



LAPORAN AKHIR PROJEK PENYELIDIKAN TAHUN AKHIR (PENILAI) FINAL REPORT OF FINAL YEAR PROJECT (EXAMINER)

PART A (FINAL REPORT): (30.0 %)

Category	Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Moderate (3)	Weak (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)
Title	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Informative, concise & clearly expressed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Relevant, concise & clearly expressed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Relevant but not concise & good expression 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Vague, not concise & poorly expressed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Irrelevant & poorly expressed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Omitted.
Abstract	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Detail and specific description on the issues, variables, context and methods of study. ▪ Provide relevant and specific data/evidence to back up summary of results. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Detail description of the issues, variables, context, and methods of study. ▪ Provide relevant data/evidence to back up summary of result. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sketchy description of issues, variables, context and methods of study. ▪ Provide enough data/evidence to back up summary of results. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Inappropriate problem, research questions and method of the study. ▪ Provide less than enough data/evidence to back up summary of results. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Includes a summary of the problem, research questions and method of the study. ▪ Specific data/evidence to back up summary of results is not provided. 	
Introduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Excellent coverage of research background. ▪ Problem statements, objectives and variables are specific and clearly and precisely defined. ▪ Scope of study satisfy the objectives and is clearly explained. ▪ Significance of the study is relevant, explicit and clearly described. ▪ All elements are supported by literature. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Good coverage of research background ▪ Problem statements, objectives, and variables are specific and adequately defined. ▪ Scope of study partially fulfil the objectives and adequately explained. ▪ Significance of the study is clearly stated and focused. ▪ Connections are established with the literature. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Moderate coverage of research background. ▪ Problem statements, objectives are identified but not clearly defined. ▪ Scope of study is too broad or not specific and poorly explained. ▪ Significance of the study is not logically relevant to the problem. ▪ Connections to the literature are unclear or debatable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Poor coverage of research background. ▪ Problem statements and objectives are identified but not defined. ▪ Scope of study does not fulfil the objectives. ▪ Significance of the study is not clear, nor focused nor explicit. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Inadequate coverage of research background. ▪ Problem statements and objectives are not identified. ▪ Scope of study and significance of the study are not clearly stated and irrelevant. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Research background, problem statement, scope of the study, and objectives are omitted.

<p>Literature review</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Excellent literature review covers essential aspects related to issue/ problem, objectives, theory and methods. ▪ Source from multiple, research based documents. ▪ Detail conclusions based on evidence cited. ▪ Sources are properly cited & in standardized /APA format ▪ Narrative integrates critical and logical details from literatures. ▪ Excellent synthesis and organization of literature that is clearly linked to research question. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Good literature review covers essential aspects related to issue/ problem, objectives, theory and methods. ▪ Source from multiple documents. ▪ Conclusions based on evidence cited. ▪ Sources are properly cited. ▪ Good synthesis and organization of the literature, which is clearly linked to the research question. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Adequate literature review covers generally essential aspects related to issue/ problem, objectives, theory and methods. ▪ Source from limited number of documents. ▪ Some conclusions based on evidence cited. ▪ Sources are cited but some are in improper format. ▪ Moderate synthesis and organization of the literature, which minimally links it to the research question. ▪ Selected literature was from unreliable sources. Literally supports were vague and ambiguous. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Minimal literature review, covers minimally on essential aspects related to issue/ problem, objectives, theory and methods. ▪ Source from single document. ▪ Only one conclusion based on evidence cited. ▪ Sources are cited incorrectly. ▪ Poor synthesis and organization of the literature. ▪ The review of literature was missing of non-research based articles, irrelevant, inaccurate or inappropriate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Very little or fail to provide previous research background supporting issue/ problem, objectives, theory and methods. ▪ No sources quoted. ▪ No conclusion given. ▪ Source is not cited. ▪ Synthesis and organization is based on limited information. There is very poor link to the research question. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Literature reviews are omitted
<p>Materials and Methods</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Valid and appropriate methods with sound justifications. ▪ Research methodology is clearly identified and coherently described in detail. ▪ Assumptions & limitations are clearly stated. ▪ The context population and sampling strategy were fully described (quantitative and qualitative). ▪ Instruments and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Valid and appropriate methods but with limited justifications. ▪ Research methodology is clearly identified and described with sufficient details. ▪ Some limitations and assumptions have been identified. ▪ The context, population and sampling strategy were adequately identified and described. ▪ Instruments and observation protocols 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Valid and appropriate methods and without justifications. ▪ Research methodology is not clearly described or incomplete. ▪ Important limitations and assumptions have not been identified. ▪ The context, population or sampling strategy was confusing, little relevance to the research objective, incomplete or not identified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Valid but inappropriate methods without justifications. ▪ The research methodology is not identified nor described. ▪ Limitations and assumptions are omitted. ▪ The context, population or sampling strategy was poorly described. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Invalid and inappropriate methods and justifications. ▪ Wrong methodology. ▪ The context, population or sample was not identified or described ▪ Instruments and observation protocols for data collection were not identified nor described. ▪ Procedures for treatments and gathering data were omitted ▪ Analytical methods 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Research design, sampling, instruments, procedures, data analysis based on the issues, the objectives of the study, and what to achieve in the thesis are omitted.

	<p>observation protocols were clearly described in detail.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Procedures for implementing the study (permissions, treatments, and data gathering) were fully identified and described. ▪ Analytical methods (descriptive, inferential test, and significance level) were sufficiently specific, clear and appropriate. 	<p>were clearly identified and described.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Procedures for implementing the study (permissions, treatments, and data gathering) were identified and described. ▪ Descriptive and inferential methods were identified. Level of significance was stated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Instruments or observation protocols description was incomplete or of little relevance to the research objectives. ▪ Procedures (permissions, treatments and data gathering) lacked clarity. ▪ Descriptive or inferential methods were confusing, incomplete or lacked relevance to the research objectives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Description of the instruments is incomplete or lacked relevance to the research objectives. Observation protocol was not described. ▪ Procedures (permissions, treatments and data gathering) were incomplete or lacked relevance to the research objectives. ▪ Analytical methods (descriptive, inferential test, and significance level) were inappropriately aligned with data and research objectives. 	<p>(descriptive, inferential test, and significance level) were missing/not implemented.</p>	
Results and Discussions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Excellent presentation, explanation and evaluation of results. ▪ Have a very good quality and trustworthy data, with excellent presentation. ▪ Excellent discussions on findings and data interpretations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Good presentation, explanation and evaluation of results. ▪ Have good quality and mostly trustworthy data, with good presentation. ▪ Good discussions on findings and data interpretations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sufficient quality of presentation, explanation and evaluation of results. ▪ Insufficient and slightly doubtful data, with moderate presentation. ▪ Sufficient discussions on findings and data interpretations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Moderate presentation, explanation and evaluation of results. ▪ Insufficient and mostly doubtful data with poor presentation. ▪ Moderate discussions on findings and data interpretations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Poor presentation, explanation and evaluation of results. ▪ Insufficient and non-trustworthy data, with inappropriate presentation. ▪ Poor discussions on findings and data interpretations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No explanation or evaluation of the results. ▪ No worthy data, and bad presentation ▪ No discussion on findings and very poor data interpretation.
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Conclusion addresses the research objectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Conclusion addresses the research objectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Conclusion addresses the research objectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Conclusion addresses the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Conclusion addresses the research objectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Conclusion was omitted.

	and based on the work done. ▪ Conclusions were supported by relevant results, and presented concisely in logical sequence.	and based on the work done. ▪ Conclusions were supported by relevant results, but not presented in logical sequence.	and based on the work done. ▪ Conclusions were mostly concise but with some vagueness in wording.	research objectives and based on the work done. ▪ Some conclusions are not supported by results or merely repeat results	and based on the work done. ▪ Conclusions merely repeat the results.	
Recommendation	▪ Recommendations are to the-point, well-linked to the conclusions, original and are extensive enough to serve as project description for a new thesis project.	▪ Recommendations are to-the point, well-linked to the conclusions and original.	▪ Recommendations are well-linked to the conclusions	▪ Some recommendations are given, but the link to the conclusions is not always clear.	▪ Recommendations are absent or trivial.	▪ No Recommendations.
References	▪ All the sources used are cited in the reference list, which follows the recommended style.	▪ Most of the sources used are cited in the reference list, which follows the recommended style.	▪ Only a few sources used are cited in the reference list, which follows the recommended style.	▪ Many sources are missing from the reference list and did not follow recommended style.	▪ Most of the sources are missing from the reference list and did not follow recommended style.	▪ No list of references.

PART B (PRESENTATION EVALUATION): (10.0 %)

Category	Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Moderate (3)	Weak (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)
Contents of Presentation	▪ Major points (title, research background, problem statement, objectives, literature review, methodology, result & discussion, conclusion & recommendation) strongly supported with suitable detail.	▪ All major points (title, research background, problem statement, objectives, literature review, methodology, result & discussion, conclusion & recommendation) covered and explained clearly and correctly.	▪ Covers important points (title, research background, problem statement, objectives, literature review, methodology, result & discussion, conclusion & recommendation). ▪ A few inaccurate or irrelevant points.	▪ Important points (title, research background, problem statement, objectives, literature review, methodology, result & discussion, conclusion & recommendation) covered only	▪ Loss of important points (title, research background, problem statement, objectives, literature review, methodology, result & discussion, conclusion & recommendation) and covered only superficially. ▪ Major error and misconception.	▪ All points (title, research background, problem statement, objectives, literature review, methodology, result & discussion, conclusion & recommendation) are omitted.

				superficially. ▪ No major error and misconception.		
Presentation Skill	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Excellent organization and preparation (eye contact, clear voice, pronunciation skill, well dressed, good time management). ▪ Confident and relaxed in the whole presentation. ▪ Engaging with audience. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Good organization and preparation (eye contact, clear voice, pronunciation skill, well dressed, good time management). ▪ Confident in most parts of the presentation. ▪ Attractive to audience. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Moderate organization and preparation (eye contact, clear voice, pronunciation skill, well dressed, good time management). ▪ Confident in only some parts of the presentation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Basic organization and preparation (eye contact, clear voice, pronunciation skill, well dressed, good time management). ▪ Lack of confidence in some parts of the presentation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Unorganized and lack of preparation (eye contact, clear voice, pronunciation skill, well dressed, good time management). ▪ Very much lacking in confidence on the whole presentation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No confidence and eye contact, voice, pronunciation skill, dressed, time management are omitted.
Communication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Handle difficult question with ease and confidence. ▪ Illustrative explanation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Answer all questions correctly and concisely. ▪ Answers are uniformly good, and show knowledge beyond presentation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Answer most questions correctly. ▪ Answers are uniformly good, both in substance and delivery. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Answer half of question correctly. ▪ Sometimes need clarification. ▪ Answers are inconsistent, both in substance or delivery. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Answer at least one question correctly. ▪ Need clarification. ▪ Answers are low in quality, either in substance or delivery. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Unable to answer all the questions.
Overall Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Able to generate new idea or ideas that have potential to be applied, have depth, quality and novel in nature in the project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Able to generate new ideas that are relevant and appropriate in the project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Able to generate new ideas with some help from lecturer or colleagues in the project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Able to generate a simple idea independently in the project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Not able to generate any new idea in research project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No idea.

Research Paper Rubric for Final Report of Final Year Project (Examiner)

PART A (FINAL REPORT): (30.0 %)

No	Full Name (as identity card/ passport)	Student's Matric No	Category							
			Title & Abstract	Introduction	Literature review	Materials and Methods	Results and Discussions	Conclusion	Recommendation	Reference
			Weightage (0.5)	Weightage (0.5)	Weightage (0.5)	Weightage (1.0)	Weightage (2.0)	Weightage (0.5)	Weightage (0.5)	Weightage (0.5)
1.										
2.										
3.										
4.										
5.										
6.										
7.										
8.										
9.										
10.										

PART B (PRESENTATION EVALUATION): (10.0 %)

No	Full Name (as identity card/ passport)	Student's Matric No	Category			
			Contents of Presentation	Presentation Skill	Communication	Overall Evaluation
			Weightage (0.5)	Weightage (0.5)	Weightage (0.5)	Weightage (0.5)
1.						
2.						
3.						
4.						
5.						
6.						
7.						
8.						
9.						
10.						

Comments and Recommendations:

Signature : _____
Name : _____
Date : _____

TOTAL MARKS: _____
40