

Circular: Second-Year Semester I
Continuous Assessment 1 (CA1) & Continuous Assessment 2 (CA2)
Guidelines for Students

(Applicable to Faculty Members – A.Y. 2026–27)

1. About CA1 & CA2

CA1 & CA2 are internal assessment in Semester I. It evaluates attendance, participation, and academic performance.

2. CA1 & CA2 Components (Total = 15 Marks)

Component	Marks
Attendance	5
Activity	10
Total	15

3. Component 1 – Attendance (Maximum 5 Marks)

Marks shall be awarded strictly as per the student's attendance percentage recorded in the ERP/official attendance register.

Attendance Percentage	Marks
Above 75%	5
50% to 75%	3
Below 50%	1

Note:

- Attendance should be calculated up to the commencement of CA1 & CA2.
- Students representing the college in official events (technical, cultural, sports, NSS, etc.) should be considered "on duty" with prior approval.

4. Components 2 – Activity (Faculty-Decided Activity) (Maximum 10 Marks)

Each course faculty member shall select one assessment activity for CA1 and a different assessment activity for CA2, in accordance with the guidelines issued by the Dean - Academics.

Evaluation Guidelines:

- Activities must map with at least one Course Outcome (CO).
- Faculty should maintain documentation (question papers, rubrics, evaluated samples).
- Marks must be uploaded in the ERP/Google Sheet format provided by the academic office before the notified deadline.
- A uniform evaluation scale (0–10) shall be applied for each component:
 - Excellent: 10
 - Good: 8
 - Satisfactory: 5
 - Poor/Incomplete: 2
 - Not submitted/Absent: 0

6. Timeline for CA1 & CA2

Activity	CA1 Date / Duration	CA2 Date / Duration	Responsibility
Completion of syllabus portion to be assessed	By 14 August 2026	By 19 October 2026	Faculty
CA Assessment Period	17 – 24 August 2026	21 – 28 October 2026	Faculty
Submission of evaluated CA marks to Department	28 August 2026	31 October 2026	Faculty
Verification of records by Department Coordinator	02 September 2026	06 November 2026	Dept. Academic/ Examination Coordinator
Final submission to Dean – Academics	04 September 2026	09 November 2026	HOD/Dean
Display of Marks	07 – 11 September 2026	11 – 16 November 2026	Controller of Examination

7. Evaluation Criteria and Rubrics

Use the official **CA Rubric Sheet (Chapter 9)**.

Each criterion must be rated on a **10-point scale**:

Excellent = 10 | Good = 8 | Satisfactory = 5 | Poor = 2 | Absent = 0

7.1 Rubrics for Continuous Assessment Tools (CA1 & CA2)

(As per AGCE Academic Rules & Regulations 2025 – Chapter 9)

A. Assignments & Creative Submissions

Criteria	Excellent (10)	Good (8)	Satisfactory (5)	Poor (2)
Understanding of Concepts	Deep, error-free, original	Clear, minor errors	Basic understanding	Incomplete or incorrect
Application	Innovative application to real-world problems	Relevant but limited	Minimal application	No practical link
Presentation	Well-structured, neat, with references	Structured with minor lapses	Disorganized	Poorly written

B. Case Studies (Industry / Community-Based)

Criteria	Excellent (10)	Good (8)	Satisfactory (5)	Poor (2)
Problem Identification	Clearly identifies and defines key issues	Identifies most issues	Identifies few issues	Lacks clarity
Analysis & Reasoning	Strong critical analysis with evidence	Logical but less comprehensive	Limited analysis	No analysis
Solution / Recommendations	Innovative, feasible, linked to theory	Practical but less creative	Generalized solutions	Irrelevant solutions
Presentation	Professional and clear	Clear but lacks polish	Minimal clarity	Poorly presented

C. Class / Unit Tests (Bloom's Taxonomy Coverage)

Criteria	Excellent (10)	Good (8)	Satisfactory (5)	Poor (2)
Recall (Knowledge)	Correct and complete	Mostly correct	Partial	Incorrect
Application (Problem Solving)	Logical, stepwise solution	Minor errors	Major errors	Incorrect
Higher-Order Thinking	Clear analysis or derivation	Partly analytical	Limited attempt	No attempt

D. Open Book / Applied Exams

Criteria	Excellent (10)	Good (8)	Satisfactory (5)	Poor (2)
Interpretation of Question	Insightful, beyond textbook	Accurate interpretation	Partial understanding	Misunderstood
Application & Creativity	Original and practical solutions	Logical, less creative	Limited	Superficial
Synthesis & Integration	Connects multiple concepts	Connects few	Minimal integration	None

E. Quizzes & Online Tests

Criteria	Excellent (10)	Good (8)	Satisfactory (5)	Poor (2)
Accuracy	90–100% correct	75–89% correct	50–74% correct	<50% correct
Time Management	Completed within time	Minor delay	Delayed completion	Incomplete
Consistency	Regular performance	Occasional accuracy	Irregular	Rare participation

F. Field / Community-Based Assignments

Criteria	Excellent (10)	Good (8)	Satisfactory (5)	Poor (2)
Data Collection	Comprehensive & authentic	Adequate	Limited	Incomplete
Analysis	Critical and reflective	Logical, some gaps	Minimal	None
Report Writing	Professional, well-documented	Clear, minor errors	Disorganized	Incomplete

G. Group Tasks with Peer / Self Evaluation

Criteria	Excellent (10)	Good (8)	Satisfactory (5)	Poor (2)
Teamwork & Collaboration	Active, balanced contribution	Good participation	Unequal contribution	No participation
Peer / Self Evaluation	Honest, reflective	Adequate reflection	Limited	None
Output Quality	High-quality, creative	Relevant, minor issues	Average	Weak

H. Class Participation & Attendance (Compulsory)

Weightage: 0–5 Marks

Basis: Attendance up to **commencement of CA1 & CA2** and participation in lectures

Criteria	Excellent (5)	Good (3)	Poor (1)
Attendance	>75%	50–75%	<50%

I. Seminar / Interdisciplinary Presentations

Criteria	Excellent (10)	Good (8)	Satisfactory (5)	Poor (2)
Content & Knowledge	Deep, beyond syllabus	Adequate	Limited	Inaccurate
Delivery & Communication	Confident, engaging	Clear, minor issues	Hesitant	Poor delivery
Q&A Handling	Accurate, logical	Partial	Minimal	Unable to answer

J. Professional & Lifelong Learning – Certifications.

Basis: **Verified participation in technical/professional clubs, events, or workshops (by mentor/faculty coordinator).**

Criteria	Excellent (10)	Good (8)	Satisfactory (5)	Poor (2)
Certification Completion	High score / Advanced	Basic completion	Ongoing with proof	Not completed
Relevance	Highly relevant	Moderately relevant	Low relevance	Irrelevant
Learning Outcome	Clear reflection	Partial reflection	Minimal	None
Timeliness	On time	Slight delay	Late	Not submitted

K. Project-Based Learning (With Innovation / Societal Relevance)

Criteria	Excellent (10)	Good (8)	Satisfactory (5)	Poor (2)
Idea Selection	Relevant, innovative, feasible	Relevant and feasible	Basic idea	Poor idea
Prototype	Functional and innovative	Functional	Partially functional	Non-functional
Report	Clear and complete	Well-organized	Average	Incomplete
Presentation	Confident, effective, teamwork	Good presentation	Average presentation	Poor presentation

8. Sample Assessment Sheet (For Faculty Use)

Roll No.	Student Name	Attendance (5)	Activity (10)	Total (15)
1		5	8	13
2		3	6	09
3		4	7	11

9. Responsibilities of Faculty Members

- Align CA tasks with CO–PO mapping.
- Follow academic calendar strictly.
- Use approved rubrics for objectivity.
- Encourage original work and avoid plagiarism.
- Retain CA records for audit and NAAC/NBA review.

10. Guidelines to Assess Activities According to Rubrics

1. Pre-Assessment Preparation

- Read rubric descriptors and decide weightage per criterion.
- Explain evaluation method to students for clarity.
- Prepare observation sheet for each activity.

2. During Assessment

- Observe students systematically during presentations, labs, or submissions.
- Score each criterion separately (10–8–5–2).
- Support scores with written comments or evidence (screenshots, photos, reports).
- For group tasks, rate **team output** and **individual contribution** both.

3. After Assessment

- Average scores to get activity mark (0–10).
- Give feedback verbally or in remarks column.
- Keep digital and hard-copy evidence ready for audit.

4. Moderation & Verification

- Organize cross-checking of evaluations within department.
- Maintain audit-ready files (assessment sheets, rubrics, proofs).

10.1 Sample Evaluation Using Rubrics

Sample Evaluation Using Rubrics — Assignment / Creative Submission (Weight = 10 Marks)

Roll No.	Student Name	Understanding of Concepts (10)	Application (10)	Presentation (10)	Average Score	Final Marks (Out of 10)
1		10	10	10	$(10+10+10)/3 = 10.0$	10.0
2		8	8	8	$(8+8+8)/3 = 8.0$	8.0
3		5	5	5	$(5+5+5)/3 = 5.0$	5.0
4		2	2	2	$(2+2+2)/3 = 2.0$	2.0

Faculty Assessment Notes:

- Each criterion should be **scored independently** using the official rubric levels (Excellent–Poor).
- Average score is rounded to the nearest whole or half mark.
- Marks should reflect **evidence of effort, originality, and correctness**.
- Maintain **sample evaluated assignments** for departmental moderation.

-sd-

Dean Academic (Autonomy)

Dr. Vishal Hingmire

-sd-

Principal/Director

Dr. Sharad Mulik