Name of Student: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Title of the Project: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Main Supervisor: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Co-Supervisor: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

I/We as the Panel for Evaluation of Project 1 for the above student, have evaluated the Student’s *Project 1 Report* for the MSc (Computer Systems Engineering) and arrived at the decision as stated below:-

*The Project 1 Report is accepted with amendments and MUST be corrected and submitted before the deadline as stated in the academic calendar. (Needs approval from the supervisor) (>=60%)*

*The Project 1 Report is rejected (the reasons for rejection are given below)*

*The student needs to be reassessed in the following semester.*

*Reason: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_*

*\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_*

Examiner 1: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Signature: ­­­­­­­\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Examiner 2:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Signature: ­­­­­­­\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Course Outcomes** | | |  | |  | |  | |
| **No.** | **Course Learning Outcomes** | **Programme Outcome(s)** | | **Taxanomies**  **(C,P,A)** | | **Assessment Methods** | |
| CO1 | **Formulate** the problem and hypothesis during the process of the development of the project | **PO1** | | **C5** | | **Report, Pr** | |
|
| CO2 | **Design** the solution for the problem to be solved in the project | **PO2** | | **P7** | | **Report, Pr** | |
|  | |
| CO3 | **Relate** the solution to the related industry | **PO6** | | **A4** | | **Report, Pr** | |
| **KK1** | |
| CO4 | **Organise** clearlythe proposed solution by adhering to the UTM Thesis Writing Guideline. | **PO3**  **PO5** | | **A4** | | **Report, Pr** | |
| **CS1 – CS6**  **LL1-LL2** | |
| CO5 | **Defend** the method or solution proposed in the project | **PO6** | | **A4** | | **Report, Pr** | |
| **LS1-LS2** | |

1. **Report**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1. Title and Abstract** | Informative, succinct, and offer sufficiently specific details about the educational issue, variables, context, and proposed methods of the study. | | | Relevant, offering details about the proposed research study. | | | Lacks relevance or fails to offer appropriate details about the educational issue, variables, context, or methods of the proposed study. | | Inappropriate given the problem, research questions, and method. | | | Rating |
| 10 | 9 | | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |
| Comments: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **2. Introduction:**  **Problem,**  **Significance,**  **Purpose of the**  **Study** | Articulates a specific, significant problem by connecting that problem to the literature. Statements of purpose flow logically from the introduction. The research problem and the statement of significance clearly establishes relevance to the research topic | | | Identifies a relevant research issue. Connections established  with the literature. | | | Although a research issue is identified, the statement is too  broad or the description fails to  establish the importance of the  problem area. Connections to the  literature are unclear, debatable,  or insignificant. | | Statement of the problem,  significance, purpose, questions/hypotheses, or definitions of constructs and  variables were omitted or  inappropriate. | | | Rating |
| 10 | | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |
| Comments: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **3. Introduction:**  **Research Objectives,**  **Research**  **Questions,**  **Assumptions,**  **Limitations** | Articulates clear, reasonable, and succinct research objectives and questions given the purpose, design, and methods of the proposed study. A thorough, reasonable discussion of assumptions and limitations is provided. All elements are mutually supportive. | | | Research objectives and research questions are stated, connected to the research issue, and supported by the literature. Constructs (if available) have been identified and variables have been operationally defined.  Assumptions and limitations are  present. | | | Elements are poorly formed,  ambiguous, or not logically connected to the description of the problem, purpose, or research  methods. | | Research objectives, research questions, assumptions and limitations were omitted or inappropriate given the context, purpose, or methods of the study. | | | Rating |
| 10 | | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |
| Comments: | | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4. Literature Review:**  **Organization** | Structure is intuitive and sufficiently grounded to each of the key constructs and variables of the proposed study. | | A workable structure has been  presented for presenting relevant  literature related to the constructs and variables of the proposed study. | | | The structure of the literature review is weak; it does not identify important ideas, constructs or variables related to the research purpose, questions, or context. | | The structure of the literature review is incomprehensible, irrelevant, or confusing. | | | Rating |
| 10 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |
| Comments: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **5. Literature Review:** | Narrative integrates critical and logical details from the peer-reviewed theoretical and research literature.  Attention is given to different  perspectives, conditionalities, threats to validity, and opinion vs. evidence. | | Key constructs and variables were connected to relevant, reliable theoretical and research literature. | | | A key construct or variable was  not connected to the research  literature. Selected literature was  from unreliable sources. Literary  supports were vague or  ambiguous. | | The review of literature was  missing or consisted of nonresearch based articles.  Propositions were irrelevant, inaccurate, or inappropriate. | | | Rating |
| 10 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |
| Comments: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **6. Research Methodology: Operational Framework**  **and research design** | The purpose, questions, and design are mutually supportive and coherent.  Attention has been given to eliminating alternative explanations and controlling  extraneous variables. Appropriate and important limitations and assumptions have been clearly stated. | | The research design has been  identified and described in sufficiently detailed terms. Some  limitations and assumptions have  been identified. | | | The research design is confusing  or incomplete given the research  questions and sampling strategy.  Important limitations and assumptions have not been  identified | | The research design is  inappropriate or has not  been identified and or  described using standard  terminology. Limitations and  assumptions are omitted. | | | Rating |
| 10 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |
| Comments: | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **7. Research Methodology: Procedures** | Procedures were thorough,  manageable, coherent, and powerful for generating valid and reliable data. | | Procedures for implementing the study were identified and described in a chronological  fashion. | | | Procedures were confusing, incomplete, or lacked relevance to purpose, research objectives or research questions | | Procedures were omitted | | | Rating |
| 10 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |
| Comments: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **8. Research Methodology: the proposed solution can be implemented in the related industry** | The proposed solution is **very suitable** to be implemented in related industry | | The proposed solution is **suitable** to be implemented in related industry | | | The proposed solution is **less suitable** to be implemented in related industry. | | The proposed solution is **not suitable** to be implemented in related industry | | | Rating |
| 10 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |
| Comments: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **9. Report: References/Citations, English Composition, & Comply to UTM Thesis Manual Writing** | Consistently complied to thesis manual guidelines,  English composition, and  References especially in regards to citations, references, headings, table of  contents, and page numbers. | | Conformed to most  standards of English composition and thesis manual guidelines. | | | Weak, incomplete, ambiguous, or  inconsistent application of thesis manual guidelines, report organization, rules of English composition.  Delivery was delinquent. | | Failure to apply standard  rules for report  presentation, references/citations and English composition. | | | Rating |
| 10 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |
| Comments: | | | | | | | | | | | |

**Mark 1 (Report): \_\_\_\_\_\_ X 70% = \_\_\_\_\_ %**

**90**

1. **Oral Presentation**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1. Communicate clearly and**  **effectively in defending the project**  **.** | A thorough and clear presentation of the research,  speaks well, and engages the  audience. Presenter responds  confidently and thoroughly to critical questions or feedback, enhancing the audience’s understanding of the project. | | Clear and good presentation.  Speaks good and engages the audience. | | | Weak organization and not clear of the presentation of the research.  Not clear in communicating key points and weak engage with the audience. | | Disorganized.  Presenter speaks poorly or simply reads from a text, fails to communicate key points, does not engage the audience, and/or does not respond to critical questions or feedback. | | | Rating |
| 10 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |
| Comments: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **2. Content** | * Clearly defines the topic or   thesis and its significance.   * Supports the thesis and key   findings with an analysis of  relevant and accurate evidence   * Provides evidence of extensive and valid research with multiple and varied sources * Provides evidence of complex problem solving and learning stretch. * Combines and evaluates existing ideas to form new insights. | | * Clearly defines the topic or   thesis.   * Supports the thesis and key   findings with evidence.   * Presents evidence of valid   research with multiple sources.   * Provides evidence of problem   solving and learning stretch.   * Combines existing ideas to form new insights. | | | * Defines the topic or thesis. * Supports the thesis with   evidence.   * Presents evidence of research   with sources.   * Provides some evidence of   problem solving and learning stretch.   * Combines existing ideas. | | * Does not clearly define the topic or thesis. * Does not support the thesis with evidence. * Presents little or no evidence of valid research. * Shows little evidence of problem solving and learning stretch. * Shows little evidence of the combination of ideas. | | | Rating |
| 10 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |
| Comments: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **3. Eye contact, graphics and mechanics** | * Presenter maintains eye contact with audience, seldom returning to notes. * Presenter’s graphics explain and reinforce screen text and presentation. * Presentation has no misspellings or grammatical errors. | | * Presenter maintains eye contact most of the time but frequently returns to notes. * Presenter’s graphics relate to text and presentation. * Presentation has no more than two misspellings and/or grammatical errors. | | | * Presenter occasionally uses eye contact, but still reads most of report. * Presenter occasionally uses graphics that rarely support text and presentation. * Presentation has three misspellings and/or grammatical errors. | | * Presenter reads all of report with no eye contact. * Presenter uses superfluous graphics or no graphics * Presenter ‘s presentation has four or more spelling errors and/or grammatical errors. | | | Rating |
| 10 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |
| Comments: | | | | | | | | | | | |

**Mark 2 (Presentation) = \_\_\_\_\_\_ X 30% = \_\_\_\_\_\_ %**

**30**

**Total = Mark 1 + Mark 2 = \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ %**