

**FINAL YEAR PROJECT 1
 EXAMINATION PANEL ASSESSMENT FORM (REPORT)**

This is a confidential document for use by the FYP Examination Panel. Assessment should be done in discretion.

PART I: STUDENT DETAILS							
Student's Name:				Matric Card No.:			
Final Year Project 1 Title:							
PART II: PROJECT PROPOSAL ASSESSMENT (30%)							
PROJECT PROPOSAL							
	Criteria	Weightage	Score				
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor
			5	4	3	2	1
EX04	Introduction - Aims and objectives are explicitly stated - Identification of problems	0.8					
EX05	Literature Review - Literature review is relevant with the research topic - The work of others is acknowledged and referenced	1.0					
EX06	Methodology - Work scope is justifiable and workable - Identification, justification, explanation and use of appropriate tools and techniques/approaches	1.0					
EX07	Expected results - Expected results are relevance and focus on the aim	0.4					
EX08	Planning - Final report structure - Gantt chart	0.4					
EX09	References - References format are consistent	0.4					
EX10	Format - Free from spelling mistake and grammatical error - Layout, format and outline of the report are consistent	1.0					
EX11	Integration of Complex Problem Solving	1.0					
PART III: CERTIFICATION BY EXAMINER							
Comments (if any):							
Examiner's Signature:				Date:			

To be filled by student

To be filled by examiner

 Note: (1) This form must be completed and kept for documentation purposes.
 (2) The examiner must submit these marks via FYP Online (<http://tcis.uthm.edu.my>)

ALL EXAMINERS MUST SUBMIT THESE MARKS VIA FYP ONLINE
(<http://tcis.uthm.edu.my>) BY WEDNESDAY, 3 JUNE 2018



Assessment Guide For Examination Panelists

ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT PROPOSAL	
Score	Description
5 (Very Good)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The research background, statement of problem, aims, objectives, scope and importance are exceptionally well stated. • The supporting literature is very relevant and is reviewed critically. • The proposed methods are very appropriate and are described in great detail. • The expected results are very clearly stated and very consistent with the objectives. • The sources of reference are very reliable and citations are very consistent with the list of references. • The project plan is exceptionally well-prepared and appropriate. • The proposal follows the prescribed format very closely.
4 (Good)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The research background, statement of problem, aims, objectives, scope and importance are clearly stated. • The supporting literature is relevant and is reviewed well. • The proposed methods are appropriate and are described in detail. • The expected results are clearly stated and consistent with the objectives. • The sources of reference are reliable and citations are consistent with the list of references. • The project plan is well-prepared and appropriate. • The proposal follows the prescribed format closely.
3 (Fair)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The research background, statement of problem, aims, objectives, scope and importance are satisfactory. • The supporting literature is only slightly relevant and is reviewed inadequately. • The proposed methods are partly acceptable and are described in general terms. • The expected results are not clearly stated and not consistent with the objectives. • The sources of reference are questionable and some citations are not consistent with the list of references. • The project plan has some flaws and is rather inappropriate. • The proposal follows the prescribed format very loosely.
2 (Poor)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The research background, statement of problem, aims, objectives, scope and importance are vaguely stated. • The supporting literature is mostly irrelevant and is reviewed badly. • The proposed methods are mostly not acceptable and are described badly. • The expected results are vaguely stated and mostly not consistent with the objectives. • The sources of reference are not reliable and most citations are not consistent with the list of references. • The project plan is badly-prepared and not appropriate. • The proposal mostly does not follow the prescribed format.
1 (Very Poor)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The research background, statement of problem, aims, objectives, scope and importance are unsuccessfully stated. • The supporting literature is completely irrelevant, and is reviewed very badly. • The proposed methods are completely wrong and are described very badly. • The expected results are not properly stated and highly inconsistent with the objectives. • The sources of reference are highly unreliable and citations are very inconsistent with the list of references. • The project plan is very badly-prepared and highly inappropriate. • The proposal does not follow the prescribed format at all.