



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

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

Category	Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Moderate (3)	Weak (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)
Title Abstract	<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.	<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.	<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.	<input type="checkbox"/> Vague, not concise & poorly expressed. <input type="checkbox"/> Inappropriate problem, research questions and method of the study. <input type="checkbox"/> Provide insufficient results and conclusions.	<input type="checkbox"/> Irrelevant & poorly expressed. <input type="checkbox"/> Includes a summary of the problem, research questions and method of the study. <input type="checkbox"/> Not provide results and conclusions.	<input type="checkbox"/> Omitted.
Chapter 1 Introduction	<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.	<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.	<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.	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor coverage of research background. <input type="checkbox"/> Problem statements and objectives are identified but not defined. <input type="checkbox"/> Scope of study does not fulfil the objectives. <input type="checkbox"/> Significance of the study is not clear, nor focused nor explicit.	<input type="checkbox"/> Inadequate coverage of research background. <input type="checkbox"/> Problem statements and objectives are not identified. <input type="checkbox"/> Scope of study and significance of the study are not clearly stated and irrelevant.	<input type="checkbox"/> 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"/> Conclusions based on evidence cited. <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"/> Some conclusions based on evidence cited. <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"/> Only one conclusion based on evidence cited. <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"/> No conclusion given. <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"> <input type="checkbox"/> Valid and appropriate methods with comprehensive justifications. <input type="checkbox"/> Research methodology is clearly identified and coherently described in detail. <input type="checkbox"/> The context population and sampling strategy were fully described (quantitative and qualitative). <input type="checkbox"/> Instruments and observation protocols were clearly identified and described in detail relevance to the research objectives. <input type="checkbox"/> Procedures for implementing the study (permissions, treatments, and data gathering) were fully identified and described. <input type="checkbox"/> Analytical methods (descriptive, inferential test, and significance level) were sufficiently specific, clear and appropriate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Valid and appropriate methods but with limited justifications. <input type="checkbox"/> Research methodology is clearly identified and described with sufficient details. <input type="checkbox"/> The context, population and sampling strategy were adequately identified and described. <input type="checkbox"/> Instruments and observation protocols were clearly identified and described relevance to the research objectives. <input type="checkbox"/> Procedures for implementing the study (permissions, treatments, and data gathering) were identified and described. <input type="checkbox"/> Descriptive and inferential methods were identified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Valid and appropriate methods and without justifications. <input type="checkbox"/> Research methodology is not clearly described or incomplete. <input type="checkbox"/> The context, population or sampling strategy was confusing, little relevance to the research objective, incomplete or not identified. <input type="checkbox"/> Instruments or observation protocols description was incomplete or of little relevance to the research objectives. <input type="checkbox"/> Procedures (permissions, treatments and data gathering) lacked clarity. <input type="checkbox"/> Descriptive or inferential methods were confusing, incomplete or lacked relevance to the research objectives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Valid but inappropriate methods without justifications. <input type="checkbox"/> The research methodology is not identified nor described. <input type="checkbox"/> The context, population or sampling strategy was poorly described. <input type="checkbox"/> Description of the instruments is incomplete or lacked relevance to the research objectives. Observation protocol was not described. <input type="checkbox"/> Procedures (permissions, treatments and data gathering) were incomplete or lacked relevance to the research objectives. <input type="checkbox"/> Analytical methods (descriptive, inferential test, and significance level) were inappropriately aligned with data and research objectives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Invalid and inappropriate methods and justifications. <input type="checkbox"/> Wrong methodology. <input type="checkbox"/> The context, population or sample was not identified or described <input type="checkbox"/> Instruments and observation protocols for data collection were not identified nor described. <input type="checkbox"/> Procedures for treatments and gathering data were omitted <input type="checkbox"/> Analytical methods (descriptive, inferential test, and significance level) were missing/not implemented. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Research design, sampling, instruments, procedures, data analysis based on the issues, the objectives and scope of the study in the thesis are omitted.
---	---	---	--	---	---	--

Chapter 4 Mapping	<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"/> 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"/> 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"/> 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"/> 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"/> 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.
Chapter 4 Specification	<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"/> 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"/> 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"/> 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"/> 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 or evaluation of the results. <input type="checkbox"/> No worthy data, and bad presentation <input type="checkbox"/> No discussion on findings and very poor data interpretation
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Conclusion addresses the research objectives and based on the work done. <input type="checkbox"/> Conclusions were supported by relevant results, and	<input type="checkbox"/> Conclusion addresses the research objectives and based on the work done. <input type="checkbox"/> Conclusions were supported by relevant results, but not presented in logical sequence.	<input type="checkbox"/> Conclusion addresses the research objectives and based on the work done. <input type="checkbox"/> Conclusions were mostly concise but with some vagueness in wording.	<input type="checkbox"/> Conclusion addresses the research objectives and based on the work done. <input type="checkbox"/> Some conclusions are not supported by results or merely repeat results	<input type="checkbox"/> Conclusion addresses the research objectives and based on the work done. <input type="checkbox"/> Conclusions merely repeat the results.	<input type="checkbox"/> Conclusion was omitted.

	presented concisely in logical sequence.					
Recommendation	<input type="checkbox"/> 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.	<input type="checkbox"/> Recommendations are to-the point, well-linked to the conclusions and original.	<input type="checkbox"/> Recommendations are well-linked to the conclusions	<input type="checkbox"/> Some recommendations are given, but the link to the conclusions is unclear.	<input type="checkbox"/> Recommendations are trivial.	<input type="checkbox"/> No Recommendations.
References	<input type="checkbox"/> All the sources in the reference list are cited in the text vice versa, which follows the recommended style.	<input type="checkbox"/> Most of the sources in the reference list are cited in the text vice versa, which follows the recommended style.	<input type="checkbox"/> Only a few sources used are cited in the reference list vice versa, which follows the recommended style.	<input type="checkbox"/> Many sources are missing from the reference list vice versa and did not follow recommended style.	<input type="checkbox"/> Most of the sources are missing from the reference list vice versa and did not follow recommended style.	<input type="checkbox"/> No list of references.

PART B (SUPERVISION): (15.0 %) – PLO 4

Category	Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Moderate (3)	Weak (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)
Academic Discussion with Supervisor	<input type="checkbox"/> Discusses progress with their supervisor more than 10 times through various communication channels supported by progress report link.	<input type="checkbox"/> Discusses progress with their supervisor at least 10 times through various communication channels supported by progress report link.	<input type="checkbox"/> Discusses progress with their supervisor at least 7 times through various communication channels supported by progress report link.	<input type="checkbox"/> Discusses progress with their supervisor at least 5 times through various communication channels supported by progress report link.	<input type="checkbox"/> Discusses progress with their supervisor less than 5 times through various communication channels supported by progress report link.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Never discusses progress with their supervisor. ▪ Students never do anything as constructed by supervisor.
Moral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Student always practices good values and behave decently with supervisor in any situation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Student practices good values and behave decently with supervisor in most situations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Student practices good values and behave decently with supervisor in many situations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Student practices good values or behave decently with supervisor only in some situation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Student has once behaved nicely with supervisor 	<input type="checkbox"/> Student does not practice good values or does not behave decently with supervisor in any situation as it should be

PART C (LAB WORK CONDUCT / FIELDWORK CONDUCT): (10.0 %) – PLO2

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 in 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.

No	Full Name (as identity card/passport)	Student's Matric No	PART A (FINAL REPORT): (30.0 %) – PLO 6										PART B (SUPERVISION): (10.0 %) – PLO 4			PART D (LAB WORK CONDUCT / FIELDWORK CONDUCT): (10.0 %) – PLO 2		
			Title & Abstract	Chapter 1 Introduction	Chapter 2 Lit. review	Chapter 3 Materials & Methods	Chapter 4 Mapping	Chapter 4 Specification	Conclusion	Recommendation	References	Total 30 %	Academic Discussion With Supervisor	Moral	Total 10 %	Methods / Materials Handling	Safety Work Procedure	Total 10 %
			Weightage (x0.5)	Weightage (x0.5)	Weightage (x0.5)	Weightage (x1.0)	Weightage (x1.0)	Weightage (x1.0)	Weightage (x0.5)	Weightage (x0.5)	Weightage (x0.5)		Weightage (x1.0)	Weightage (x1.0)		Weightage (x1.0)	Weightage (x1.0)	
	CONTOH	CONTOH123	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	30	5	5	10	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 50%
			A	B	C	
			30%	10%	10%	
	CONTOH	CONTOH123	30	10	10	50
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: _____