

FAKULTI TEKNOLOGI DAN KEJURUTERAAN ELEKTRONIK DAN KOMPUTER

PSM 1 REPORT EVALUATION FORM (SUPERVISOR, PANEL 1)

NAME OF STUDENT			
STUDENT MATRIX NO.		ACADEMIC SESSION	
DEPARTMENT / COURSE			
TITLE OF PROJECT			
NAME OF SUPERVISOR			

REPORT EVALUATION (CLO1, PLO3)

CLO1	Evaluate appropriate methodologies for successful execution of the project.	
PLO3	Ability to design solutions for broadly-defined engineering technology problems, and to design systems, components or processes to meet specified needs with appropriate consideration for public health and safety, as well as cultural, societal, environmental and sustainability concerns.	MARK
Abstract (C2, Weightage: 0.125) <i>(Items: Background, Problem Statement, Objectives, Methodology, Expected Outcome/Result, Conclusion)</i>		
Excellently written abstract, clear, and concise, providing all items: project background, problem statements, objectives, methodology, the expected outcome/result, and conclusion.		4
Fairly written abstract with one or more item missing and with some errors.		3
Poorly written abstract with two or more items missing and with some errors.		2
Poorly written abstract with multiple items missing and with so many errors.		1
No abstract is provided.		0
Introduction (C2, Weightage: 0.125)		
Consists of information regarding project background, project justification and organization, excellently presented in a precise and well-organized structure.		4
Consists of information regarding project background, project justification and organization, however, not well written.		3
Consists of information regarding project background, project justification and organization which are insufficiently stated.		2
Consists of information regarding project background, project justification and organization which are poorly stated.		1
Introduction is not provided or is plagiarized.		0

Problem Statement (C2, Weightage: 0.125)	
Problem statement is well defined and described with high clarity.	4
Problem statement is fairly defined and described.	3
Problem statement is poorly defined and described with less clarity.	2
Problem statement has some ambiguity or missing some important points.	1
Problem statement is not provided.	0
Objectives (C3, Weightage: 0.1)	
The objectives excellently describe the project.	4
The objectives fairly describe the project.	3
The objectives poorly describe the project.	2
The objectives do not describe the project.	1
The objectives are not provided.	0
Scope (C3, Weightage: 0.1)	
The scope excellently describes the project.	4
The scope fairly describes the project.	3
The scope poorly describes the project.	2
The scope does not describe the project.	1
The scope is not provided.	0
Literature Review (C5, SK5, SP2, SP3, SP4, Weightage: 1.85)	
Excellent investigation into well-proven existing systems/techniques/technology that are closely related to the project, and comparisons between them are provided.	4
Relevant and sufficient investigation into existing systems/techniques/technology, and the comparison between them are provided insufficiently.	3
Slightly relevant and/or poor investigation into existing systems/techniques/technology, and no comparison between them are provided.	2
Very poor investigation into existing systems/techniques/technology, and no comparison between them are provided.	1
No literature review is provided.	0

Methodology (C6, SK5, SP1, SP2, SP7, Weightage: 2) <i>(Methodology should include the design of procedure which implies the process of the hardware and/or software implementation suitable for the project)</i>	
The design of procedure is excellently described in depth to achieve the objectives within the scope of the project and the interdependency between the components/system are shown through clear and proper flow/block diagram.	4
The design of procedure is fairly described to achieve the objectives within the scopes of the project and the interdependency between the components/system are shown with acceptable flow/block diagram.	3
The design of procedure is poorly described to achieve the objectives within the scopes of the project and the interdependency between the components/system are shown by flow/block diagram.	2
There is design of procedure described but very poorly and the interdependency between the components/system are not shown by flow/block diagram.	1
Project methodology is not presented.	0
Preliminary Results (C4, Weightage: 0.1)	
Preliminary results are well discussed and shows excellent relevance to the project.	4
Preliminary results are discussed and shows fair relevance to the project.	3
Preliminary results are discussed and shows poor relevance to the project.	2
Preliminary results are provided but are not relevant to the work.	1
Preliminary results are not provided.	0
Conclusion (C4, Weightage: 0.1)	
Student has provided excellent conclusion relevant to the project.	4
Student has provided fair conclusion relevant to the project.	3
Student has provided weak conclusion relevant to the project.	2
Student has provided very poor conclusion relevant to the project.	1
No conclusion has been provided.	0
Citation and References (C3, Weightage: 0.25) <i>(Minimum 20 references, mostly recent 5 years)</i>	
All the references are fully relevant and clearly cited in proper format.	4
Some of the references are relevant and some are cited in proper format.	3
Least of the references are relevant and not cited in proper format.	2
None of the references are relevant and not cited in proper format.	1
No references are cited.	0

Language and formatting (C2, Weightage: 0.125)	
Report is excellently written, and follows proper formatting, with no grammatical errors.	4
Report is well written and/or the standard format is partially followed, with minor grammatical errors.	3
Report is poorly written and partially follow the standard format with major grammatical errors.	2
Report is very poorly written and does not follow the standard format with major grammatical errors.	1
No report submission.	0
TOTAL	

REPORT EVALUATION (THE ENGINEER AND SOCIETY) [CLO3, PLO6]

CLO3 : Demonstrate awareness of societal and global issues (societal/health/safety/legal/cultural issues).	MARK
PLO6 : Ability to demonstrate an awareness of and consideration for societal, health, safety, legal and cultural issues and their consequent responsibilities.	
In Chapter 1 and/or 2 (C5, SK7, SP6, Weightage: 0.625)	
The information about societal and global issues (societal/health/safety/legal/cultural issues) is completely explained.	4
Some information about societal and global issues (societal/health/safety/legal/cultural issues) is explained.	3
Less information about societal and global issues (societal/health/safety/legal/cultural issues) is explained.	2
Key of theory background challenges and motivation not identified and no explanation on the societal and global issues (societal/health/safety/legal/cultural issues).	1
Not available.	0

REPORT EVALUATION (ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY) [CLO4, PLO7]

CLO4 : Considering sustainable development goal (SDG) in project design	MARK
PLO7 : Ability to demonstrate an understanding of the impact of engineering technology practices, taking into account the need for sustainable development.	
In Chapter 3 (C5, SK7, SP5, Weightage: 0.625)	
Project are clearly identified, comprehensively explained and rationally justified for sustainable development. to meet at least 1 SDG	4
Project are clearly identified, and briefly explained for sustainable development to meet at least 1 SDG	3
Project are identified, and few appropriate references are used for sustainable development to meet at least 1 SDG	2
Project are vaguely identified for sustainable development to meet at least 1 SDG	1
Not available.	0
TOTAL	

COMMENTS			
APPROVED BY SUPERVISOR (Signature & Official Stamp)		DATE	

*Broadly-defined engineering problem (SP) characteristic from a single CLO must have SP1 and 2SPs from SP2-SP7 : SP1, SPx, SPx.

Broadly Defined Engineering Problems (SP)	
SP1	Depth of knowledge
SP2	Conflicting requirement
SP3	Depth of analysis
SP4	Familiarity of issues
SP5	Extent of applicable codes
SP6	Extent of stakeholder involvement & level of conflicting requirements
SP7	Interdependence