

**PROGRAMME OUTCOMES 9 (COMMUNICATION) ASSESSMENT-SUPERVISOR**

Semester & Academic Year :  
 Course Code and Section : MCT 4399 / MCTE 4399  
 Course Title : Final Year Project 2  
 Assessment : Supervisor  
 Name of Student (Matric No) :  
 Date of Evaluation :

Evaluation (You may use decimal points i.e. 0.8, 1.3, 2.2 etc)

<b>PO9 Communication</b>	Communicate effectively and inclusively on complex engineering activities with the engineering community and with society at large, such as being able to comprehend and write effective reports and design documentation, make effective presentations, taking into account cultural, language, and learning differences					
Items	Unacceptableness	Marginal	Acceptable	Exemplary	Score (S)	Mark (S x W)
Score	S = 0 - < 5	S = 5 - < 6.5	S = 6.5 - < 7.5	S = 7.5 - <10		
<b>General Evaluation</b>						
Meeting (W = 10) <i>(EA1, EA2)</i>	Fails or rarely discusses project details.	Occasionally discusses project, with limited context.	Frequently discusses progress and challenges with supervisor.	Actively initiates comprehensive discussions, seeks and integrates feedback.		
$\Sigma W = 10$	<b>Total Mark</b>					
Final score percentage (%) = (Total Mark/ $\Sigma W$ )*10						

Lecturer/Evaluator

Name:

Date:

**PROGRAMME OUTCOMES 7 (ETHICS) ASSESSMENT-  
SUPERVISOR**

Semester & Academic Year :  
 Course Code and Section : MCT 4399 / MCTE 4399  
 Course Title : Final Year Project 2  
 Assessment : Supervisor  
 Name of Student (Matric No) :  
 Date of Evaluation :

Evaluation (You may use decimal points i.e. 0.8, 1.3, 2.2 etc)

<b>PO7 Ethics (WK9)</b>	Apply ethical principles and commit to professional ethics and norms of engineering practice and adhere to relevant national and international laws. Demonstrate an understanding of the need for diversity and inclusion					
Items	Unacceptable	Marginal	Acceptable	Exemplary	Score (S)	Mark (S x W)
Score	S = 0 - < 5	S = 5 - < 6.5	S = 6.5 - < 7.5	S = 7.5 - < 10		
<b>General Evaluation</b>						
<b>Project Management (W = 15)</b>	Demonstrates minimal or no ability to manage time, resources, or consider ethical/professional norms.	Demonstrates some ability to manage time and resources, with inconsistent attention to professional ethics.	Demonstrates ability to manage time and resources while generally adhering to professional ethics.	Demonstrates skillful management of time/resources, proactively integrates ethical principles and compliance.		
<b>Ownership (W = 20)</b>	Poor resource management; depends solely on supervisor, and disregards ethical responsibility (e.g., use of AI tools).	Limited resource management; still depends on supervisor and shows minimal commitment to professional ethics (e.g., use of AI tools).	Good resource management; contributes ideas, generally upholds ethics, and considers inclusion (e.g., use of AI tools).	Excellent independent resource management; provides ideas, and actively upholds professional ethics (e.g., use of AI tools).		
<b>Proper Use of Others' Work and Citation (W=5)</b>	Minimal or no recognition and/or application of proper ethical use of intellectual property, copyrighted materials, or others' research.	Some recognition and application of proper ethical use of intellectual property, copyrighted materials, and others' research.	Recognizes and applies proper ethical use of intellectual property, copyrighted materials, and others' research.	Always recognizes and applies proper ethical use of intellectual property, copyrighted materials, and others' research.		
<b><math>\Sigma W = 40</math></b>	<b>Total Mark</b>					
<b>Final score percentage (%) = (Total Mark/<math>\Sigma W</math>)*10</b>						

.....  
**Lecturer/Evaluator**  
 Name:

Date:

**PROGRAMME OUTCOMES 4 (INVESTIGATION) ASSESSMENT-SUPERVISOR**

**Semester & Academic Year** :  
**Course Code and Section** : MCT 4399 / MCTE 4399  
**Course Title** : Final Year Project 2  
**Assessment** : Supervisor  
**Name of Student (Matric No)** :  
**Date of Evaluation** :

<b>PO4 Investigation</b>	Conduct investigation into complex problems, displaying creativeness, using research-based knowledge, and research methods including design of experiments, analysis and interpretation of data, and synthesis of information to provide valid conclusions.				
Items	Unacceptable	Marginal	Acceptable	Exemplary	Score (S) Mar k
<b>Score</b>	<b>S = 0 - &lt; 5</b>	<b>S = 5 - &lt; 6.5</b>	<b>S = 6.5 - &lt; 7.5</b>	<b>S = 7.5 - &lt;10</b>	<b>(S x W)</b>
<b>Report Evaluation</b>					
<b>Literature Review (W = 5) (WP1, WK8)</b>	Insufficient explanation/elaboration of previous works; no link to project context, little research-based insight or creativity.	Limited explanation of prior works; mostly reporting, minimal critical thinking, and limited use of research-based knowledge.	Fair explanations and elaboration; some critical thinking and creative linkage of prior research to project aims.	Thorough, well-elaborated review; demonstrates strong critical thinking, creative insight, and effective synthesis of research-based knowledge into project rationale.	
<b>Methodology (W = 10) (WP1)</b>	No clear description of techniques, procedures, or experimental design; narrative is disorganized and not research-grounded.	Addresses and cites techniques/procedures but explanations are vague or confusing; limited creativity in experimental approach.	Clearly describes techniques, procedures, and experimental design; organized narrative, shows use of research-based methods with some originality.	Exceptionally clear, concise methodology with innovative experimental design; fully grounded in research methods and demonstrates creative problem-solving.	
<b>Results and Discussion (W =20) (WP3)</b>	Provides minimal data analysis; findings are illogically presented with no interpretation or link to research questions.	Provides some data analysis with logical elements but is occasionally confusing; interpretation is basic and shows limited synthesis.	Provides sufficient, logically organized data analysis; interprets findings coherently and links results to research questions with some synthesis of insights.	Provides rich, in-depth analysis and interpretation; synthesizes data creatively to generate convincing insights that directly address complex research questions.	

<b>Conclusions and Recommendations (W=10)</b>	Limited ability to draw conclusions from data; fails to synthesize information or address objectives meaningfully.	Some valid conclusions drawn but misses several objectives; synthesis is basic and recommendations show limited creativity or grounding in data.	Draws valid, data-grounded conclusions; addresses most objectives; recommendations are reasonable and show clear synthesis of findings.	Draws insightful, innovative conclusions fully grounded in data; addresses all objectives; recommendations are forward-looking, creative, and well-justified by synthesis.	
<b>Report Format (W = 5)</b>	Does not follow guidelines; inconsistent formatting (references, captions); detracts from clarity of research presentation.	Follows a few guidelines but with significant formatting errors; formatting issues sometimes hinder understanding of methods or results.	Generally follows engineering/report guidelines; minor formatting issues; overall presentation supports clarity of research content.	Fully adheres to specified engineering/report format; formatting is exemplary (references, captions, headings), enhancing readability and professionalism of the report.	
<b><math>\Sigma W = 50</math></b>	<b>Total Mark</b>				

	<b>Final score percentage (%) = (Total Mark/<math>\Sigma</math>W)*10</b>	
--	--	--

.....  
**Lecturer/Evaluator**

**Name:**

**Date:**