



LAPORAN AKHIR PROJEK PENYELIDIKAN TAHUN AKHIR (PENYELIA) FINAL REPORT OF FINAL YEAR PROJECT (SUPERVISOR)

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 observation protocols 	<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 were clearly identified 	<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. ▪ Instruments or 	<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. ▪ Description of the 	<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 (descriptive, inferential 	<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>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>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. 	<p>observation protocols description was incomplete or of little relevance to the research objectives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Procedures (permissions, treatments and data gathering) lacked clarity. Descriptive or inferential methods were confusing, incomplete or lacked relevance to the research objectives. 	<p>instruments is incomplete or lacked relevance to the research objectives. Observation protocol was not described.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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>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 and based on the work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conclusion addresses the research objectives and based on the work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conclusion addresses the research objectives and based on the work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conclusion addresses the research objectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conclusion addresses the research objectives and based on the work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conclusion was omitted.

	done. ▪ Conclusions were supported by relevant results, and presented concisely in logical sequence.	done. ▪ Conclusions were supported by relevant results, but not presented in logical sequence.	done. ▪ Conclusions were mostly concise but with some vagueness in wording.	and based on the work done. ▪ Some conclusions are not supported by results or merely repeat results	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 (TECHNICAL FORMAT): (5.0 %)

Category	Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Moderate (3)	Weak (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)
Format, Structure And Grammar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Well organized, demonstrates logical sequencing and structure. ▪ All paragraphs within a section flow well from one to the next. ▪ Consistently complied with UMK-FSB guidelines. ▪ No grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Organized and demonstrates logical sequencing and structure. ▪ Paragraphs within a section generally flow well from one to the next. ▪ Mostly complied with UMK-FSB guidelines. ▪ Very little grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Organized but demonstrates illogical sequencing or structure. ▪ Paragraphs within a section flow somewhat from one to the next. ▪ Sparingly complied with UMK-FSB guidelines. ▪ Few grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Weakly organized with no logical sequencing or structure. ▪ Paragraph within a section were disconnected. ▪ Mostly does not comply with the UMK-FSB guidelines. ▪ Many grammatical, spelling, or punctuation errors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No organization, sequencing, or structure. ▪ Paragraphs within a section do not clear. ▪ Fail to comply with UMK-FSB guidelines. ▪ Too many grammatical, spelling, or punctuation errors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No paragraphs within a section. ▪ Fail to comply with UMK-FSB guidelines. ▪ Too many grammatical, spelling, or punctuation errors.
	▪ Able to write very well, concisely and clearly.	▪ Able to write well and clearly.	▪ Able to write clearly but require some	▪ Writing is not clear and requires further	▪ Writing is not clear and requires a lot of	▪ Unable to write ideas and no

Clarity and Continuity in Writing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Elegantly organized with respect to both the whole thesis and the coherence and continuity of paragraphs. ▪ Accommodates the complexity of the argument imaginatively. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Well organized throughout but without elegance and complexity. ▪ Accommodates the argument satisfactorily. 	<p>improvements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Well organized on the whole but occasionally needing work on individual paragraph coherence or continuity. ▪ Accommodates the argument moderately. 	<p>improvements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Organization is haphazard and the argument is difficult to follow. ▪ Paragraph coherence and continuity need work. 	<p>improvements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No continuity in writing. 	<p>continuity in writing.</p>
--	---	---	--	--	--	-------------------------------

PART C (SUPERVISION): (15.0 %)

Category	Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Moderate (3)	Weak (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)
Work Responsibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Completes work on time and is punctual. ▪ When asking for advice to supervisor, states what already has been tried. ▪ Carry out the task given beyond the scope of work set and beyond expectations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Regularly work on time and is punctual. ▪ Regularly asks for advice when needed. ▪ Carry out the tasks given in the scope of work beyond expectations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Regularly takes actions, always uses his or her time wisely. ▪ Sometimes knows when advice is needed and asks. ▪ Carry out the tasks given in accordance with the scope of work and meet expectations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Displays lack of interest or pride in their work. Does not always manage time wisely. ▪ Do not know when advice is needed and do not ask. ▪ Carry out tasks assigned in accordance with scope of work with supervision. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Rarely manages time wisely. ▪ Does not ask for or accept advice. ▪ Do not perform the task given even with supervision. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fails to manage time wisely. ▪ Never ask for or accept advice
Academic Discussion With Supervisor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Discusses progress with their supervisor more than 10 times through various communication channels supported by log card. ▪ Shows improvement of research every time meeting with supervisor. ▪ Dissertation draft had been discussed few times with supervisor. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Discusses progress with their supervisor at least 10 times through various communication channels supported by log card. ▪ Shows improvement of research every time meeting with supervisor. ▪ Dissertation draft had been discussed few times with supervisor. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Discusses progress with their supervisor at least 7 times through various communication channels supported by log card. ▪ Shows not much of improvement of research every time meeting with supervisor. ▪ Dissertation draft had been discussed few times with supervisor. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Discusses progress with their supervisor at least 5 times through various communication channels supported by log card. ▪ Never shows any improvement of research every time meeting with supervisor. ▪ Report draft had been discussed few times with supervisor. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Discusses progress with their supervisor less than 5 times through various communication channels supported by log card. ▪ Never do anything as instructed by supervisor. ▪ Thesis draft never shown to supervisor. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Never discusses progress with their supervisor. ▪ Students never do anything as constructed by supervisor. ▪ Thesis draft never shown to supervisor.

Plagiarism-Turnitin Software	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The final similarity result is below 20%. ▪ The final report is legally and ethically attributes ideas, languages and graphics to the original source in a standard format with no errors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The final similarity result is below 20%. ▪ The final report is consistently attributes ideas, languages and graphics to the original source in a standard format with few errors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The final similarity result is below 20%. ▪ The final report inconsistently attributes ideas, languages and graphics to the original source, at times in a non standard format. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The final similarity result is below 20%. ▪ The final report is consistently fails to attribute ideas, languages and graphics to the original source or does so in a nonstandard format. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The final similarity result is below 20%. ▪ The final report is consistently fails to attribute ideas, languages and graphics to the original source or does so in a nonstandard format but without intent to plagiarize. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The final similarity result is above 20%. ▪ The final report is plagiarized or borrows heavily or completely from other sources without crediting them or uses decoy sources.
-------------------------------------	---	---	--	---	--	--

PART D (LAB WORK CONDUCT / FIELDWORK CONDUCT): (10.0 %)

Category	Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Moderate (3)	Weak (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)
Methods / Materials Handling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Has the ability to use the techniques, skills and tools without assistance confidently at laboratory or/and fieldwork. ▪ Utilize the experimental apparatus/equipment creatively and innovatively. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Has the ability to use the techniques, skills and tools without assistance confidently at laboratory or/and fieldwork 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Understand the apparatus' or equipment's method principle but lack of techniques and skills at laboratory or/and fieldwork. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Not confident in utilizing the apparatus/equipment but can perform the experiments on their own at laboratory or/and fieldwork. Need some assistance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Not confident at all in utilizing the apparatus/equipment. Need assistance continuously 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Unable to use any apparatus/equipment at laboratory or/and fieldwork
Safety Work Procedure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Excellent in organizing and perform experiment, follow correct safety procedure in laboratory or/and fieldwork. ▪ Always follow the dress code. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Good in organizing and perform experiment, follow correct safety procedure in laboratory or/and fieldwork. ▪ Always follow the dress code. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Moderate skill in organizing and perform experiment, follow correct safety procedure it lab. ▪ Do not follow the dress code. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Weak in organizing and perform experiment, follow correct safety procedure in lab. ▪ Do not follow the dress code. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Poor in organizing and perform experiment, follow correct safety procedure in laboratory or/and fieldwork. ▪ Do not follow the dress code. Do not plan work effectively 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Need fully supervision. Unsafe work procedure. Fail to identify the important information in laboratory or/and fieldwork. ▪ Do not follow the dress code of workplace.

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

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 (TECHNICAL FORMAT): (5.0 %)

No	Full Name (as identity card/ passport)	Student's Matric No	Category	
			Format, Structure And Grammar	Clarity and Continuity In Writing
			Weightage (0.5)	Weightage (0.5)
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				

9.				
10.				

PART C (SUPERVISION): (15.0 %)

No	Full Name (as identity card/ passport)	Student's Matric No	Category		
			Work Responsibility	Academic Discussion With Supervisor	Plagiarism-Turnitin Software
			Weightage (1.0)	Weightage (1.0)	Weightage (1.0)
1.					
2.					
3.					
4.					
5.					
6.					
7.					
8.					
9.					
10.					

PART D (LAB WORK CONDUCT / FIELDWORK CONDUCT): (10.0 %)

No	Full Name (as identity card/ passport)	Student's Matric No	Category	
			Methods / Materials Handling	Safety Work Procedure
			Weightage (1.0)	Weightage (1.0)
1.				
2.				
3.				

4.				
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				
9.				
10.				

Comments and Recommendations:

Signature : _____

Name : _____

Date : _____

<p>TOTAL MARKS: _____</p> <p style="text-align: right;">60</p>
--