

**Marking Rubrics**

| Preliminary Report (20%)  |   |    |  |   |  |   |  |   |
|---|---|----|--|---|--|---|--|---|
| Key assessment  | Criteria  | CO | Unacceptable (0)   | Poor (1)  | Marginal (2)   | Average (3)   | Good (4)   | Excellent (5)   |
| Problem statement / research problems (4%)                      | Identification of the problem (4%)                      | 1  | Problem area not discussed at all.   | Poor or unclear description of problem area.                            | Problem area is quite clearly stated.                                  | Problem area is correctly identified and well formulated.                     | Problem area is explicitly identified, described and analyzed.   | Problem area is very clearly stated and analyzed, including discussion on dependencies and inter-relationships with other problems.   |
| Proposed approach/ solution or Research Questions & design (4%) | Proposed approach or solution / research questions (2%) | 3  | Proposed approach and proposed solution or research questions are not provided.                  | Poor description of proposed approach and solution/ research questions. | Proposed approach and solution /research questions are clearly stated. | Proposed approach and solution / Research questions are stated and described. | Proposed approach and solution / research questions are clearly stated, including discussion on the relationships of some investigated problems with the proposed solutions and approach/ research questions.  | Proposed approach and solution / research questions are clearly stated, including unquestionable discussion on the relationships of all investigated problems with the proposed solutions and approach/ research questions.   |
|   | Justification/ Research design (2%)                     | 3  | No justification/ research design provided to support the proposed solution/ research questions. | Unclear description of justification/ research design.                  | General justification/ research design is provided.                    | General justification/ research design are well defined.                      | For development project: Justification is clearly stated and analysed, support with a few of relevant proved works from other projects or scholars.<br>For research project: Research design are clearly discussed and supported with some identified research questions, research problems/ issues discussed. | For development project: Justification is clearly stated and analysed, support with all relevant proved work from other projects or scholars.<br>For research project: Research design is described clearly, with support of all identified research questions and research problems/ issues discussed. |
| Objectives (4%)   | Address the need or problem.(2%)                        | 2  | Objectives are not provided.   | Unclear or vague objectives provided.                                   | General objectives are provided.                                       | General objectives are well defined.  | Specific objectives are clearly formulated and obviously derived from the identified problem area.   | Specific objectives, which are obviously and unquestionable derived from the identified problem area, are explicitly and clearly defined.   |
|   | adequate and measurable. (2%)                           | 2  | Objectives are not provided.   | Objectives are not adequate and not measurable.                         | Somewhat adequate and somewhat measurable objectives.                  | Adequate and somewhat measurable objectives.                                  | Adequate and specific objectives for the implementation of final year project.   | Adequate and specific objectives for the implementation of final year project and allows for direct measurement of success provided.  |
| Scope (4%)  | Clearly described (4%)                                  | 2  | Not provided   | Unclear scope   | General scope is provided.   | General scope is provided that address some project objectives.               | Well-defined scope and appropriate for a final year project. Some objectives are addressed.  | Scope is well-defined, address all the project objectives, and appropriate for the a final year project.  |
| Bibliography (4%)   | Appropriateness (2%)                                    | 6  | No relevant references provided.   | Limited references, with questionable quality or relevance.             | Limited references, with questionable quality or relevance.            | Sufficient number of relevant and reliable sources.                           | Large number of relevant and reputable references.   | Huge number of relevant, cutting edge and wide variety of reputable references.   |
|   | Follow Harvard referencing style (2%)                   | 6  | Not following required citation or bibliography format at all.                                   | Some errors (11-15 errors) either in citation format or bibliography.   | Some errors (7-10 errors) either in citation format or bibliography.   | Some errors (3-6 errors) either in citation format or bibliography.           | Minor errors (less than 3) either in citation format or bibliography.  | Exactly follow. No error.   |
| <b>Total</b>  | <b>20%</b>  |    |  |   |  |   |  |   |

| Key assessment                              | Criteria  | CO | Unacceptable (0)   | Poor (1)  | Marginal (2)   | Average (3)   | Good (4)  | Excellent (5)   |
|---|---|----|--|---|--|---|---|---|
| <b>Proposal Report (40%)</b>                |   |    |  |   |  |   |   |   |
| Key assessment                              | Criteria  | CO | Unacceptable (0)   | Poor (1)  | Marginal (2)   | Average (3)   | Good (4)  | Excellent (5)   |
| Project / Research description (4%)         | Identification of the problem (2%)  | 1  | Problem area is not discussed at all.  | Poor description of problem area.   | Problem area is quite clearly stated.  | Problem area is correctly identified and well formulated.                                     | Problem area is explicitly identified, described and analyzed.  | Problem area is very clearly stated and analyzed, including discussion on dependencies and inter-relationships with other problems.   |
|   | Proposed approach/ solution. ( Research questions and design ) (2%)   | 3  | Proposed approach and proposed solution (research questions and design ) are not provided. | Poor description of proposed approach and solution (research questions and design). | Proposed approach and solution (Research questions and design) are clearly stated. | Proposed approach and solution ( research questions and design are) are stated and described. | Proposed approach and solution/ (research questions and design) are clearly stated, including discussion on the relationships of some investigated problems with the proposed solutions and approach (research questions and design.) | Proposed approach and solution (research questions and design) are clearly stated, including unquestionable discussion on the relationships of all investigated problems with the proposed solutions and approach ( research questions and design). |
| Key assessment                              | Criteria  | CO | Unacceptable (0)   | Poor (1)  | Marginal (2)   | Average (3)   | Good (4)  | Excellent (5)   |
| Project/ Research scope and objectives (4%) | Definition of scope (2%)  | 2  | Not provided   | Unclear scope   | General scope is provided.   | General scope is provided that address some project objectives.                               | Well-defined scope and appropriate for a final year project. Some objectives are addressed.   | Scope is well-defined, address all the project objectives, and appropriate for the a final year project.  |
|   | Definition of objectives (2%)   | 2  | Not provided.  | Unclear or vague objectives provided.   | General objectives provided.   | General objectives are well defined   | Specific objectives are clearly formulated and obviously derived from the identified problem area.  | Specific objectives, which are obviously and unquestionably derived from the identified problem area, are explicitly and clearly defined.   |
| Literature Review (6%)                      | Review of research topic (2%)   | 1  | No review, or a review which is totally off-topic  | Poor review of very few sources which is off topic                                  | Limited review with few sources or a review which is partly off topic              | Sufficient review with mostly relevant and reliable sources                                   | Adequate review with closely relevant, reliable and reputable sources.  | A comprehensive review covering a large number of relevant sources which are well linked and described in relation to the project scope   |
|   | Analytical/Critical thinking (2%)   | 1  | No analysis of information/data is evident.  | Poor analysis of sources is evident   | Sources are quite sufficiently analyzed  | Sources are evaluated quantitatively or qualitatively   | Sources are evaluated quantitatively or qualitatively, discussed in-depth and backed by experts' opinion  | Various sources are reviewed in depth, all relevant and necessary aspects discussed and /or evaluated, and experts' opinion analyzed  |
|   | Structure and coherence of literature review (2%)   | 5  | No noticeable structure is evident   | Poor structure; no clear relationship between sections of the review                | Quite clear structure, but not all sections follow a natural or logical order      | Well structured literature review where all sections are well connected.                      | A clear structure is obvious, which allows a reader to see relationships and transition between different sections; the review content is complete .  | The structure of the review is very clear which expands a reader's deeper understanding of the topic; the content is arranged in unquestionable logical order.  |
|   | <u>development project</u> : Methodology of the project (iterative, agile etc) (3%)<br><u>research project</u> ; Research method (3%) | 1  | No description of project's or research methodology.                                       | Incomplete description of methodology   | Quite sufficient description of methodology  | Methodology is well described providing basic information to carry out a project/ research.   | Methodology is clearly described providing all necessary information to carry out a project and reproduce the results.  | Methodology is described in very clear unquestionable manner to provide all necessary details to repeat it and obtain reproducible results.   |

| Key assessment  | Criteria   | CO | Unacceptable (0)  | Poor (1)   | Marginal (2)   | Average (3)  | Good (4)  | Excellent (5)   |
|---|--|----|---|--|--|--|---|---|
| <b>Development/ Research Methodology and Development tools (6%)</b> | <p><u>development project:</u> Development Tools (eg. Software-QFD, TRIZ, Mind-Map, Netbeans, Rational Rose, MYSQL Workbench, MS Project, Java, C/C++, or different kind of technologies, libraries and frameworks, Ms Visual Source Safe, Amazon web services, etc) (3%)</p> <p><u>Research project:</u> Instrument or tool (questionnaire design, interview scripts, focus group, observation etc) to carry out data collection and analysed. (3%)</p> | 1  | No description of any project's tool / research instruments.  | Incomplete description of tool/ research instrument.   | Quite sufficient description of tool/ research instrument.   | Clearly states tool/ research instrument to be used, with explanatory details provided in an understandable manner. Reasons for choice of tools/ techniques/ instrument are somewhat valid.  | Clearly states tool/ research instrument to be used, with explanatory details provided to support some phases in methodology/ research method. Reasons for choice of tools/ techniques/ instrument are mostly valid.  | Clear and systematic presentation of all relevant tools/ research instrument appropriate to support all phases in methodology / research method. Reasons for choice of tools/ techniques/ instrument are valid.   |
| <b>Project Management / Research plan (4%)</b>                      | Planning and managing of project/ research activities. (4%)  | 4  | No evidence of project/ research planning.  | Planning or resource allocation is poor and obviously sub-optimal.   | Main tasks are identified but resources (time, cost, material etc.) allocation is insufficient.  | Main tasks are well identified and resources (time, cost, material etc.) allocated   | All tasks are clearly identified and explained; necessary resource (time, cost, material etc.) allocation is clearly justified; all planned tasks/items are achieved timely.  | All tasks are clearly identified and well explained; all necessary resources (time, cost, material etc.) are allocated and clearly justified; all planned tasks/items are achieved as planned and successfully.   |
| <b>Initial deliverables (8%)</b>                                    | <p><u>development:</u> Requirement specification for the implementation of FYPII (4%)</p> <p><u>research :</u> developing research instruments (4%)</p>  | 3  | No evidence of any form of requirement specification/ research instrument developed.  | <p><u>development:</u> Some features of the proposed system and/ or high level view showing some components of the proposed system.</p> <p><u>Research:</u> Incomplete description of research instrument.</p>                 | <p><u>development:</u> Describe the main features of the proposed system and/ or high level view showing the major components of the proposed system and their relationships with each other, but lack of details.</p> <p><u>Research:</u> Describes instrument in an understandable manner.</p> | <p><u>development:</u> Requirement specification is clearly described and its detail is somewhat sufficient for the implementation. (eg. Some diagrams or modeling included in the description but lack of completeness)</p> <p><u>research:</u> Clearly states instruments to be used, with explanatory details provided and justified.</p> | <p><u>development:</u> Requirement specification is clearly described and its detail is sufficient for the implementation. (eg. Complete diagrams or modeling included in the description)</p> <p><u>research:</u> Clearly states instruments to be used that address some relevant variables, with explanatory details provided and justified.</p> | <p><u>development:</u> Requirement specification is clearly described and its detail is sufficient for the implementation at a professional quality (that could determine the completeness of the requirement, resolve conflict or change requirements)</p> <p><u>research:</u> Comprehensive description of research instrument that address all relevant variables, including of validity of data collection and reliability of research instruments.</p> |
|   | <p><u>development :</u> Prototype/ conceptual development (4%)</p> <p><u>research :</u> data analysis in pilot study (4%)</p>  | 3  | <p><u>development :</u> No evidence of conceptual or prototype of the proposed system.</p> <p><u>research :</u> No analysis or interpretation done.</p> | <p><u>development :</u> The conceptual or prototype is demonstrated only a minimal understanding of purpose and results.</p> <p><u>research :</u> Analysis or interpretation done but show little relevance to the issues.</p> | <p><u>development :</u> The proposed system meets some of the defined scope.</p> <p><u>research :</u> Minimal analysis or interpretation done and show some relevance to the issues.</p>   | <p><u>development :</u> The proposed system meets all the defined scope, without thinking out different possibilities.</p> <p><u>research :</u> Able to analyze and interpret what the results mean in a simple manner and show some relevance to the issues.</p>  | <p><u>development :</u> The proposed system meets all the defined scope, with the consideration of different possibilities.</p> <p><u>research :</u> Commendable analysis show clear and relevant to the issues. The result is able to set conclusions in context of current understanding in the project.</p>                                      | <p><u>development :</u> The proposed system meets all the defined scope and shows different scenarios (or different possibilities of interaction). It is demonstrated as a real system.</p> <p><u>research :</u> Very detailed analysis that show clear and relevant to the issues. The result demonstrates considerable insight regarding justification to improve the research method/ design.</p>  |
| <b>Language and clarity (4%)</b>                                    | Grammar and style (4%)   | 5  | Numerous grammatical or spelling errors are present which cause at least some part(s) of the report to be incomprehensible.                             | Many obvious grammatical or spelling errors are present which negatively effect understandability of the report  | Some obvious grammatical or spelling errors are present which affect understandability of the report   | Few grammatical or spelling errors can be found which does not significantly affect the report's quality   | A very few grammatical or spelling errors can be found which does not affect the report's quality   | No grammatical or spelling errors.  |
|   | References & Citation (2%)   | 6  | No citation or uses material from other sources without citation. All references not following Harvard referencing style.                               | Some citation and/or bibliography errors. Limited references, with questionable quality or relevance. Not exactly follow Harvard referencing style.  | Numerous citation and/or bibliography errors. Limited references, with questionable quality or relevance. Follow Harvard referencing style.  | A reasonable number of sufficiently modern sources. Citations and bibliography are generally correct, with a couple of minor errors  | A good number of modern sources supplemented by older relevant sources. Citations and bibliography are exactly according to standard  | Numerous cutting edge sources while also citing previous works of great impact. Citations and bibliography are exactly according to standard, and special effort made to refer to and credit the work of others.  |

| Key assessment               | Criteria                      | CO  | Unacceptable (0)  | Poor (1)  | Marginal (2)   | Average (3)   | Good (4)   | Excellent (5)   |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----|---|---|--|---|--|---|
| Structure and references(4%) | Overall report structure (2%) | 5   | No discernible structure. Consistently lack of focus. Points of paragraphs are unclear. | Poor structure; no clear relationship between sections. Most of the chapters lack of focus, and points of paragraphs are unclear. | Quite clear structure, but not all sections follow a natural or logical order. Some sections lack of focus.. | A clear structure is used in the presentation of contents. Lack of coherent organization of ideas within individual paragraphs or from one paragraph to the next<br>Lacks consistent focus and control of argument. | A clear structure is used which allows the reader to clearly see relationships between sections of the review and the proposed solutions. Concrete details are present but weak because of insufficient evidence to support arguments. | The structure of the review enhances reader understanding by logical separation of sources and content in a natural flow. Paragraphs are well-organized to create a coherent points. Points discussed in each paragraph are always clear. Carefully developed and supported argument; transitions between points are logical. |
| Total                        |                               | 40% |   |   |  |   |  |   |

| Oral Presentation FYP I (Presentation) |   |     |  |  |  |   |   |   |
|--|---|-----|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| Key assessment                         | Criteria  | CO  | Unacceptable (0)   | Poor (1)   | Marginal (2)   | Average (3)   | Good (4)  | Excellent (5)   |
| Presentation skill (5%)                | Appearance (1%)                                   | 5   | sweats, shorts, flip-flops, hair uncombed  | Jeans, t-shirt, polo shirt, sneakers   | Casual: Polo shirt, dress slacks, sneakers.  | Business casual: Dockers or other dress slacks, untucked-in polo shirt, dress shoes.  | Business casual: Dockers or other dress slacks, tucked-in polo shirt, dress shoes.                                      | 3-piece suit, shirt/ blazer/ dress slacks, tucked-in dress/ shirt, tie, dress shoes.  |
|  | Presentation length (within 25minutes) (2%)       | 5   | Too long or too short (+/- 10 minutes)   | +/- 8 minutes  | +/- 6 minutes  | +/- 4 minutes   | +/- 2 minutes   | +/- 1 minute  |
|  | Preparedness and confidence (2%)                  | 5   | Presenter does not make eye contact, mumbles or presentation or is interrupted in some major way due to lack of preparation. | Presenter does not make eye contact, is hard to hear, or some minor interruptions to the presentation.               | Poor eye contact with audience, voice not very clearly heard, some minor interruptions to the presentation | Eye contact with audience, clear-voiced presentation, no interruption to presentation | Presenter speaks with confidence in clear loud voice and captures audience's attention                                  | Very confident presenter who speaks and holds himself/herself as a professional, completely capturing audience's attention  |
| Content (9%)                           | adequately cover major parts of the report. (3%)  | 5   | Does not give adequate coverage of the FYP I.  | Basic covers of some topics. Majority of the contents are irrelevant to the FYP1.                                    | Basic covers of some topics. Some contents are irrelevant to the FYP1.                                     | Covers all the topics, but lack of details and accuracy in some contents.             | Covers all the topics, but lack of details in some important aspects.   | Demonstrate substance and depth, is comprehensive, shows mastery of content. Appropriate amount of material is prepared. Points made reflect well their importance. |
|  | Structure and attractiveness of presentation (3%) | 5   | No indication of any structure   | A disjointed presentation which is out of logical order  | Poorly structured presentation with erratic topical shifts and jumps                                       | Well structured presentation which provides good understanding of the project         | A clearly structured presentation which enhances understanding of the project and engages an audience                   | An outstanding presentation of smooth unquestionable structure and engaging content that captures audience  |
|  | Use of presentation tools and visual aids. (3%)   | 5   | No presentation tools and/or visual aids used  | Very minimal use of presentation tools and/or aids, distracts audience or confuses understanding of the presentation | Presentation tools and/or aids add no value to understanding of the presentation                           | Presentation tools and/or aids are used appropriately                                 | Creative presentation tools and/or aids are used that highlight the quality and audience's interest to the presentation | Novel, unusual, very creative presentation tools used which captures audience's attention and enhances understanding of the presentation                            |
| Q&A (6%)                               | Quality of answers provided (3%)                  | 5   | Does not answer question(s) at all.  | Out-of-topic or evasive answers to questions.  | Partly appropriate answers to questions  | Concise answers provided  | Detailed straight to the point and yet succinct answers provided  | Thorough, well elaborated and very convincing answer provided   |
|  | Attitude and composure (3%)                       | 5   | Loses composure during the Q&A session.  | Visibly downcast, upset, or distracted during the Q&A session.   | Attentive when taking and answering questions.   | Attentive and adequately responsive when taking and answering questions               | Calm, clear and confident when taking and answering questions   | Impressive composure as of a professional speaker when taking and answering questions   |
| Total                                  |   | 20% |  |  |  |   |   |   |

| Overall effort FYP I (10%) |   |    |                              |  |   |  |   |  |
|----------------------------|---|----|------------------------------|--|---|--|---|--|
| Key assessment             | Criteria                                    | CO | Unacceptable (0)             | Poor (1)   | Marginal (2)  | Average (3)  | Good (4)  | Excellent (5)  |
| Communicates ideas         | Well in written and oral communication (2%) | 5  | Could not understand at all. | Sometimes ideas are not delivered clearly, either in written or oral ; lack of confidence. | Able to communicate ideas clearly either in written or oral ; lack of confidence. | Generally can understand the delivery of the project information in both written and oral. | Able to communicate ideas clearly both written and oral in most of the times; sometimes lack of confidence. | Able to communicate ideas clearly both written and oral and shows confidence at all times. |

| Key assessment          | Criteria  | CO | Unacceptable (0)  | Poor (1)  | Marginal (2)   | Average (3)  | Good (4)   | Excellent (5)  |
|-------------------------|---|----|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| systematic work         | Implementation of project methodology and plan (2%) | 4  | No planning or scheduling is evident.   | Very brief plan or schedule without explicit milestones and goals, or selected plan or schedule is not realistic.                                 | A general plan or schedule is selected, including milestones and goals.  | A plan or schedule is selected, including explicit milestones and goals  | A plan or schedule is selected which includes well-chosen and significant milestones and goals                             | A thorough plan or schedule is selected which includes well-chosen and significant milestones and goals  |
| Ethical behaviour       | Complies with FYP policies and code of ethics (2%)  | 6  | Habitually late or absent, often misses deadlines, or totally lacks independence in carrying out project. | Frequent cases of absence or lateness, or overly reliant on supervisor's guidance   | Scattered cases of absence or lateness, or overly reliant on supervisor's guidance.  | Mostly punctual, meets most deadlines, and is reasonably independent of supervisor's instructions.                                     | Always punctual, meets all deadlines, and demonstrates considerable independence of supervisor's instructions.             | Always punctual, meets all deadlines, and takes own initiatives outside of supervisor's recommendations.   |
| Meeting with supervisor | Disciplined and regular reporting (2%)              | 6  | Non-existing log book, never reports to supervisor or does not heed supervisor's advice.                  | Sparsely filled in log book, rarely reports to supervisor or not very receptive to advice.  | Log book is used to keep supervisor fairly updated on progress, but student is not receptive to supervisor's advice                                | Log book is used appropriately to keep supervisor fairly updated on progress, and student is receptive to supervisor's advice          | Log book is well compiled, student regularly updates supervisor and seeks the appropriate advice                           | Takes initiative to inform supervisor of progress while actively seeking supervisor's input where necessary, above and beyond the normal log book requirements |
| Amount of effort        | Sufficient amount of effort put (2%)                | 6  | Did not attempt to explore the project personally.  | Limited interest in personal development, participated in at least one activity for this purpose, or honed an existing skill set for this project | sufficient interest in personal development, participated in a few activities for this purpose or improved an existing skill set for this project. | Willing to develop personally and participated in some activities for this purpose or improved an existing skill set for this project. | Eager to develop personally and often participated in activities for this purpose or picked up new skills for this project | Very eager to develop personally and often participated in activities or self-learning of skills for this project  |
| <b>Total</b>            | <b>10%</b>  |    |   |   |  |  |  |  |