Revised date : 01/04/2026

UNIVERSITI TEKNIKAL MALAYSIA MELAKA

FAKULTI TEKNOLOGI DAN KEJURUTERAAN ELEKTRONIK DAN KOMPUTER

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

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

PROJECT PRESENTATION (CLO5, PLO10)

CLO4 : Explain the project execution and findings in oral and written forms effectively. PLO10 : Ability to communicate effectively with the engineering community and society at large.	MARK
Confidence (A3, TA2, Weightage: 0.375)	
Outstanding ***interaction*** with the audience with great confidence.	4
Interacts with limited confidence and require minor improvements.	3
Interacts with limited confidence and require major improvements.	2
Not able to interact confidently.	1
Student did not make any presentation.	0
Effective and Articulate delivery of ideas (A3, TA2, TA5, Weightage: 0.375)	
Displays outstanding ***familiarity*** of the project through effective and ***articulate*** delivery of ideas.	4
Displays fair ***familiarity*** of the project with acceptable effectiveness and ***articulate*** delivery of ideas.	3
Displays poor ***familiarity*** of the project with less effective and less articulate delivery of ideas.	2
Displays unfamiliarity of the project with non-effective and non-articulate delivery of ideas.	1
Student did not make any presentation.	0

Understand and respond to questions (A3, TA2, TA5, Weightage: 0.25)	
Able to fully ***understand*** and ***respond*** to questions excellently.	4
Able to ***understand*** and ***respond*** to questions satisfactorily.	3
Able to ***understand*** and ***respond*** to questions but not able to accurately answer the question.	2
Not able to understand and respond to a question.	1
Student did not make any presentation.	0
Poster (A3, TA1, TA3, Weightage: 0.25) ***(Elements: Project description, introduction, problem statement, objectives, methodology, results and analysis, conclusion, project features, project potential of commercialization)***	
Excellent presentation of project ***innovation*** where all the required ***elements*** are clearly visible, organized, and relevant.	4
Fair presentation of project ***innovation*** where some of the required ***elements*** are clearly visible, organized, and relevant.	3
Poor presentation of project ***innovation*** where very few of the required ***elements*** are clearly visible, organized, and relevant.	2
None of the required elements are clearly visible, organized, and relevant.	1
No poster is presented.	0
TOTAL	

PROJECT DEMONSTRATION (CLO3, PLO5)

CLO3	:	Demonstrate project results using appropriate techniques with an understanding of it limitations	MARK
PLO5	:	Ability to select and apply appropriate techniques, resources and modern engineering tools, with an understanding of their limitation.	
Project Functionality (P4, SK6, SP7, Weightage: 0.75)			
Project is fully ***functional*** and excellently meets all the objectives and the scope of the project.			4
Project is ***functional*** and meets some of the objectives and the scope of the project.			3
Project is poorly functional and does not meet the objectives and the scope of the project.			2
Project is not functional and does not meet the objectives and the scope of the project.			1
No demonstration is presented.			0

Project Design Complexity (P5, SK6, SP2, Weightage: 1.5)	
Demonstrates excellent **design complexity** with consideration of a lot of appropriate techniques, resources, and modern engineering tools to develop the product/project.	4
Demonstrates adequate **design complexity** with consideration of some appropriate techniques, resources, and modern engineering tools to develop the product/project.	3
Demonstrates poor **design complexity** with consideration of only few appropriate techniques, resources, and modern engineering tools to develop the product/project.	2
Demonstrates no **design complexity** with no consideration on appropriate techniques, resources, and modern engineering tools to develop the product/project.	1
No demonstration is presented.	0
Project Justification (P5, SK6, SP1, Weightage: 0.25)	
Excellent description of the ***technical requirements*** of the project.	4
Moderate description of the ***technical requirements*** of the project.	3
Poor description of the ***technical requirements*** of the project.	2
Very poor description of the ***technical requirements*** of the project.	1
No description of the technical requirements of the project.	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 activities (TA) from a single CLO must have some or all of the TA characteristics.

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
Broadly Defined Engineering Activities (TA)	
TA1	Range of resources
TA2	Level of interactions
TA3	Innovation
TA4	Consequences to Society & the Environment
TA5	Familiarity