



Senior Graduation Project II (ITBP 481) Evaluation Form

Project ID:	Project Title:	Semester: Spring 2026
--------------------	-----------------------	------------------------------

Trait	Not Assessed (0)	Unacceptable (1)	Below Expectation (2)	Meets Expectation (3)	Exceeds Expectation (4)	Weightage	Mark	Weighted Mark
Discussion of ethical, social, economic, environmental and sustainability issues	Not mentioned at all.	Ethical codes, social issues, economic issues, environmental concerns or sustainability concerns are just initiated and not discussed.	Ethical codes, social issues, economic issues, environmental concerns or sustainability concerns are superficial or undeveloped.	Ethical codes, social issues, economic issues, environmental concerns or sustainability concerns are appropriately explained.	Ethical codes, social issues, economic issues, environmental concerns or sustainability concerns are complete, appropriate and thoroughly discussed.	4		$M \times \frac{W}{4}$
Poster	No Poster Presented	Poorly organized, unclear poster. Lacks technical content, innovation, and team input. Not professionally presented.	Poster has basic structure but lacks clarity or completeness. Minimal visuals. Limited technical explanation or innovation. Team effort unclear.	Clear and well-structured poster. Conveys project goals and technical content. Some innovation shown. Good team contribution and design.	Professional, visually appealing poster. Clearly communicates technical depth and project impact. Innovative elements and strong team effort are evident. Ethical/societal impact mentioned.	4		$M \times \frac{W}{4}$
Project implementation	No Project implementation.	Does not meet project requirements. Code is incomplete, poorly written, and lacks teamwork, innovation, or impact.	Partially implemented with limited functionality. Basic or unreliable implementation. Minimal innovation or collaboration. Ethical impact not considered.	Mostly implemented as designed. Project runs with minor issues. Shows moderate complexity and some innovation. Team effort and basic impact awareness are evident.	Fully implemented and runs successfully. Implementation is technically sound, shows innovation, and follows good coding practices. Strong teamwork and clear awareness of societal or ethical aspects.	10		$M \times \frac{W}{4}$
Integrate IT technologies/ Applying Standards	No integration of IT technologies presented or submitted.	No clear use of tools or technologies. No mention or understanding of relevant standards.	Tools and standards are mentioned but poorly understood or applied. Technical depth is lacking.	Good understanding and appropriate use of tools. Relevant standards are identified and partially applied.	Tools and technologies are applied effectively and professionally. Strong understanding of standards and their correct integration into the project.	4		$M \times \frac{W}{4}$
Testing, results and analysis	No results were reported.	Very limited results and analysis. No comparison with existing work.	Limited results and shallow analysis. Comparisons with similar work are missing or weak.	Clear results and analysis. Relevant comparisons with similar projects are made.	Detailed, thorough analysis with insightful comparisons to related work. Demonstrates strong technical depth and reflects on broader impact.	8		$M \times \frac{W}{4}$
Presentation	Absent during presentation or did not present.	Slides poorly organized with many errors. Students are inaudible, hesitant, rely heavily on notes, and struggle to answer questions. Presentation timing is off.	Slides contain errors and weak flow. Students are often hesitant and rely on notes. Responses to questions are unclear. Presentation barely finished on time.	Slides are clear and logically structured. Students mostly fluent and audible, with minimal note use. Questions answered appropriately. Presentation fits allotted time.	Slides are polished, clear, and visually effective. Students speak confidently without notes, engage audience well, and answer questions accurately. Presentation is professional and timely.	6		$S1: M \times \frac{W}{4}$
								$S2: M \times \frac{W}{4}$
								$S3: M \times \frac{W}{4}$
								$S4: M \times \frac{W}{4}$
								$S5: M \times \frac{W}{4}$
Report	No report submitted for evaluation.	Disorganized report with poor clarity. Little to no original work or technical insight. Missing teamwork evidence and no mention of ethical or societal considerations. Many language errors.	Some organization but inconsistent logic. Limited technical depth or innovation. Minimal reflection on teamwork or ethical impact. Language errors present but mostly understandable.	Clear, well-structured report showing good technical understanding and some innovation. Team contributions acknowledged. Ethical or societal aspects briefly addressed. Minor language or formatting issues.	Highly organized, insightful report demonstrating strong technical depth and innovation. Clear evidence of teamwork and professional skills. Thoughtful discussion of societal and ethical impact. Error-free and polished writing with effective visuals.	4		$M \times \frac{W}{4}$



Examiner Name and Signature

Seq.	Student Name	Student ID	Total Mark (40)
S1			0
S2			0
S3			0
S4			0
S5			0

Trait	Comments
Discussion of ethical, social, economic, environmental and sustainability issues	
Poster	
Project implementation	
Integrate IT technologies/ Applying Standards	
Testing, results and analysis	
Presentation	
Report	

For Best Senior Project Nomination purpose only:

Trait	Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Mark
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	
Novelty	The project shows little or no originality. It mainly replicates existing ideas or solutions.	The project includes some new ideas or improvements but lacks clear novelty or distinction.	The project presents an innovative concept or approach with evident originality.	The project demonstrates exceptional innovation and creativity, clearly advancing beyond existing solutions.	
Usability	The project outcome is not usable or lacks functional value.	The project outcome is partially usable but has noticeable limitations or usability issues.	The project outcome is functional, user-friendly, and demonstrates practical applicability.	The project outcome is highly usable, well-designed, fully functional, and shows strong potential for real-world adoption or impact.	