



FAKULTI TEKNOLOGI DAN KEJURUTERAAN ELEKTRONIK DAN KOMPUTER

PSM 2 REPORT EVALUATION FORM (PANEL 1, PANEL 2)

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

REPORT EVALUATION (CLO1, PLO2)

CLO1	: (Re)construct solutions of broadly-defined engineering problems using relevant tools and techniques.		
PLO2	: Ability to solve broadly-defined engineering problems systematically to reach substantiated conclusions, using tools and techniques appropriate to electrical engineering technology.		MARK
Abstract (C2, Weightage: 0.125)			
<i>(Items: Background, Problem Statement, Objectives, Methodology, Project Outcome/Results, Conclusion)</i>			
Excellently written abstract, clear, and concise providing all items: project background, problem statements, objectives, methodology, the project outcome/results, and conclusion/future directions.			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
Information regarding project background, project justification and organization 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
Objective (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 (C4, SK5, SP2, SP3, SP4, Weightage: 0.25)	
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: 0.625) <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
Results (C6, SK5, SP1, SP2, Weightage: 1.625) <i>(Results produced from the simulation or experiments are relevant to the project objectives and scope)</i>	
Results produced are displaying outstanding utilization of the engineering tools/techniques//technology and fully relevant to the project objectives and scope.	4
Results produced are fairly displaying utilization of the engineering tools/techniques//technology and relevant to the project objectives and scope.	3
Results produced are acceptable and partially relevant to the project objectives and scope.	2
Results produced are poor and somewhat relevant to the project objectives and scope.	1
No results produced.	0
Analysis of results (C4, SK5, SP1, SP3, SP4, Weightage: 1)	
All relevant results are excellently analyzed and discussed in depth through application of well-proven analysis technique.	4
Results are fairly analyzed and discussed with acceptable analysis technique.	3
Results are poorly analyzed and discussed .	2
There are very limited, to almost no discussion on the analysis of results.	1
No analysis of results is presented.	0
Conclusion (C5, Weightage: 0.125)	
Conclusions are excellently presented according to the project objectives.	4
Conclusions are fairly presented according to the project objectives.	3
Conclusions are poorly presented according to the project objectives.	2
Irrelevant conclusion has been made.	1
Conclusion is not presented.	0

Recommendation (C6, Weightage: 0.125)	
Relevant and realistic recommendations for future works.	4
Fairly relevant recommendations for future works.	3
Limited/minimal recommendations for future works.	2
Insufficient or irrelevant recommendations for future works.	1
No recommendation for future works has been made.	0
Project Potential (C6, Weightage: 0.125)	
Clear and detail explanation of project commercialization potential or practical application or community need.	4
Acceptable explanation of project commercialization potential or practical application or community need.	3
Poor explanation of project commercialization potential or practical application or community need.	2
Very poor explanation of project commercialization potential or practical application or community need.	1
No explanation of project commercialization potential or practical application or community need.	0
Citation and References (C3, Weightage: 0.125) <i>(Minimum 10 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: 0.425)	
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	

COMMENTS			
APPROVED BY PANEL (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