



UNIVERSITI TEKNIKAL MALAYSIA MELAKA
FAKULTI TEKNOLOGI DAN KEJURUTERAAN ELEKTRIK

EVALUATION FORM MASTER PROJECT 2
(MEKG 5397/MEKH 5317)

PANEL 1/PANEL 2

STUDENT DETAILS

Name :

Matrix No. :

Contact No. :

Project Title :

.....

Supervisor :

A. Seminar (10%)

Q1 Graphical Presentation: Presentation structure and layout are organized and well presented with appropriate text and graphics (5 Marks x 0.4 Weightage) (CLO 5, PLO 6)

1	2	3	4	5
Presentation has unclear structure and graphical layout.	Presentation has visible but incomplete structure and graphical layout.	Presentation has acceptable structure and graphical layout.	Presentation has a clear structure and good graphical layout.	Presentation has an excellent structure and graphical layout.

Q2 Verbal presentation: Good command of language and engagement with audience. Explanation was done within prescribed time (5 Marks x 0.4 Weightage) (CLO 5, PLO 6)

1	2	3	4	5
Presentation is monotonous and/or student reads from slides: attention of audience not captured. Over the time limit.	Presentation is at times unclear and unattractive. Time limit not followed.	Presentation is mostly clear. Time limit followed.	Presentation is clear and engaging. Time limit followed	Presentation is excellent and very interactive and engaging. Time limit followed.

Q3 Life long learning: Student is able to relate the results of the project with future or potential applications. (5 Marks x 0.4 Weightage) (CLO 7, PLO 8)

1	2	3	4	5
Could not relate the project with potential applications.	Limited knowledge on link of the project with potential applications.	Could establish minimal link of the project with potential applications.	Establish good link of the project with potential applications.	Envisage and predict future/potential applications with the project.

Q4 Outputs of project: Demonstration (Project Output) (5 Marks x 0.4 Weightage) (CLO 6, PLO 7)

1	2	3	4	5
Incorrect/incomplete prototype and/or analysis and/or simulation works.	Lack of results of prototype and/or analysis and/or simulation works.	Acceptable results of prototype and/or analysis and/or simulation works.	Good results of prototype and/or analysis and/or simulation works.	Excellent results of prototype and/or analysis and/or simulation works.

Q5 Outputs of project: Demonstration (technique/method) (5 Marks x 0.4 Weightage) (CLO 6, PLO 7)

1	2	3	4	5
The student does not show the relevant engineering methods using appropriate tools.	The student shows lack of relevant engineering methods using appropriate tools.	The student shows acceptable understanding of relevant engineering methods using appropriate tools.	The student shows good understanding of relevant engineering methods using appropriate tools.	The student shows excellent understanding of relevant engineering methods using appropriate tools.

Comments

--

Overall marks

Task	Marks	X Weightage	Actual Marks
Q1		0.4	
Q2		0.4	
Q3		0.4	
Q4		0.4	
Q5		0.4	
TOTAL MARKS (10%)			

Evaluated and comment by:

(Supervisor Signature)
Stamp

Contact. No. :

Date :

A. Final Report (25%)

Turnitin Report	Accept	Reject
Note: Project report is rejected if Turnitin report is more than 30%. Proceed with the next evaluation ONLY if the percentage is less than or equal to 30% and Ai writing score Must be less than or equal to 15%.		

Q1 Objective, Problem Statement and Scope of Work (5 Marks x 1 Weightage) (CLO 1, PLO 2)

1	2	3	4	5
Incorrect objectives, problem statement and/or scope.	Vague objectives, problem statement and/or scope.	Acceptable objectives, problem statement and scope.	Concise objectives, problem statement and scope.	Consistent precision of details in objectives, problem statement and scope.

Q2 Literature Review (5 Marks x 1 Weightage) (CLO 2, PLO 3)

1	2	3	4	5
Insufficient, based on a single source, the internet or book or magazine only.	Sufficient information. Poor analysis and synthesis. Information is poorly organized.	Sufficient information. Acceptable analysis and synthesis. Information is moderately organized.	Information is clearly analyzed, evaluated and well synthesized. Clear organization of information.	Excellent analysis, synthesis and evaluation. Well organized information.

Q3 Project Methodology: Problem Solving (5 Marks x 1 Weightage) (CLO 2, PLO 3)

1	2	3	4	5
Incorrect approach/ method(s)/ design to address the problem.	Insufficient articulation of approach/ method(s)/ design to address the problem.	Sufficient description of approach/ method(s)/ design to address the problem.	Clear description of approach/ method(s)/ design to address the problem.	Provides accurate and thorough description of approach/ method(s)/ design to address the problem.

Q4 Project Methodology: Consideration of legal, ethical, professional and sustainable practice (5 Marks x 0.5 Weightage) (CLO 3, PLO 4)

1	2	3	4	5
Does not consider legal, ethical and professional and/or sustainable practice.	Mention legal, ethical, professional and/or sustainable practice.	Minimal adherence to relevant legal, ethical, professional and/or sustainable practice.	Adhere to relevant legal, ethical, professional and sustainable practice.	Adhere to relevant legal, ethical, professional and clear description on sustainable practice.

Q5 Result Reliability and Discussion (5 Marks x 1 Weightage) (CLO 2, PLO 3)

1	2	3	4	5
Result is not reliable. No influential factors taken into account. Unrelated discussion of results.	Result is poorly acceptable, based on the experiment only. Influential factors such as the effect of error, uncertainties in making measured variables has not been discussed.	Result is fairly acceptable, based on the experiment and measurement only. Influential factors such as the effect of error, uncertainties in making measured variables has not been discussed.	Result is acceptable, based on the experiment and measurement only. Influential factors such as the effect of error, uncertainties in making measured variables has been discussed.	Result is well presented and trusted based on the experiment, measurement and validity. Influential factors such as the effect of error, uncertainties in making measured variables has been discussed.

Q6 Reference (5 Marks x 0.2 Weightage) (CLO 7, PLO 8)

1	2	3	4	5
No technical papers, only notes and web links, irrelevant, less than 5 references.	Technical papers cited, at least 5 and up to 10 references.	Relevant technical papers cited, at least 10 and up to 15 references.	Relevant and recent technical papers cited, at least 15 and up to 20 references.	High impact and most recent technical papers cited, more than 20 references.

Q7 Format, organization and writing skills (5 Marks x 0.3 Weightage) (CLO 5, PLO 6)

1	2	3	4	5
Format not followed, content is poorly organized. Unable to convey ideas. Poor sentence construction and mistakes in grammar/language.	Inconsistent format, Convey ideas but not clear and effective enough. Acceptable sentence construction with mistakes in grammar/language.	Acceptable formatting and organized content. Convey ideas clearly and effectively with good sentence construction with some mistakes in grammar/language.	Acceptable formatting and well-organized content. Convey ideas clearly and effectively with good sentence construction with minor mistakes in grammar/language.	Good formatting and well organized content. Convey ideas clearly and effectively with good sentence construction, no mistake in grammar/language.

Comments

--

Overall marks

Task	Marks	X Weightage	Actual Marks
Q1		1	
Q2		1	
Q3		1	
Q4		0.5	
Q5		1	
Q6		0.2	
Q7		0.3	
TOTAL MARKS (25%)			

Evaluated and comment by:

(Supervisor Signature)
Stamp

Contact. No. :

Date :