



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

PART A (FINAL REPORT): (30.0 %) – PLO 6

Category	Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Moderate (3)	Weak (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)
Title Abstract	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Informative, concise & clearly expressed. <input type="checkbox"/> Detail and specific description on the issues, variables, context and methods of study. <input type="checkbox"/> Provide relevant and specific results and conclusions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Relevant, concise & clearly expressed. <input type="checkbox"/> Detail description of the issues, variables, context, and methods of study. <input type="checkbox"/> Provide relevant results and conclusions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Relevant but not concise & good expression <input type="checkbox"/> Sketchy description of issues, variables, context and methods of study. <input type="checkbox"/> Provide results and conclusions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Vague, not concise & poorly expressed. ▪ 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"> ▪ Irrelevant & poorly expressed. ▪ 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Omitted.
Chapter 1 Introduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent coverage of research background. <input type="checkbox"/> Problem statements, objectives and variables are specific and clearly and precisely defined. <input type="checkbox"/> Scope of study satisfy the objectives and is clearly explained. <input type="checkbox"/> Significance of the study is relevant, explicit and clearly described. <input type="checkbox"/> All elements are supported by literature. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Good coverage of research background <input type="checkbox"/> Problem statements, objectives, and variables are specific and adequately defined. <input type="checkbox"/> Scope of study partially fulfil the objectives and adequately explained. <input type="checkbox"/> Significance of the study is clearly stated and focused. <input type="checkbox"/> Connections are established with the literature. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Moderate coverage of research background. <input type="checkbox"/> Problem statements, objectives are identified but not clearly defined. <input type="checkbox"/> Scope of study is too broad or not specific and poorly explained. <input type="checkbox"/> Significance of the study is not logically relevant to the problem. <input type="checkbox"/> 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>Chapter 2 Literature review</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent literature review covers essential aspects related to issue/ problem, objectives, theory and methods. <input type="checkbox"/> Source from multiple, research based documents. <input type="checkbox"/> Sources are properly cited & in standardized /APA format <input type="checkbox"/> Narrative integrates critical and logical details from literatures. <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent synthesis and organization of literature that is clearly linked to research question. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Good literature review covers essential aspects related to issue/ problem, objectives, theory and methods. <input type="checkbox"/> Source from multiple documents. <input type="checkbox"/> Sources are properly cited. <input type="checkbox"/> Good synthesis and organization of the literature, which is clearly linked to the research question. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate literature review covers generally essential aspects related to issue/ problem, objectives, theory and methods. <input type="checkbox"/> Source from limited number of documents. <input type="checkbox"/> Sources are cited but some are in improper format. <input type="checkbox"/> Moderate synthesis and organization of the literature, which minimally links it to the research question. <input type="checkbox"/> Selected literature was from unreliable sources. Literally supports were vague and ambiguous. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Minimal literature review, covers minimally on essential aspects related to issue/ problem, objectives, theory and methods. <input type="checkbox"/> Source from single document. <input type="checkbox"/> Sources are cited incorrectly. <input type="checkbox"/> Poor synthesis and organization of the literature. <input type="checkbox"/> The review of literature was missing of non-research based articles, irrelevant, inaccurate or inappropriate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Very little or fail to provide previous research background supporting issue/ problem, objectives, theory and methods. <input type="checkbox"/> No sources quoted. <input type="checkbox"/> Source is not cited. <input type="checkbox"/> Synthesis and organization is based on limited information. There is very poor link to the research question. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Literature reviews are omitted
---	---	--	---	---	---	---

<p>Chapter 3 Materials and Methods</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Valid and appropriate methods with comprehensive justifications. □ Research methodology is clearly identified and coherently described in detail. □ The context population and sampling strategy were fully described (quantitative and qualitative). □ Instruments and observation protocols were clearly identified and described in detail relevance to the research objectives. □ 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Valid and appropriate methods but with limited justifications. □ Research methodology is clearly identified and described with sufficient details. □ The context, population and sampling strategy were adequately identified and described. □ Instruments and observation protocols were clearly identified and described relevance to the research objectives. □ Procedures for implementing the study (permissions, treatments, and data gathering) were identified and described. □ Descriptive and inferential methods were identified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Valid and appropriate methods and without justifications. □ Research methodology is not clearly described or incomplete. □ The context, population or sampling strategy was confusing, little relevance to the research objective, incomplete or not identified. □ 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"> □ Valid but inappropriate methods without justifications. □ The research methodology is not identified nor described. □ The context, population or sampling strategy was poorly described. □ 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. 	<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 test, and significance level) were missing/not implemented. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Research design, sampling, instruments, procedures, data analysis based on the issues, the objectives and scope of the study in the thesis are omitted.
---	---	---	--	--	---	---

Poster Mapping	<input type="checkbox"/> Produce excellent geological map of the study area with proper scale and complete symbols/legends for all components in the map .	<input type="checkbox"/> Produce good geological map of the study area with proper scale and correct symbols/legends for most of the components in the map.	<input type="checkbox"/> Produce moderate geological map of the study area with proper scale but missing some symbols/legends	<input type="checkbox"/> Produce poor geological map of the study area with wrong scale and incomplete symbols/legends.	<input type="checkbox"/> Produce very poor geological map of the study area with wrong scale and incomplete symbols/legends	<input type="checkbox"/> Unable to produce geological map of the study area.
Chapter 4 Results	<input type="checkbox"/> All part of geology in the study area (general geology, structural geology and petrography, etc) is well explained. <input type="checkbox"/> Able to produce excellent geological map of the study area. <input type="checkbox"/> Able to provide correct symbols and for interpretation of structural features, contacts, cross section/s, legend, coordinates, etc. <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent presentation, explanation and evaluation of results. <input type="checkbox"/> Have a very good quality and trustworthy data, with excellent presentation. <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent discussions on findings and data interpretations.	<input type="checkbox"/> Most part of geology in the study area tasks (general geology, structural geology and petrography, etc.) is well explained. <input type="checkbox"/> Able to produce very good geological map of the study area. <input type="checkbox"/> Able to provide correct symbols and markings for interpretation of structural features, contacts, cross section/s, legend, coordinates, etc. <input type="checkbox"/> Good presentation, explanation and evaluation of results. <input type="checkbox"/> Have good quality and mostly trustworthy data, with good presentation. <input type="checkbox"/> Good discussions on findings and data interpretations.	<input type="checkbox"/> Some parts of geology in the study area (general geology, structural geology and petrography, etc.) are well explained. <input type="checkbox"/> Able to produce good geological map of the study area. <input type="checkbox"/> Able to provide several symbols and markings are used for interpretation of structural features, contacts, cross section/s, legend, coordinates, etc. <input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient quality of presentation, explanation and evaluation of results. <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient and slightly doubtful data, with moderate presentation. <input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient discussions on findings and data interpretations.	<input type="checkbox"/> Many part of geology in the study area (general geology, structural geology and petrography, etc.) are not well explained. <input type="checkbox"/> Able to produce poor geological map of the study area. <input type="checkbox"/> Only able to provide very few symbols and markings for interpretation of structural features, contacts, cross section/s, legend, coordinates, etc. <input type="checkbox"/> Moderate presentation, explanation and evaluation of results. <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient and mostly doubtful data with poor presentation. <input type="checkbox"/> Moderate discussions on findings and data interpretations.	<input type="checkbox"/> Fail to provide the explanation of the geology in the study area (general geology, structural geology and petrography, etc) <input type="checkbox"/> Able to produce very poor geological map of the study area. <input type="checkbox"/> No symbols and markings for interpretation of structural features, contacts, cross section/s, legend, coordinates, etc. <input type="checkbox"/> Poor presentation, explanation and evaluation of results. <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient and non-trustworthy data, with inappropriate presentation. <input type="checkbox"/> Poor discussions on findings and data interpretations.	<input type="checkbox"/> No explanation of the geology in the study area (general geology, structural geology and petrography, etc) <input type="checkbox"/> Unable to produce geological map of the study area. <input type="checkbox"/> No symbols and markings for interpretation of structural features, contacts, cross section/s, legend, coordinates, etc. <input type="checkbox"/> No explanation or evaluation of the results.

Chapter 5 Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Conclusion addresses the research objectives and based on the work done. ▪ Conclusions were supported by relevant results, and presented concisely in logical sequence. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Conclusion addresses the research objectives and based on the work done. ▪ Conclusions were supported by relevant results, but not presented in logical sequence. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Conclusion addresses the research objectives and based on the work done. ▪ Conclusions were mostly concise but with some vagueness in wording. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Conclusion addresses the research objectives and based on the work done. ▪ Some conclusions are not supported by results or merely repeat results 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Conclusion addresses the research objectives and based on the work done. ▪ Conclusions merely repeat the results. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Conclusion was omitted.
Chapter 5 Recommendation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Recommendations are to-the point, well-linked to the conclusions and original. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Recommendations are well-linked to the conclusions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Some recommendations are given, but the link to the conclusions is unclear. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Recommendations are trivial. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> No Recommendations.
References	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> All the sources in the reference list are cited in the text vice versa, which follows the recommended style. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Most of the sources in the reference list are cited in the text vice versa, which follows the recommended style. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Only a few sources used are cited in the reference list vice versa, which follows the recommended style. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Many sources are missing from the reference list vice versa and did not follow recommended style. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Most of the sources are missing from the reference list vice versa and did not follow recommended style. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No list of references.

PART B (TECHNICAL FORMAT): (5.0 %) – PLO 5						
Category	Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Moderate (3)	Weak (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)
Format, Structure And Grammar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Well organized, demonstrates logical sequencing and structure. <input type="checkbox"/> All paragraphs within a section flow well from one to the next. <input type="checkbox"/> Consistently complied with UMK-FSB guidelines. <input type="checkbox"/> No grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Organized and demonstrates logical sequencing and structure. <input type="checkbox"/> Paragraphs within a section generally flow well from one to the next. <input type="checkbox"/> Mostly complied with UMK-FSB guidelines. <input type="checkbox"/> Very little grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Organized but demonstrates illogical sequencing or structure. <input type="checkbox"/> Paragraphs within a section flow somewhat from one to the next. <input type="checkbox"/> Sparingly complied with UMK-FSB guidelines. <input type="checkbox"/> Few grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Weakly organized with no logical sequencing or structure. <input type="checkbox"/> Paragraph within a section were disconnected. <input type="checkbox"/> Mostly does not comply with the UMK- FSB guidelines. <input type="checkbox"/> 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.
Clarity and Continuity in Writing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Able to write very well, concisely and clearly. ▪ 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"> ▪ Able to write well and clearly. ▪ Well organized throughout but without elegance and complexity. ▪ Accommodates the argument satisfactorily. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Able to write clearly but require some improvements. ▪ Well organized on the whole but occasionally needing work on individual paragraph coherence or continuity. ▪ Accommodates the argument moderately. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Writing is not clear and requires further improvements. ▪ Organization is haphazard and the argument is difficult to follow. ▪ Paragraph coherence and continuity need work. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Writing is not clear and requires a lot of improvements. ▪ No continuity in writing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Unable to write ideas and no continuity in writing.

PART C (PRESENTATION EVALUATION): (10.0 %) – PLO 5						
Category	Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Moderate (3)	Weak (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)
Contents of Presentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Major points (title, research background, problem statement, objectives, literature review, methodology, result & discussion, conclusion & recommendation) strongly supported with suitable detail. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All major points (title, research background, problem statement, objectives, literature review, methodology, result & discussion, conclusion & recommendation) covered and explained clearly and correctly. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Covers important points (title, research background, problem statement, objectives, literature review, methodology, result & discussion, conclusion & recommendation). ▪ A few inaccurate or irrelevant points. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Important points (title, research background, problem statement, objectives, literature review, methodology, result & discussion, conclusion & recommendation) covered only superficially. ▪ No major error and misconception. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All points (title, research background, problem statement, objectives, literature review, methodology, result & discussion, conclusion & recommendation) are omitted.
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.

No	Full Name (as identity card/passport)	Student's Matric No	PART A (FINAL REPORT): (30.0 %) – PLO 6										PART B (TECHNICAL FORMAT): (5.0 %) – PLO 5			PART C (PRESENTATION EVALUATION): (10.0 %) – PLO 5			
			Title & Abstract	Introduction	Lit. review	Materials & Methods	Poster	Results	Conclusion	Recommendation	References	Total 30 %	Format, Structure & Grammar	Clarity and Continuity In Writing	Total 5%	Contents of Presentation	Presentation Skill	Communication	Total 10 %
			Weightage (x0.5)	Weightage (x0.5)	Weightage (x0.5)	Weightage (x0.5)	Weightage (x1.0)	Weightage (x1.5)	Weightage (x0.5)	Weightage (x0.5)	Weightage (x0.5)		Weightage (x0.5)	Weightage (x0.5)		Weightage (x0.5)	Weightage (x0.5)	Weightage (x1.0)	
	CON TOH	CONT OH123	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	30	5	5	5	5	5	5	10
1.												0			0				0
2.												0			0				0
3.												0			0				0
4.												0			0				0
5.												0			0				0
6.												0			0				0
7.												0			0				0
8.												0			0				0
9.												0			0				0
10.												0			0				0

GRAND TOTAL MARKS

No	Full Name (as identity card/ passport)	Student's Matric No	PART			GRAND TOTAL 45%
			A	B	B	
			30%	5%	10%	
	CONTOH	CONTOH123	30	5	10	45
1.	0	0	0	0	0	0
2.	0	0	0	0	0	0
3.	0	0	0	0	0	0
4.	0	0	0	0	0	0
5.	0	0	0	0	0	0
6.	0	0	0	0	0	0
7.	0	0	0	0	0	0
8.	0	0	0	0	0	0
9.	0	0	0	0	0	0
10.	0	0	0	0	0	0

Comments and Recommendations:

Name: _____

Date: _____