

Assessment Form PI2– LOG BOOK & REPORT
PANEL ASSESSMENT FORM

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.:		
Supervisor:						
Academic Project 2 Title:						
PART II: LOG BOOK (10%)						
Criteria	Weightage	Score				
		Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor
		5	4	3	2	1
Meeting with supervisor	0.2					
Attitude	0.2					
Management	0.3					
Leadership	0.3					
PART III: FINAL REPORT (40%)						
Abstract	0.2					
Introduction (Background, problem statement, objectives, scope and limitation of work)	0.1					
Literature	0.1					
Methodology	0.1					
Results and Discussion	0.2					
Conclusion	0.2					
Format (writing, citation, references, tables and figures)	0.1					
					TOTAL (50%)	
PART IV: CERTIFICATION BY EXAMINER						
Comments (if any):						
Examiner's Signature:				Date:		

Note: This form must be completed and kept for documentation purposes.

ASSESSMENT OF LOG BOOK				
Score	Meeting with supervisor	Attitude	Management	Leadership
5 (very good)	Have very frequent meetings with the supervisor.	Shows a genuine interest in the project and is exceptionally hardworking, inquisitive and independent .	Project plan is exceptionally well prepared, systematic and appropriate .	Conducts work according to plan and adapts well to changes.
4 (Good)	Meets with the supervisor regularly .	Shows an interest in the project and is hardworking, inquisitive and independent .	Project plan is well prepared, systematic and appropriate .	Most work is conducted according to plan and can adapt to changes.
3 (Fair)	Meets with the supervisor once in a while, but not frequent enough .	Shows some interest in the project but is not fully committed. Moderately hardworking, lacks inquisitiveness and is dependent on the supervisor half of the time .	Project plan needs improvement and should be more systematic and appropriate .	Work is not completely conducted according to plan and has some difficulty adapting to changes.
2 (Poor)	Very seldom meets with the supervisor.	Shows little interest in the project and lacks commitment. Has issues with completing tasks, lacks inquisitiveness and is dependent on the supervisor most of the time .	Project plan is flawed and needs to be more systematic and appropriate .	Work is not conducted according to plan and has major difficulty adapting to changes.
1 (Very Poor)	Hardly ever meets with the supervisor.	Shows no interest in the project. Has major issues with completing tasks , shows no signs of inquisitiveness and is highly dependent on the supervisor.	Project plan is seriously flawed .	Seldom does work and cannot adapt to changes.

Score	Abstract	Introduction (Background, problem statement, objectives, scope and limitation of work)	Literature	Methodology	Results and Discussion	Conclusion	Format (writing, citation, references, tables and figures)
5 (very good)	The abstract is exceptionally well-written, concise and comprehensive .	The research background, statement of problem, objectives, scope and limitation of work 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 results are reported and interpreted very effectively , and the discussions are very insightful .	The conclusions very clearly identify the key findings and include significance and limitations of current work, and recommendations for future work.	The report follows the prescribed format very closely .
4 (Good)	The abstract is written well , and rather concise and comprehensive .	The research background, statement of problem, objectives, scope and limitation of work are clearly stated .	The supporting literature is relevant and is reviewed well .	The proposed methods are appropriate and are described in detail .	The results are reported and interpreted effectively , and the discussions are insightful .	The conclusions clearly identify the key findings and include significance and limitations of current work, and recommendations for future work.	The report follows the prescribed format closely .
3 (Fair)	The abstract is slightly flawed .	The research background, statement of problem, objectives, scope and limitation of work 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 results are reported and interpreted rather ineffectively , and the discussions lack insightfulness .	The conclusions do not clearly identify the key findings and do not mention the significance and limitations of current work, or recommendations for future work.	The report follows the prescribed format very loosely .
2	The abstract is badly written .	The research background, statement of problem, objectives,	The supporting literature is mostly irrelevant and is	The proposed methods are mostly not acceptable and	The results are reported and interpreted ineffectively , and there	The conclusions do not identify the key findings and do not include the	The report mostly does not follow the

(Poor)		scope and limitation of work are vaguely stated .	reviewed badly .	are described badly .	are insignificant or no discussions provided .	significance and limitations of current work, and recommendations for future work.	prescribed format.
1 (Very Poor)	The abstract is very badly written .	The research background, statement of problem, objectives, scope and limitation of work 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 results are reported and interpreted very ineffectively , and there are no discussions .	The conclusions are weak and do not include significance and limitations of current work, and recommendations for future work.	The report does not follow the prescribed format at all.