methodology not defined properly	1. Partial division of problem into modules and inappropriate selection of computing framework 2. Design methodology not defined properly
Overall Presentation 20	1. Team is able to justify and articulate the all the above criteria in the presentation 2. The slides presented are in a specific format and in logical order	1. Team is able to justify and articulate the all the above criteria in the presentation 2. The slides presented are in a specific format and in logical order	1. Team presents all the above criteria, but with room for improvement 2. Slides are mostly in logical order	1. The team is not able to justify and articulate most of the above criteria 2. Slides presented are not in logical order
Results and Conclusion 10	1. Clear application of research tools. Results are analyzed properly and discussed with guide 2.Results are presented in very appropriate manner 3. Project work is well summarized and concluded. 4. Future extensions in the project are well specified	1. Clear application of research tools. Results are analyzed to some extent and discussed with guide 2.Results are presented in good manner 3. Project work summary and conclusion not very appropriate. 4.Future extensions in the project are Specified	1. Clear application of research tools. Results were not analyzed and hardly discussed with guide 2. Results presented are not much satisfactory 3.Project work summary and conclusion not very appropriate 4. Future extensions in the project are not specified	1. Research tools are not specified. Results were not analyzed and not discussed with guide 2.Results are not presented properly 3. Project work is not summarized and concluded. 4.Future extensions in the project are not specified

Shashibu

H O D
Dept. of Computer Science & Eng:
3 G.S. Institute of Technology
B.G. Nagar - 571 448.
Nagamangala Tq, Mandya Hi

Report 10	1. Format for text, tables, figures, charts, etc. is strictly followed; 2.Organization of the content is in logical order with all sections mentioned in the Guidelines; 3. Explanations are clear with properly placed figures and tables; 4. Contents are properly cited	1. Format for text, tables, figures, charts, etc. is strictly followed; 2. Organization of the content is in logical order with all sections mentioned in the Guidelines; 3. Explanations are adequate with figures and tables properly placed; 4. Most of the contents are properly cited	1. Format is as per the set standards; 2.Organization of the content is somewhat in logical order with all sections mentioned; 3. Explanations are adequate with most of the figures and tables properly placed; 4. Most of the contents are cited.	1. Format is not as per standards; 2.Organization not in logical order; 3. Explanations in the report are not clear; 4.Citations are improper

सेतलारम

M·J· pramod

Project Coordinator

C Lashibed·

Signature of HoD

H O D
jept. of Computer Science & Engg
s G.S. Institute of Technology,
B.G. Nagar - 571 448.
Nagamangala Tq, Mandya Dist,
Karnataka (INDIA)

BGSIT	Doc. Title: Phase I Evaluation		Doc. No.: 04#Form#01
BG Nagara	Page 1 of 1	Date: 01.04.2018	Rev. No. 00

Department: Computer Science and Engineering

Sub: Project Work

Code:15CSP78

Phase I Evaluation

Sl. No.	Date of Evaluation	Project Title	USN	Name	Guide Details	Components / Criteria of Evaluation				Total (100)	Sign
						1	2	3	4*		
1	22/10/2018	Enhancing the naive bayes spam filter through intelligent text modification	4BW15CS077	Spoorthi S	Pallavi N R Assistant professor	14	09	24	28	75	N Pallavi
			4BW15CS078	Summaiya Taz		14	09	24	27	74	
2	22/10/2018	Block chain based smart contract for bidding system	4BW15CS012	Chaithra H	Pallavi N R Assistant Professor	14	09	23	27	73	N Pallavi
			4BW15CS049	Poornima G		14	09	23	26	72	
			4BW15CS050	Prabhovathi S		14	09	23	26	72	
			4BW15CS014	Chaithra B.		13	09	23	27	72	

Arpitha.6
_____
Project Coordinator

Shashikala
_____
HOD

Note: Evaluation Process

* Marks is allotted by the evaluators(80),(1,2,3,4(30 marks)) and Project coordinator (20)=100Marks.

1	Significance And Relevance Of Work	15 Marks	3	Phase I Report	25 Marks
2	Problem Identification And Definition	10 Marks	4*	Presentation And Planning	(30+20)= 50 Marks

04#Form#01-0

BGSIT BG Nagara	Doc. Title: Phase II Evaluation		Doc. No.: 04#Form#01
	Page 1 of 1	Date: 01.04.2018	Rev. No. 00

Department: Computer Science and Engineering

Sub: Project Work
Code:15CSP85

Phase II Evaluation

Sl. No.	Date of Evaluation	Project Title	USN	Name	Guide Details	Components / Criteria of Evaluation			Total (40)	Sign
						1	2	3		
1	15/03/2019	Enhancing the naive buyer spam filter through intelligent text modification	4BW15CS077	Spoorthi S	Pallavi N.R Assistant Professor	13	08	12	33	Npallav
			4BW15CS078	Suromanya Taz		13	08	12	33	
2	15/03/2019	Block chain based smart contract for bidding system	4BW15CS012	chaitra H	Pallavi N.R Assistant Professor	14	09	13	36	Npallav
			4BW15CS049	Poornima G		13	08	14	35	
			4BW15CS050	Prabhavathi S		13	08	14	35	
			4BW15CS014	chaithra R		13	09	14	36	

Arpitha B
Project Coordinator

Shashikala
HOD

HOD
Dept. of Computer Science & Engg.
G.S. Institute of Technology
B.G. Nagar - 571 448
.umangala Tq. Mandya D
.....nataka (INDIA)

Note: Evaluation Process

* Marks is allotted by the evaluators (40 Marks).

1	Design and Methodology, PPT Presentation	15 Marks	3	Plan Execution	15 Marks
2	Progress of Work	10 Marks		Total	40 Marks

04#Form#01-0

Department: Computer Science and Engineering

Sub: Project Work

Code: 15CSP85

Phase III Evaluation

Sl. No.	Date of Evaluation	Project Title	USN	Name	Guide Details	Components / Criteria of Evaluation			Total (40)	Sign
						1	3	4		
1	23/04/19	Enhancing the naive bayes spam filter through intelligent text modification	4BW15CS077	Spoorthi S	Pallavi N.R Assistant Professor	16	09	09	34	Nagabai
			4BW15CS078	Summaiya Taz		16	08	09	33	
2	23/04/19	Block chain based Smart Contract for Bedding System	4BW15CS012	Chaithra H	Pallavi N.R Assistant Professor	19	09	09	37	Nagabai
			4BW15CS049	Poornima G		19	09	09	37	
			4BW15CS050	Prabhavathi S		18	09	09	36	
			4BW15CS014	Chaithra R		18	09	09	36	

_____
Project Coordinator

_____
HOD

Note: Evaluation Process

* Marks Is Allotted By The Evaluators(40),(1,3,4) And Coordinators(20),(2)   (60 Marks).

1	Implementation, Result & Conclusion	20 Marks	3	Results And Conclusion		10 Marks
2	Overall Presentation	20 Marks	4*	Report		10 Marks

04#Form#01-0

BGSIT	Doc. Title: Phase I Presentation		Doc. No.: 04#Form#01
BG Nagara	Page 1 of 1	Date: 01.04.2018	Rev. No. 00

Department: Computer Science and Engineering

Sub: Project Work

Code: 15CSP85

Final Presentation

Sl. No.	Date of Evaluation	Project Title	USN	Name	Guide Details	Components / Criteria of Evaluation				Total (100)	Sign
						1	2	3	4*		
1	23/04/2019	Stratergies for quality aware video content analytics	4BW16CS410	NAVYA A U	MANU Y M Asst. Professor Dept of CSE	34	34	09	08	85	
			4BW16CS409	NAVYA A S		34	35	08	09	86	
			4BW16CS405	HARSHITHA K S		34	35	08	09	86	
			4BW16CS408	LAKSHMI R		34	34	08	09	85	
2	23/04/2019	Blockchain smart contract for bidding system	4BW15CS012	CHAITHRA H	PALLAVI N R Asst. Professor Dept of CSE	36	37	08	09	90	
			4BW15CS049	POORNIMA G		35	37	08	08	88	
			4BW15CS050	PRABHAVATHI S		35	36	09	08	88	
			4BW15CS014	CHAITHRA R		36	36	09	09	90	

Signature of Project Coordinator

Signature of HOD

H O D
Dept. of Computer Science & Engg
B G.S. Institute of Technoley
B.G. Nagar - 571 448
Nagamangala Tq. Mandya
Karnataka (INDIA)

Note: Evaluation Process
*Marks is allotted by the evaluators and Project coordinator (80+20= 100marks)

1	Phase II Evaluation	84 marks	3	HOD	10 marks
2	Phase III Evaluation	40 marks	4*	Project Coordinator	10 arks