Faculty of Computer & Mathematical Sciences

F4 - METHODOLOGY EVALUATION FORM

STUDENT NAME PROGRAM SUPERVISOR PROJECT TITLE		STUDENT ID		
	·			
	Assessment Criteria	Weight (W)	Score (S) [1-10] (Refer to rubric)	Marks (W*S)
1.	Design of the methodology (Appropriate and comprehensible design of the methodology)	3	,	
2.	Description (Comprehensible and detailed description of each component in methodology)	3		
3.	Model/Technique/Method (Model/Technique/Method employed)	4		
Total				
		'		1
Lec	eturer's Name Signature		Date	

EC Forms.indd 71 8/28/2015 4:23:42 PM

F4 - METHODOLOGY EVALUATION RUBRIC

Assessment Criteria	Excellent (8-10)	Good (6-7)	Satisfactory (5)	Poor (1-4)	0
Design of the methodology	The design is correct and completeAdditional appropriate ideas and components are presented	The design is reasonable and completeSome of the component presented but not appropriate	The design goes in the right directionSome of the components are not complete	- The design component is missing or not appropriate	No evidence
2. Description	 Description of the components is detailed Every component description is presented in correct and appropriate relation 	 Description of the components is reasonable and complete Some of the components' description are presented but not appropriate 	 Part of the components' description are reasonable Some of the components' description are not complete 	- Description of the components are missing, not understandable, or not relevant	No evidence
3. Model/Technique/M ethod	- Model/technique/metho d employed is clear, complete, precise and follows logical order	- Model/technique/method employed appears complete but is either unclear, imprecise or fails to follow a logical order	- Model/technique/meth od employed appears not complete with either unclear, imprecise or fails to follow a logical order	- Model/technique/met hod employed is unclear, incomplete, imprecise and fails to follow a logical order	No evidence