

CANDIDATE PARTICULARS

Name: _____
 Project Title: _____

Dept: MPE/ESE/CPE
 Matric No: _____

PEER ASSESSMENT (4%)

Participation (1%) (CLO4, PLO10)	Marks	
Actively participates in all discussion or lab activities.	4-5	
Occasionally participates in discussion or lab activities.	2-3	
Participates minimally in discussion or lab activities.	0-1	

Communication (1%) (CLO4, PLO10)	Marks	
Shares ideas related to the goals clearly. Listens attentively to others and respond appropriately.	4-5	
Shares few ideas. Listens to others and hardly argues.	2-3	
Does not share ideas. Observes without responding.	0-1	

Attitude (1%) (CLO4, PLO10)	Marks	
Exceptionally positive and constructive; encourages other group members	4-5	
Neutral; neither encouraging nor discouraging; not interested in the performance of others	2-3	
Negative, withdrawn	0-1	

Lab Ethics (1%) (CLO4, PLO10)	Marks	
Always on time and well prepared for lab with proper lab attire.	4-5	
Sometimes on time and lack in preparation for lab.	2-3	
Never on time and not prepared.	0-1	

Examiner's overall comments/suggestions:

<table style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 70%; vertical-align: top;"> Name and examiner's signature: </td> <td style="width: 30%; vertical-align: top;"> Date: </td> </tr> </table>	Name and examiner's signature: 	Date:
Name and examiner's signature: 	Date: 	

CANDIDATE PARTICULARS

Name: _____
 Project Title: _____

Dept: MPE/ESE/CPE
 Matric No: _____

TECHNICAL PAPER (10%)

Introduction (1%) (CLO1, PLO4)	Marks	
Introduction is complete and well written; provides all necessary background principles for the research project.	4-5	
Introduction is nearly complete, missing some minor points.	2-3	
Very little background information or information is incorrect OR, does not give any information about what to expect in the technical paper	0-1	

Methodologies (1%) (CLO2, PLO5)	Marks	
Materials and methodology are complete and adequately detailed. Logical and easily followed. Description of procedure is complete, ensuring that it can be replicated.	4-5	
Materials and methodology are explained with sufficient detail; some lack detail or are confusing. Mostly easy to follow. Description of procedure makes it likely that the work can be reliably replicated.	2-3	
Missing several important explanations of materials and/or methodology. Not sequential. Most steps are missing or are confusing. Some procedural components generally described but are not replicable.	0-1	

Result Representation (2%) (CLO2, PLO5)	Marks	
All figures, graphs, tables are correctly drawn, are numbered and contain titles or captions.	4-5	
All figures, graphs, tables are correctly drawn, but some have minor errors or could still be improved	2-3	
All figures, graphs, tables contain errors or are poorly constructed, have missing titles, captions or numbers, units missing or incorrect, etc.	0-1	

Analysis / Discussion (2%) (CLO1, PLO4)	Marks	
All the important trends and data comparison have been interpreted clearly and precise, students show excellent understanding of the project.	4-5	
Almost all the results have been correctly interpreted and discussed, only minor improvements are needed.	2-3	
Students show minimal analysis and poor understanding of the project.	0-1	

Conclusion (1%) (CLO1, PLO4)	Marks	
All the important conclusions have been clearly made and relates directly to support or contradict the hypothesis. Student also shows good understanding	4-5	
All the important conclusions are drawn, could be better stated. Conclusion is precise, related to the hypothesis.	2-3	
No conclusions or conclusion missing the important points which indicating a lack of understanding. Conclusion is too general.	0-1	

Overall Writing/ Citation (3%) (CLO1, PLO4)	Marks	
All needed sections present by using the given template. Excellent organized and easily followed. Contents show full excellent knowledge of subject. All citations in text are available in list of reference.	4-5	
All needed sections present. Well organized. Contents show enough knowledge of subject. All citations in text are available in list of reference.	2-3	
Not well organized. Contents show lack of knowledge. Some citations in text are not available in list of reference.	0-1	

Examiner's overall comments/suggestions:

Name and examiner's signature:	Date:

PANEL: Academic / Industry (please circle as applicable)

CANDIDATE PARTICULARS

 Name: _____
 Project Title: _____

 Dept: MPE/ESE/CPE
 Matric No: _____

POSTER PRESENTATION (10%)

Main Idea (2%) (CLO1, PLO4)	Marks	
Clear technical to layman perspective	4-5	
Ambiguity in translating from technical to layman perspective	2-3	
Poor in translating from technical to layman perspective	0-1	

Content - Accuracy (2.5%) (CLO1, PLO4)	Marks	
Content is accurate and all required information is presented in a logical order.	4-5	
Content is accurate but some required information is missing and/or not presented in a logical order, but is still generally easy to follow.	2-3	
Content is inaccurate. Information is incomplete, inaccurate, or not presented in a logical order, making it difficult to follow	0-1	

Comprehension (1.25%) (CLO3, PLO9)	Marks	
Students are able to accurately defend and justify their answers.	4-5	
Students have difficulties to defend and justify their answers.	2-3	
Students cannot defend and justify their answers.	0-1	

Graphics – Relevance (1.5%) (CLO2, PLO5)	Marks	
Suitable choice of graphics that relate to the topic and all borrowed graphics have source of citations	4-5	
Acceptable choice of graphics that relate to the topic and some borrowed graphics have source of citations	2-3	
Poor choice of graphics that do not relate to the topic and borrowed graphics do not have source citation	0-1	

Design / Layout (1%) (CLO2, PLO5)	Marks	
Appealing and comprehensive overall visual, content arrangement, readability, use of font and colours	4-5	
Acceptable overall visual, content arrangement, readability, use of font and colours	2-3	
Poor overall visual, content arrangement, readability, use of font and colours	0-1	

Presentation Skills (1.25%) (CLO3, PLO9)	Marks	
Fluency, pace, body language and eye contact are excellent.	4-5	
Fluency, pace, body language and eye contact are satisfactory	2-3	
Poor efforts on the fluency, pace, body language and eye contact.	0-1	

Bibliography / Citations (0.5%) (CLO1, PLO4)	Marks	
Bibliography / Citations are from credible resources	4-5	
Bibliography / Citations are from less credible resources	2-3	
No bibliography / Citations included	0-1	

Examiner's overall comments/suggestions:

Name and examiner's signature:	Date:

CANDIDATE PARTICULARS

 Name: _____
 Project Title: _____

 Dept: MPE/ESE/CPE
 Matric No: _____

REPORT (30%)

Abstract (1.5%) (CLO1, PLO4)	Marks	
The abstract is very well-written with the justification of the study and statement on the significance of the findings.	4-5	
The abstract is adequately written but does not justify the study and does not state the significance of the findings.	2-3	
The abstract is not well presented or not presented at all or is plagiarized.	0-1	
Problem statement (1.5%) (CLO1, PLO2)	Marks	
Clearly defines the problem and outlines necessary objectives and methodology.	4-5	
Problem statement has some ambiguity or misses some important issues.	2-3	
Problem is defined incorrectly or too narrowly. Key information is missing or incorrect.	0-1	
Objectives & scopes (3%) (CLO2, PLO3)	Marks	
The objectives and scopes strongly describe the project.	4-5	
The objectives and scopes somewhat describe the project.	2-3	
The objectives and scopes are not clearly described or incorrect or plagiarized.	0-1	
Literature Review & Project background (3%) (CLO1, PLO4)	Marks	
Critical review of literatures is presented with thorough reference to most important studies. The importance of study is well established.	4-5	
Equal mix of non-research and research-based literatures is presented. The importance of study is not well established.	2-3	
No research-based literature is given, or the literature review is not presented or is plagiarized.	0-1	
Methodology (6%) (CLO2, PLO3 & CLO2, PLO5)	Marks	
Project methodology is very well described. Process flow of the project strongly leads to successful achievement of the objectives.	4-5	
Project methodology is generally described. Process flow of the project leads to the achievement of the objectives.	2-3	
Project methodology is not adequately described, or incorrect. Process flow of the project is not clearly presented or not given.	0-1	
Results (6%) (CLO1, PLO4)	Marks	
Results are very well presented with appropriate format and excellent visual appearance.	4-5	
Results are adequately presented with appropriate format and visual appearance.	2-3	
Results are poorly presented, in term of format and visual appearance or no results	0-1	

Analysis & discussion (4.5%) (CLO1, PLO2)	Marks	
Sufficient and accurate data analysis presented. Detailed discussion and strongly related to results.	4-5	
Sufficient but inaccurate data analysis presented. Discussion is somewhat related to results.	2-3	
Insufficient data analysis presented. Discussion is not related to results or no analysis and discussion.	0-1	
Conclusion & recommendation (1.5%) (CLO1, PLO4)	Marks	
Conclusion is very well presented and clearly related to the objectives. Clear and realistic recommendations for future works.	4-5	
Conclusion is sufficiently presented and somewhat related to the objectives. Acceptable recommendations for future works.	2-3	
Poor conclusion is presented and not related to the objectives. Poor or no recommendations for future works. Or conclusion and recommendations are not presented.	0-1	
References & report format (3%) (CLO2, PLO5)	Marks	
Report is very well written, and the standard format is fully followed, with minor grammatical errors.	4-5	
Report is well written according to the standard format but with some grammatical errors.	2-3	
Report is not well written according to the standard format with many grammatical errors. Or report does not totally follow the standard format.	0-1	

Examinor's overall comments/suggestions:

<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 70%; padding: 5px;">Name and examiner's signature:</td> <td style="width: 30%; padding: 5px;">Date:</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="height: 40px;"></td> <td style="height: 40px;"></td> </tr> </table>	Name and examiner's signature:	Date:		
Name and examiner's signature:	Date:			

CANDIDATE PARTICULARS

 Name: _____
 Project Title: _____

 Dept: MPE/ESE/CPE
 Matric No: _____

RINKOH PRESENTATION (3%)

Problem statements/ objectives (1%) (CLO2, PLO3)	Marks	
Significant and clearly described.	4-5	
Significant but not clearly described.	2-3	
Insignificant or no problem definition	0-1	
Methodology (1%) (CLO2, PLO3)	Marks	
Well-explained on the methodology	4-5	
Project methodology is generally described. Process flow of the project leads to the achievement of the objectives.	2-3	
Project methodology is not adequately described, or incorrect. Process flow of the project is not clearly presented or not given.	0-1	
Project direction (1%) (CLO2, PLO3)	Marks	
Clear directions and project execution according to planned timeline and high percentage of project completion	4-5	
Project seems to be moving in the right direction but with some delay according to the planned timeline. Moderate percentage of project completion	2-3	
Project direction is not clear, no significant progress and did not follow the planned timeline. Low percentage of project completion	0-1	

LOG BOOK (3%)

Progress (1%) (CLO4, PLO12)	Marks	
Continuous progress and reporting on-time	4-5	
Some missing or delayed progress reporting	2-3	
No progress and reporting	0-1	
Content (2%) (CLO4, PLO12)	Marks	
Comprehensive objective, problem definition, formulated solution and next action plan	4-5	
Moderate objective, problem definition, formulated solution and next action plan	2-3	
Poor objective, problem definition, formulated solution and next action plan	0-1	

REPORT (30%)

Abstract (1.5%) (CLO1, PLO4)	Marks	
The abstract is very well-written with the justification of the study and statement on the significance of the findings.	4-5	
The abstract is adequately written but does not justify the study and does not state the significance of the findings.	2-3	
The abstract is not well presented or not presented at all or is plagiarized.	0-1	
Problem statement (1.5%) (CLO1, PLO2)	Marks	
Clearly defines the problem and outlines necessary objectives and methodology.	4-5	
Problem statement has some ambiguity or misses some important issues.	2-3	
Problem is defined incorrectly or too narrowly. Key information is missing or incorrect.	0-1	

Objectives & scopes (3%) (CLO2, PLO3)	Marks	
The objectives and scopes strongly describe the project.	4-5	
The objectives and scopes somewhat describe the project.	2-3	
The objectives and scopes are not clearly described or incorrect or plagiarized.	0-1	
Literature Review & Project background (3%) (CLO1, PLO4)	Marks	
Critical review of literatures is presented with thorough reference to most important studies. The importance of study is well established.	4-5	
Equal mix of non-research and research-based literatures is presented. The importance of study is not well established.	2-3	
No research-based literature is given, or the literature review is not presented or is plagiarized.	0-1	
Methodology (6%) (CLO2, PLO3 & CLO2, PLO5)	Marks	
Project methodology is very well described. Process flow of the project strongly leads to successful achievement of the objectives.	4-5	
Project methodology is generally described. Process flow of the project leads to the achievement of the objectives.	2-3	
Project methodology is not adequately described, or incorrect. Process flow of the project is not clearly presented or not given.	0-1	
Results (6%) (CLO1, PLO4)	Marks	
Results are very well presented with appropriate format and excellent visual appearance.	4-5	
Results are adequately presented with appropriate format and visual appearance.	2-3	
Results are poorly presented, in term of format and visual appearance or no results.	0-1	
Analysis & discussion (4.5%) (CLO1, PLO2)	Marks	
Sufficient and accurate data analysis presented. Detailed discussion and strongly related to results.	4-5	
Sufficient but inaccurate data analysis presented. Discussion is somewhat related to results.	2-3	
Insufficient data analysis presented. Discussion is not related to results or no analysis and discussion.	0-1	
Conclusion & recommendation (1.5%) (CLO1, PLO4)	Marks	
Conclusion is very well presented and clearly related to the objectives. Clear and realistic recommendations for future works.	4-5	
Conclusion is sufficiently presented and somewhat related to the objectives. Acceptable recommendations for future works.	2-3	
Poor conclusion is presented and not related to the objectives. Poor or no recommendations for future works. Or conclusion and recommendations are not presented.	0-1	
References & report format (3%) (CLO2, PLO5)	Marks	
Report is very well written, and the standard format is fully followed, with minor grammatical errors.	4-5	
Report is well written according to the standard format but with some grammatical errors.	2-3	
Report is not well written according to the standard format with many grammatical errors. Or report does not totally follow the standard format.	0-1	
Supervisor's overall comments/suggestions:		
Name and examiner's signature:	Date:	