



**FACULTY OF MANUFACTURING ENGINEERING
UNIVERSITI TEKNIKAL MALAYSIA MELAKA (UTeM)**

EXAMINER - PSM II - Evaluation Form

NAME OF STUDENT: _____
(BLOCK LETTERS)

MATRIX NO: _____

PROJECT TITLE: _____

COURSE (Please Tick):

| | |
|------|--|
| BMFU | |
|------|--|

| | |
|------|--|
| BMFA | |
|------|--|

| | |
|------|--|
| BMFP | |
|------|--|

| | |
|------|--|
| BMFR | |
|------|--|

| | |
|------|--|
| BMFB | |
|------|--|

NAME OF SUPERVISOR: _____

| No | Marking Criteria | Evaluation Level, EL | | | | | | | | | W | Mark (EL x W) | Comments | |
|---|---|----------------------|---|---|----------|---|---|---|-----------|---|-------------|---------------|----------|--|
| | | Weak | | | Moderate | | | | Excellent | | | | | |
| GENERAL | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Writing - Correct grammar and definition, consistency & continuity in writing. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 0.5 | /5 | |
| Numerous spelling and grammatical errors. | | | Several spelling and grammatical errors. | | | | Minor spelling and grammatical errors. | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Format - According to format, list of references that correspond with text in the report. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 0.5 | /5 | |
| Work is illegible with format change throughout and inconsistency of references. | | | Generally consistent with only several format and minor inadequacies references errors. | | | | Consistent throughout and only minor format and references are complete and comprehensive. | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Presentation - Information and data are organized accordingly. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 0.5 | /5 | |
| Work is hard to follow as there is very little continuity. | | | Information is presented in a logical manner, which is easily followed. | | | | Information is presented in a logical, interesting way, which is easy to follow. | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Neatness - Report presented in good and tidy condition. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 0.5 | /5 | |
| Work presented in a very poor condition. | | | Work presented in a moderate condition. | | | | Work presented in excellent condition. | | | | | | | |
| REPORT CONTENT | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Abstract & Background - Consistent with title and problem statements of project. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 1.0 | /10 | |
| Serious deficiencies in project title and problem statements. | | | Effective consistency of title and clear problem statements. | | | | Excellent insight. Clear and complete understanding of problem statements and consistency of title. | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Objectives & Scope - Relevant with title and scope of the project. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 0.5 | /5 | |
| Little or no grasp of project objectives and scope. Incapable of producing a successful solution. | | | Overall sound understanding of the project objectives and scopes. Does not significantly impair solution. | | | | Clear and complete understanding of project goal and constraints. | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Literature Review - Appropriate with project title, comprehensive and most recent publications used and documented proficiently. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 1.0 | /10 | |
| Serious deficiencies in proper selection and use of engineering principles. | | | Effective application of engineering principles resulting in reasonable solution. | | | | Critical selection and application of engineering principles ensuring reasonable results. | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Methodology - Systematic approach, procedures and correct tools and techniques used to achieve the project objectives. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 1.5 | /15 | |
| Very ineffective. Would not allow project to achieve any goals | | | Somewhat effective. Would allow project to achieve most goals. | | | | Effective. Would allow project to achieve all goals. | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Results & Discussion - Explanation and analysis of data, project objective achieved and result obtained as expected. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 3 | /30 | |
| Demonstrated little or no ability to analyse and interpret data. Project fails to achieve objectives. | | | Demonstrated adequate ability to analyse and interpret data. Project achieve some objectives. | | | | Demonstrated superior ability to analyse and interpret data. Project achieve all objectives. | | | | | | | |
| 6 | Conclusion & Future Work - Main findings & suitable recommendation. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 1.0 | /10 | |
| Serious deficiencies in support for stated conclusions. | | | Sound conclusions reached based on achieved results. | | | | Insightful, supported conclusions and recommendations. | | | | | | | |
| Total Marks | | | | | | | | | | | /100 | | | |
| Actual Marks | | | | | | | | | | | /20 | | | |

Name of Examiner : _____

Date: _____

Signature: _____

EXAMINER - PSM II - Evaluation Form

NAME OF STUDENT: _____
(BLOCK LETTERS)

NAME OF SUPERVISOR: _____

DETAIL COMMENTS

Name of Examiner : _____

Date: _____

Signature: _____