

| CODE | COURSE NAME | CATEGORY | L | T | P | CREDIT |
|---------|-----------------|----------|---|---|---|--------|
| MPD 415 | PROJECT PHASE 1 | PWS | 0 | 0 | 6 | 2 |

Preamble: This course is designed for enabling the students to apply the engineering knowledge in practical problem solving. The course is also intended to foster innovation in design of products, processes or systems and students are expected to develop creative thinking in finding viable solutions to engineering problems

Prerequisites: ITD334, MINI PROJECT

Course Outcomes: After the completion of the course the student will be able to

| CO No. | Course Outcome (CO) | Bloom's Category Level |
|--------|---|------------------------|
| CO 1 | Identify a topic of interest and use acquired knowledge within the selected area of technology for project development. | Level 3: Apply |
| CO 2 | Discuss and justify the technical aspects and design aspects of the project with a systematic approach. | Level 3: Apply |
| CO 3 | Analyze the technical aspects and design aspects of the project and propose a work plan | Level 4: Analyze |
| CO 4 | Practice team dynamics to work effectively in a team for the development of technical projects. | Level 3: Apply |
| CO 5 | Develop skills in technical presentation and report preparation. | Level 6: Create |

Mapping of course outcomes with program outcomes

| POs COs | PO 1 | PO 2 | PO 3 | PO 4 | PO 5 | PO 6 | PO 7 | PO 8 | PO 9 | PO 10 | PO 11 | PO 12 |
|------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|
| CO 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | - | - | - | 3 |
| CO 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | - | 2 | 3 | - | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| CO 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | - | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| CO 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | - | - | - | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| CO 5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 |

3/2/1: high/medium/low

Assessment Pattern

The Evaluation will be conducted as an internal evaluation based on the work done, the report and a viva- voce examination, conducted by a 3-member committee appointed by Head of the Department comprising HOD or a senior faculty member, academic coordinator for that program and project guide/supervisor. The Continuous Internal Evaluation (CIE) is conducted by evaluating the progress of the project through minimum of TWO reviews. At the time of the 1st review, students are supposed to propose a new system/design/idea, after completing a thorough literature study of the existing systems under their chosen area. In the 2nd review students are expected to highlight the implementation details of the proposed solution

A zeroth review may be conducted before the beginning of the project to give a chance for the students to present their area of interest or problem domain or conduct open brain storming sessions for innovative ideas. Zeroth review will not be a part of the evaluation process..

Total marks: 100, only CIE, minimum required to pass 50

Continuous Internal Evaluation Pattern:

| | |
|--|------------|
| Interim evaluation by the evaluation committee | : 20 marks |
| Awarded by Guide | : 30 marks |
| Final Seminar | : 30 marks |
| Report evaluated by the evaluation committee | : 20 Marks |

Course Plan

A Project topic must be selected either from research literature or the students themselves may propose suitable topics in consultation with their guides. The objective of Project Work I is to enable the student to take up investigative study in the broad field of Instrumentation and Control Engineering, either fully theoretical/practical or involving both theoretical and practical work to be assigned by the Department on a group of three/four students, under the guidance of a Supervisor. This is expected to provide a good initiation for the student(s) in R&D work.

The assignment to normally include:

Survey and study of published literature on the assigned topic, Preparing an Action Plan for conducting the investigation, including team work, Working out a preliminary Approach to the Problem relating to the assigned topic, Block level design documentation, Conducting preliminary Analysis/ Modelling/ Simulation/ Experiment/ Design/Feasibility, Preparing a Written Report on the Study conducted for presentation to the Department, Final Seminar, as oral Presentation before the evaluation committee



| | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|----------|----------|-----------|---------------|
| MPD 416 | PROJECT PHASE II | CATEGORY | L | T | P | CREDIT |
| | | PWS | 0 | 0 | 12 | 4 |

Preamble: The course ‘Project Work’ is mainly intended to evoke the innovation and invention skills in a student. The course will provide an opportunity to synthesize and apply the knowledge and analytical skills learned, to be developed as a prototype or simulation. The project extends to 2 semesters and will be evaluated in the 7th and 8th semester separately, based on the achieved objectives. One third of the project credits shall be completed in 7th semester and two third in 8th semester. It is recommended that the projects may be finalized in the thrust areas of the respective engineering stream or as interdisciplinary projects. Importance should be given to address societal problems and developing indigenous technologies.

Course Objectives

1. To apply engineering knowledge in practical problem solving.
2. To foster innovation in design of products, processes or systems.
3. To develop creative thinking in finding viable solutions to engineering problems.

Course Outcomes [COs]: After successful completion of the course, the students will be able to:

| | |
|-----|---|
| CO1 | Model and solve real world problems by applying knowledge across domains (Cognitive knowledge level: Apply). |
| CO2 | Develop products, processes or technologies for sustainable and socially relevant applications (Cognitive knowledge level: Apply). |
| CO3 | Function effectively as an individual and as a leader in diverse teams and to comprehend and execute designated tasks (Cognitive knowledge level: Apply). |
| CO4 | Plan and execute tasks utilizing available resources within timelines, following ethical and professional norms (Cognitive knowledge level: Apply). |
| CO5 | Identify technology/research gaps and propose innovative/creative solutions (Cognitive knowledge level: Analyze). |
| CO6 | Organize and communicate technical and scientific findings effectively in written and oral forms (Cognitive knowledge level: Apply). |

Mapping of course outcomes with program outcomes

| | PO1 | PO2 | PO3 | PO4 | PO5 | PO6 | PO7 | PO8 | PO9 | PO10 | PO11 | PO12 |
|------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|------|------|
| CO1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| CO2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 |
| CO3 | | | | | | | | | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| CO4 | | | | | 2 | | | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| CO5 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | | | | | | | 1 |
| CO6 | | | | | 2 | | | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 |

MECHANICAL PRODUCTION ENGINEERING

Abstract POs defined by National Board of Accreditation

| PO # | Broad PO | PO# | Broad PO |
|-------------|--|------------|--------------------------------|
| PO1 | Engineering Knowledge | PO7 | Environment and Sustainability |
| PO2 | Problem Analysis | PO8 | Ethics |
| PO3 | Design/Development of solutions | PO9 | Individual and team work |
| PO4 | Conduct investigations of complex problems | PO0 | Communication |
| PO5 | Modern tool usage | PO11 | Project Management and Finance |
| PO6 | The Engineer and Society | PO12 | Lifelong learning |

PROJECT PHASE II

Phase 2 Targets

1. In depth study of the topic assigned in the light of the report prepared under Phase - I;
2. Review and finalization of the approach to the problem relating to the assigned topic.
3. Preparing a detailed action plan for conducting the investigation, including teamwork.
4. Detailed Analysis/ Modeling / Simulation/ Design/ Problem Solving/Experiment as needed.
5. Final development of product/ process, testing, results, conclusions and future directions.
6. Preparing a paper for Conference Presentation/ Publication in Journals, if possible.
7. Presenting projects in Project Expos conducted by the University at the cluster level and/ or state level as well as others conducted in India and abroad.
8. Filing Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) if applicable.
9. Preparing a report in the standard format for being evaluated by the Department Assessment Board.
10. Final project presentation and viva voce by the assessment board including the external expert.

Evaluation Guidelines & Rubrics

Total: 150 marks (Minimum required to pass: 75 marks).

1. Project progress evaluation by guide: 30 Marks.
2. Two interim evaluations by the Evaluation Committee: 50 Marks (25 marks for each evaluation).
3. Final evaluation by the Final Evaluation committee: 40 Marks
4. Quality of the report evaluated by the evaluation committee: 30 Marks

(The evaluation committee comprises HoD or a senior faculty member, Project coordinator and project supervisor. The final evaluation committee comprises of Project coordinator, expert from Industry/research/academic Institute and a senior faculty from a sister department).

Evaluation by the Guide

The guide/supervisor must monitor the progress being carried out by the project groups on regular basis. In case it is found that progress is unsatisfactory it should be reported to the Department Evaluation Committee for necessary action. The presence of each student in the group and their involvement in all stages of execution of the project shall be ensured by the guide. Project evaluation by the guide: 30 Marks. This mark shall be awarded to the students in his/her group by considering the following aspects:

Project Scheduling & Distribution of Work among Team members: Detailed and extensive Scheduling with timelines provided for each phase of project. Work breakdown structure well defined. (5)

Literature survey: Outstanding investigation in all aspects. (4)

Student's Diary/ Daily Log: The main purpose of writing daily diary is to cultivate the habit of documenting and to encourage the students to search for details. It develops the students' thought process and reasoning abilities. The students should record in the daily/weekly activity diary the day to day account of the observations, impressions, information gathered and suggestions given, if any. It should contain the sketches & drawings related to the observations made by the students. The daily/weekly activity diary shall be signed after every day/week by the guide. (7)

Individual Contribution: The contribution of each student at various stages. (9)

Completion of the project: The students should demonstrate the project to their respective guide. The guide shall verify the results and see that the objectives are met. (5)

EVALUATION RUBRICS for PROJECT Phase II: Interim Evaluation - 1

| No. | Parameters | Marks | Poor | Fair | Very Good | Outstanding |
|-----|---|-------|--|---|---|---|
| 2-a | Novelty of idea, and Implementation scope [CO5] [Group Evaluation] | 5 | The project is not addressing any useful requirement. The idea is evolved into a non-implementable one. The work presented so far is lacking any amount of original work by the team. | Some of the aspects of the proposed idea can be implemented. There is still lack of originality in the work done so far by the team. The project is a regularly done theme/topic without any freshness in terms of specifications, features, and/or improvements. | Good evidence of an implementable project. There is some evidence for the originality of the work done by the team . There is fresh specifications/features/improvements suggested by the team. The team is doing a design from fundamental principles, and there is some independent learning and engineering ingenuity. | The project has evolved into incorporating an outstandingly novel idea. Original work which is not yet reported anywhere else. Evidence for ingenious way of innovation which is also Implementable. Could be a patentable / publishable work. |
| | | | (0 – 1 Marks) | (2 – 3 Marks) | (4 Marks) | (5 Marks) |
| 2-b | Effectiveness of task distribution among team members. [CO3] [Group Evaluation] | 5 | No task distribution of any kind. Members are still having no clue on what to do. | Task allocation done, but not effectively, some members do not have any idea of the tasks assigned. Some of the tasks were identified but not followed individually well. | Good evidence of task allocation being done, supported by project journal entries, identification of tasks through discussion etc. However, the task distribution seems to be skewed, and depends a few members heavily than others. Mostly the tasks are being followed by the individual members. | Excellent display of task identification and distribution backed by documentary evidence of team brainstorming, and project journal entries. All members are allocated tasks according to their capabilities, and as much as possible in an equal manner. The individual members are following the tasks in an excellent manner. |
| | | | (0 – 1 Marks) | (2 – 3 Marks) | (4 Marks) | (5 Marks) |
| 2-c | Adherence to project schedule. [CO4] [Group Evaluation] | 5 | Little or no evidence of continued planning or scheduling of the project. The students did not stick to the plan what they were going to build nor plan on what materials / resources to use in the project. The students do not have any idea on the budget required even after the end of phase - I. No project journal kept or the journal. | There is some improvement in the primary plan prepared during phase I. There were some ideas on the materials /resources required, but not really thought out. The students have some idea on the finances required, but they have not formalized a budget plan. Schedules were not prepared. The project journal has no useful details on the project. | Good evidence of planning done and being followed up to a good extent after phase I. Materials were listed and thought out, but the plan wasn't followed completely. Schedules were prepared, but not detailed, and needs improvement. Project journal is presented but it is neither complete nor updated regularly. | Excellent evidence of enterprising and extensive project planning and follow-up since phase I. Continued use of project management/version control tool to track the project. Material procurement if applicable is progressing well. Tasks are updated and incorporated in the schedule. A well-kept project journal showed evidence for all the above, in addition to the interaction with the project guide. |
| | | | (0 - 1 Marks) | (2 - 3 Marks) | (4 Marks) | (5 Marks) |

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| 2-d | Interim Results. [CO6] [Group assessment] | 5 | There are no interim results to show. | The team showed some interim results, but they are not complete / consistent to the current stage, Some corrections are needed. | The interim results showed were good and mostly consistent/correct with respect to the current stage. There is room for improvement. | There were significant interim results presented which clearly shows the progress. |
| | | | (0 - 1 Marks) | (2 - 3 Marks) | (4 Marks) | (5 Marks) |
| 2-e | Presentation [Individual assessment] | 5 | Very poor presentation and there is no interim results. The student has no idea about the project proposal. | Presentation is average, and the student has only a feeble idea about the team work. | Good presentation. Student has good idea about the team's project. The overall presentation quality is good. | Exceptionally good presentation. Student has excellent grasp of the project. The quality of presentation is outstanding. |
| | | | (0 - 1 Marks) | (2 - 3 Marks) | (4 Marks) | (5 Marks) |
| Phase-II Interim Evaluation - 1 Total Marks: 25 | | | | | | |



EVALUATION RUBRICS for PROJECT Phase II: Interim Evaluation – 2

| No | Parameters | Marks | Poor | Fair | Very Good | Outstanding |
|-----|---|-------|--|---|--|--|
| 2-f | Application of engineering knowledge [CO1] [Individual Assessment] | 10 | The student does not show any evidence of applying engineering knowledge on the design and the methodology adopted. The student's contribution in application of engineering knowledge in the project is poor. | The student appears to apply some basic knowledge, but not able to show the design procedure and the methodologies adopted in a comprehensive manner. | The student is able to show some evidence of application of engineering knowledge in the design and development of the project to good extent. | Excellent knowledge in design procedure and its adaptation. The student is able to apply knowledge from engineering domains to the problem and develop solutions. |
| | | | (0 – 3 Marks) | (4 – 6 Marks) | (7 - 9 Marks) | (10 Marks) |
| 2-g | Involvement of individual members [CO3] [Individual Assessment] | 5 | No evidence of any Individual participation in the project work. | There is evidence for some amount of individual contribution, but is limited to some of the superficial tasks. | The individual contribution is evident. The student has good amount of involvement in core activities of the project. | Evidence available for the student acting as the core technical lead and has excellent contribution to the project. |
| | | | (0 - 1 Marks) | (2 - 3 Marks) | (4 Marks) | (5 Marks) |
| 2-h | Results and inferences upon execution [CO5] [Group Assessment] | 5 | None of the expected outcomes are achieved yet. The team is unable to derive any inferences on the failures/ issues observed. Any kind of observations or studies are not made. | Only a few of the expected outcomes are achieved. A few inferences are made on the observed failures/issues. No further work suggested. | Many of the expected outcomes are achieved. Many observations and inferences are made, and attempts to identify the issues are done. Some suggestions are made for further work. | Most of the stated outcomes are met. Extensive studies are done and inferences drawn. Most of the failures are addressed and solutions suggested. Clear and valid suggestions made for further work. |
| | | | (0 - 1 Marks) | (2 - 3 Marks) | (4 Marks) | (5 Marks) |
| 2-i | Documentation and presentation. [CO6] [Individual assessment] | 5 | The individual student has no idea on the presentation of his/her part. The presentation is of poor quality. | Presentation's overall quality needs to be improved. | The individual's presentation performance is satisfactory. | The individual's presentation is done professionally and with great clarity. The individual's performance is excellent. |
| | | | (0 - 1 Marks) | (2 - 3 Marks) | (4 Marks) | (5 Marks) |

Phase-II Interim Evaluation - 2 Total Marks: 25

EVALUATION RUBRICS for PROJECT Phase II: Final Evaluation

| No | Parameters | Marks | Poor | Fair | Very Good | Outstanding |
|-----|---|-------|---|---|---|--|
| 2-j | Engineering knowledge. [CO1] [Group Assessment] | 10 | The team does not show any evidence of applying engineering knowledge on the design and the methodology adopted. | The team is able to show some of the design procedure and the methodologies adopted, but not in a comprehensive manner. | The team is able to show evidence of application of engineering knowledge in the design and development of the project to good extent. There is scope for improvement. | Excellent knowledge in design procedure and its adaptation. The team is able to apply knowledge from engineering domains to the problem and develop an excellent solution. |
| | | | (0 – 3 Marks) | (4 – 6 Marks) | (7 - 9 Marks) | (10 Marks) |
| 2-k | Relevance of the project with respect to societal and/or industrial needs. [Group Assessment] [CO2] | 5 | The project as a whole do not have any societal / industrial relevance at all. | The project has some relevance with respect to social and/or industrial application. The team has however made not much effort to explore further and make it better. | The project is relevant to the society and/or industry. The team is mostly successful in translating the problem into an engineering specification and managed to solve much of it. | The project is exceptionally relevant to society and/or industry. The team has made outstanding contribution while solving the problem in a professional and/or ethical manner. |
| | | | (0 - 1 Marks) | (2 - 3 Marks) | (4 Marks) | (5 Marks) |
| 2-i | Innovation / novelty / Creativity [CO5] [Group Assessment] | 5 | The project is not addressing any useful requirement. The idea is evolved into a non-implementable one. The work presented so far is lacking any amount of original work by the team. | Some of the aspects of the proposed idea appears to be practical. There is still lack of originality in the work done. The project is a regularly done theme/topic without any freshness in terms of specifications, features, and/or improvements. | Good evidence of an implementable project. There is some evidence for the originality of the work done by the team. There is fresh specifications/features/improvements suggested by the team. The team is doing a design from fundamental principles, and there is some independent learning and engineering ingenuity. Could be translated into a product / process if more work is done. | The project has evolved into incorporating an outstandingly novel idea. Original work which is not yet reported anywhere else. Evidence for ingenious way of innovation which is also Implementable. Could be a patentable publishable work. |
| | | | (0 - 1 Marks) | (2 - 3 Marks) | (4 Marks) | (5 Marks) |
| 2-m | Quality of results / conclusions / solutions. [CO1] [Group Assessment] | 10 | None of the expected outcomes are achieved. The team is unable to derive any inferences on the failures/issues observed. Any kind of observations or studies is not made. | Only a few of the expected outcomes are achieved. A few inferences are made on the observed failures/issues. No further work suggested. | Many of the expected outcomes are achieved. Many observations and inferences are made, and attempts to identify the issues are done. Some suggestions are made for further work. | Most of the stated outcomes are met. Extensive studies are done and inferences drawn. Most of the failures are addressed and solutions suggested. Clear and valid suggestions made for further work. |
| | | | (0 – 3 Marks) | (4 – 6 Marks) | (7 - 9 Marks) | (10 Marks) |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| 2-n | Presentation - Part I Preparation of slides. [CO6] [Group Assessment]. | 5 | The presentation slides are shallow and in a clumsy format. It does not follow proper organization. | Presentation slides follow professional style formats to some extent. However, its organization is not very good. Language needs to be improved. All references are not cited properly, or acknowledged. Presentation slides needs to be more professional. | Presentation slides follow a good style format and there are only a few issues. Organization of the slides is good. Most of references are cited properly. The flow is good and team presentation is neatly organized. Some of the results are not clearly shown. There is room for improvement. | The presentation slides are exceptionally good. Neatly organized. All references cited properly. Diagrams/Figures, Tables and equations are properly numbered, and listed. Results/ inferences clearly highlighted and readable. |
| | | | (0 - 1 Marks) | (2 - 3 Marks) | (4 Marks) | (5 Marks) |
| | Presentation - Part II: Individual Communication [CO6] [Individual Assessment]. | 5 | The student is not communicating properly. Poor response to questions. | The student is able to explain some of the content. The student requires a lot of prompts to get to the idea. There are language issues. | Good presentation/ communication by the student. The student is able to explain most of the content very well. There are however, a few areas where the student shows lack of preparation. Language is better. | Clear and concise communication exhibited by the student. The presentation is outstanding. Very confident and tackles all the questions without hesitation. Exceptional traits of communicator. |
| | | | (0 - 1 Marks) | (2 - 3 Marks) | (4 Marks) | (5 Marks) |
| Phase-II Final Evaluation, Marks: 40 | | | | | | |



EVALUATION RUBRICS for PROJECT Phase II: Report Evaluation

| Sl. No. | Parameters | Marks | Poor | Fair | Very Good | Outstanding |
|--|--------------|-------|--|---|---|--|
| 2-0 | Report [CO6] | 30 | The prepared report is shallow and not as per standard format. It does not follow proper organization. Contains mostly unacknowledged content. Lack of effort in preparation is evident. References are not cited. Unprofessional and inconsistent formatting. | Project report follows the standard format to some extent. However, its organization is not very good. Language needs to be improved. All references are not cited properly in the report. There is lack of formatting consistency. | Project report shows evidence of systematic documentation. Report is mostly following the standard style format and there are only a few issues. Organization of the report is good. Mostly consistently formatted. Most of references/sources are cited acknowledged properly. | The report is exceptionally good. Neatly organized. All references cited properly. Diagrams/Figures, Tables and equations are properly numbered, and listed and clearly shown. Language is excellent and follows professional styles. Consistent formatting and exceptional readability. |
| | | | (0 - 11 Marks) | (12 - 18 Marks) | (19 - 28 Marks) | (29 - 30 Marks) |
| Phase - II Project Report Marks: 30 | | | | | | |

