FACULTY OF ENGINEERING
Final Year Project 1

Supervisor's Evaluation (50%)

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			
PART A : REPORT ASSESSMENT									
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 (e.g. 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	Σ(n) =	Σ(w*n)=
						TOTAL MARKS	$\frac{\sum(n*w)}{4}$		
PART B: SUPERVISION ASSESSMENT									
Similarity Index **(Turnitin Report)**	CO4/ PO8	40%-31% of the work was plagiarised from previous works (obvious plagiarism and forged results occurred)	Similarity index is in between 21%-30%. If applicable, preliminary results reported did not reflect ethical responsibility (e.g. forged results, results not presented clearly)	Similarity index is in between 16%-20%. If applicable, preliminary results reported fairly reflected ethical responsibility (e.g. no forging of results, results presented in a fairly manner)	Similarity index is in between 11% to 15%, where the index is not concentrated on a single reference. If applicable, preliminary results reported satisfactorily reflected ethical responsibility (e.g. no forging of results, results presented in a satisfactory manner)	10% or less in similarity index, where the index is not concentrated on a single reference. If applicable, preliminary results reported clearly reflected ethical responsibility (e.g. no forging of results, results presented in a professional manner)	**5**		
Commitment & Self Initiatives	CO4/ PO8	Less than 2 discussion meetings with supervisor per semester, no self-initiatives in completing the project. The student did not demonstrate any form of commitment in the work	Only 3-4 discussion meetings with supervisor per semester (monthly meetings), lack of self-initiatives in completing the project. The student was not committed and did not perform most tasks in the project	5-7 discussion meetings with supervisor per semester (once every 3 weeks), satisfactory self-initiatives in completing the project. The student was committed and performed the tasks in the project in a satisfactory manner	8 – 10 discussion meetings with supervisor per semester (biweekly meetings), good self-initiatives in completing the project. The student was committed and diligent in performing the tasks in the project	More than 10 discussion meetings with supervisor per semester (weekly meetings), excellent self-initiatives. The student was very committed and diligent in performing the tasks in the project	**2.5**		
Deadline	CO4/ PO8	The students never meet deadline	The students seldom meet deadline (e.g. change or postpone the meeting/planning less than 25%)	The student usually meet deadline (e.g. change or postpone the meeting/planning less than 50%)	The student consistently meet deadline (e.g. change or postpone the meeting/planning less than 25%)	The student consistently meet deadline (e.g. change or postpone the meeting/planning less than 10%)	**2.5**		

Planning of Project Activities **(Logbook)**	CO5/ PO11	No project schedule provided	Project activities were poorly identified and not arranged practically in a project schedule with timeline (e.g. Project Plan & Gann Chart were not properly done)	Project activities were fairly identified but some were not arranged practically in a project schedule with timeline (e.g. Project Plan & Gann Chart were satisfactorily done)	Project activities were satisfactorily identified and arranged practically in a project schedule with timeline (e.g. Project Plan & Gann Chart were done in good manner)	Project activities were clearly identified and arranged practically in a project schedule with timeline (e.g. Project Plan & Gann Chart were properly done)	**2.5**		
Weekly Activities And Progress **(Logbook)**	CO5/ PO11	There is no weekly activities and progress report done	There is only 3-4 weeks of progress report were recorded (Plan and action were not properly done)	There is around 7 weeks of weekly progress report were recorded (Plan and action were satisfactorily done)	There is around 10-11 weeks of weekly progress report were recorded (Plan and action were done in good manner)	There is more than 11 weeks of weekly progress report were recorded (Plan and action were properly done)	**2.5**		
Content **(Logbook)**	CO5/ PO11	No content presentation and adequate information regarding the project	Poor content presentation with minimum information regarding the project (i.e. discussion, draft, sketch and problems solving)	Fair content presentation and minimum information regarding the project (i.e. discussion, draft, sketch and problems solving)	Good content presentation with adequate information regarding the project (i.e. discussion, draft, sketch and problems solving)	Excellent content presentation with adequate information regarding the project (i.e. discussion, draft, sketch and problems solving)	**5**		
						TOTAL	Σw 20	Σ(n)	Σ(w*n)
						TOTAL MARKS	$\frac{\sum(n*w)}{4}$		

Comments:

Examined by : _____ **Signature** : _____

Date : _____