



CADANGAN DAN PEMBENTANGAN PROJEK PENYELIDIKAN TAHUN AKHIR (PENILAI) PROPOSAL AND PRESENTATION OF FINAL YEAR PROJECT (EXAMINER)

PART A (FINAL REPORT): (20.0 %)

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.
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.
Literature review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Excellent literature review covers essential aspects related to issue/ problem, objectives, theory and methods. ▪ Source from multiple, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Good literature review covers essential aspects related to issue/ problem, objectives, theory and methods. ▪ Source from multiple documents. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Adequate literature review covers generally essential aspects related to issue/ problem, objectives, theory and methods. ▪ Source from limited 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Minimal literature review, covers minimally on essential aspects related to issue/ problem, objectives, theory and 	<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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Literature reviews are omitted

	<p>research based documents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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"> Conclusions based on evidence cited. Sources are properly cited. Good synthesis and organization of the literature, which is clearly linked to the research question. 	<p>number of documents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<p>methods.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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"> No conclusion given. Source is not cited. Synthesis and organization is based on limited information. There is very poor link to the research question. 	
Materials and Methods	<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 were clearly described in detail. Procedures for implementing the study (permissions, treatments, and data gathering) were fully 	<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 and described. Procedures for implementing the study (permissions, treatments, and data gathering) were identified and described. 	<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 observation protocols description was incomplete or of little relevance to the research objectives. Procedures (permissions, treatments 	<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 instruments is incomplete or lacked relevance to the research objectives. Observation protocol was not 	<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 of the study, and what to achieve in the thesis are omitted.

	<p>identified and described.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analytical methods (descriptive, inferential test, and significance level) were sufficiently specific, clear and appropriate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Descriptive and inferential methods were identified. Level of significance was stated. 	<p>and data gathering) lacked clarity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Descriptive or inferential methods were confusing, incomplete or lacked relevance to the research objectives. 	<p>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. 		
Flowchart	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Display clear visual or graphic illustration of a process or system used to solve a problem or produce a product. Display high level thinking and articulation abilities when numerous factors are involved in a good way. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Display most complete visual or graphic illustration of a process or system used to solve a problem or produce a product, but difficult to grade level of thinking and articulation abilities when numerous factors are involved. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Display lacking visual or graphic illustration of a process or system used to solve a problem or produce a product, and high level thinking and articulation abilities when numerous factors are involved is not possible. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Insufficient information in flowcharts to communicate the logic involved in a system; does not allow writing proficiency assessment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flow charts seem not reproducible due to students fail to displays original synthetic thinking. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Omitted
Gantt Chart & Milestone	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gantt chart & milestone are very clear, realistic and reflect the timeline. Gantt chart & milestone are well designed according to final year project deadlines. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gantt chart & milestone are realistic and reflect the timeline. Gantt chart & milestone are mostly well designed according to final year project deadlines. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gantt chart & milestone are too closely tied to the timeline. Gantt chart & milestone are quite good designed according to final year project deadlines. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gantt chart & milestone are unrealistic, inflated, or inaccurate. Gantt chart & milestone are occasionally designed according to final year project deadlines. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gantt chart & milestone are unclear, unrealistic, inflated, or inaccurate. Not considered the Gantt chart & milestone to complete the final year project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Omitted
References	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All the sources used 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most of the sources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only a few sources used 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many sources are 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most of the sources are 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No list of

	are cited in the reference list, which follows the recommended style.	used are cited in the reference list, which follows the recommended style.	are cited in the reference list, which follows the recommended style.	missing from the reference list and did not follow recommended style.	missing from the reference list and did not follow recommended style.	references.
--	---	--	---	---	---	-------------

PART B (PRESENTATION EVALUATION): (10.0 %)

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 	<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.

				presentation.		
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 Proposal and Presentation of Final Year Project (Examiner)

PART A (FINAL REPORT): (20.0 %)

No	Full Name (as identity card/ passport)	Student's Matric No	Category						TOTAL
			Introduction	Literature review	Materials and Methods	Flowchart	Gantt Chart & Milestone	Reference	
			Weightage (1.0)	Weightage (1.0)	Weightage (0.5)	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				TOTAL
			Contents of Presentation Weightage (0.5)	Presentation Skill Weightage (0.5)	Communication Weightage (0.5)	Overall Evaluation Weightage (0.5)	
1.							
2.							
3.							
4.							
5.							
6.							
7.							
8.							
9.							
10.							

Comments and Recommendations:

Signature : _____
 Name : _____
 Date : _____

<p>TOTAL MARKS: _____</p> <p style="text-align: center;">30</p>
