



Examiner's Evaluation (30%)

Student Name : _____
 Matric No. : _____ Programme : _____
 Supervisor : _____
 Project Title : _____

Instruction: Please rate your student according to the marking criteria below. Fill in column "MARKS" for each criteria with 0/1/2/3/4 (Marks in decimal point is not allowed).

Criteria	CO/PO	Marking Criteria					Weightage w	Mark n	Total Marks (n*w)
		n = 0	n = 1	n = 2	n = 3	n = 4			
Project Significance (CH1)	CO3/PO4	Problem, aim and objectives were not identified and presented in poor complex engineering problem	Problem not clearly identified/ inaccurate and explanation is too brief, aim and objectives were vague and not addressing forefront in-depth complex engineering problem	Problem was identified and addressed in a satisfactory manner, aim and objectives were stated and presented forefront in-depth complex engineering problem in a satisfactory manner	Problem was identified and addressed in a good manner, aim and objectives were stated and presented forefront in- depth complex engineering problem in a good manner	Problem was clearly addressed, aim and objectives were clearly stated and strongly presented forefront in- depth Complex engineering problem in an excellent manner	5		
Research gap (CH1)	CO3/PO4	No research gap and problem statement identified from the literature review	Unclear research gap and problem statement identified from the literature review	Research gap and problem statement were fairly identified from the literature review	Research gap and problem statement were satisfactorily identified from the literature review	Research gap and problem statement were clearly identified from the literature review	5		
Literature review (CH2)	CO1/PO2	Poorly structured review of literature without citation of references or no review of literature at all	The review of literature was not structured in a clear order, and most citation of references was not done properly	The review of literature was sufficiently structured in a clear order, and some citation of references was not done properly	The review of literature was structured in a clear order; however, some citation of references was done properly	The review of literature was structured in a clear order, and citation of references was done critically	5		
References (CH2)	CO1/PO2	All references were not reliable (100% internet content)	25% of references were reliable and relevant (e.g internet content)	50% of references were reliable and relevant (e.g internet content)	75% of references were apparently reliable, relevant and up to date (e.g journals)	All references were reliable, relevant and up to date (e.g journals)	2.5		

Project design Or approach (CH3)	CO2/ PO4	No project approaches/methods/parameters were provided	Some project approaches/methods/parameters were not outlined and/or without any justifications provided	Project approaches/methods/parameters were fairly outlined and justified	Project approaches/methods/parameters were satisfactorily outlined and justified	Project approaches/methods/parameters were clearly outlined and justified	10		
Formatting and organisation of report	CO5/ PO11	There was no structure of report and the formatting	The report was poorly structured, and the formatting (e.g: font, spacing, labelling of figures and tables, equations numbered and etc) include very substantial and consistent error	The report was structured and formatted (e.g: font, spacing, labelling of figures and tables, equations numbered and etc) in a satisfactory manner	The report was structured and formatted (e.g: font, spacing, labelling of figures and tables, equations numbered and etc) in a good manner	The report was structured in an orderly manner, and the formatting (e.g: font, spacing, labelling of figures and tables, equations numbered and etc) was done properly in accordance to the FYP guidelines	2.5		
TOTAL							Σw 30	$\Sigma(n)$	$\Sigma(w*n)$
TOTAL MARKS							$\frac{\Sigma(n*w)}{4}$		

Comments:

Examined by : _____

Signature : _____

Date : _____