PSM 2 EVALUATION RUBRIC

Section B(1): Supervision – 10% (SUPERVISOR)

Criteria	1: Minimal	2: Satisfactory	3: Good	4: Excellent
Log book	No/inadequate entry, entries do not reflect project progress	Weekly entry, entries somewhat reflect project progress	Meaningful weekly entry, entries reflect project progress	Meaningful weekly entry, entries reflect project progress, includes project planning
Meeting frequency	Hardly meet, < 2 meetings	< 5 meetings	5 meetings	=> 6 meetings
Work ethic	Passive attitude, unable to communicate with supervisor	Good attitude, poor communication with supervisor	Good attitude, good communication and relations with supervisor	Positive attitude, good communication and relations with supervisor
Self-reliance / Independence	Highly dependent on supervisor	Dependent on supervisor	Somewhat dependent on supervisor and able to solve problems with support	Able to work and solve problems independently

Section B(2): Progress Report – 5% (SUPERVISOR)

Criteria	1: Minimal	2: Satisfactory	3: Good	4: Excellent
Improvement of PSM 1 report	No/minimal change on suggestions and comments made. Corrections not done. change	Some suggestions/comments from evaluators have been addressed. Some correction is done	Some suggestions/comments from evaluators have been addressed. All correction is done	All suggestions/comments from evaluators have been addressed. All correction is done. *addressed = either followed or counter explained by SV*
Completeness of Chapter 4	Inherent spelling and grammatical errors, incomplete chapter contents	Some spelling and grammatical errors, chapter contents somewhat complete	Some spelling and grammatical errors, chapter contents complete	No spelling and grammatical errors, chapter contents complete *chapter contents follows PSM handbook
Progress of Chapter 5	Inherent spelling and grammatical errors, incomplete chapter contents	Some spelling and grammatical errors, chapter contents somewhat complete	Some spelling and grammatical errors, chapter contents complete	No spelling and grammatical errors, chapter contents complete *chapter contents follows PSM handbook
Writing style, format and clarity	• Does not follow thesis format • Figures and tables are not captioned and referred	• Follow thesis format • Inappropriate use of figures and tables • Figures and tables are captioned but not referred	• Follow thesis format • Inappropriate use of figures and tables • Figures and tables are captioned and referred	• Follow thesis format • Appropriate use of figures and tables • Figures and tables are captioned and referred
Citation and references	• No citations • Direct translation	• Minimal citations • No direct translation	• Some facts and information are not clearly cited • No direct translation	• All facts and information are clearly cited • No direct translation

Section B(3): Project Progress 1 – 5% (SUPERVISOR)

Criteria	1: Minimal	2: Satisfactory	3: Good	4: Excellent
Milestone achieved	No/minimal achievement	< 30% project completed	< 40% project completed	> 40% project completed
Project execution follows planning	No/minimal progress	Progress behind schedule	Progress on schedule	Progress ahead of schedule
Knowledge and skill improvement	Minimal new skills developed, unable to	Some improvement in skills and knowledge, unable to	Some improvement in skills and knowledge, able	Significant improvement in skills and knowledge, able to

| | | express new skills to supervisor | express new skills to supervisor | to express new skills to supervisor | clearly express new skills to supervisor |

Section B(4): Project Progress 2 - 5% (SUPERVISOR)

Criteria	1: Minimal	2: Satisfactory	3: Good	4: Excellent
Milestone achieved	Minimal achievement	< 60% project completed	< 70% project completed	> 70% project completed
Project execution follows planning	Minimal progress	Progress behind schedule	Progress on schedule	Progress ahead of schedule
Knowledge and skill improvement	Minimal new skills developed, unable to express new skills to supervisor	Some improvement in skills and knowledge, unable to express new skills to supervisor	Some improvement in skills and knowledge, able to express new skills to supervisor	Significant improvement in skills and knowledge, able to clearly express new skills to supervisor

Section B(5): Short Paper - 5% (SUPERVISOR/EXAMINERS)

Criteria	1: Minimal	2: Satisfactory	3: Good	4: Excellent
Originality of the paper	• Ideas are taken directly from another source, not your own words. • Similarity percentage (turnitin) >30%	• Ideas not communicated well, but still in your own words. • Similarity percentage (turnitin) >25% - <30%	• Ideas somewhat clearly communicated in your own words. • Similarity percentage (turnitin) =<20%	• Ideas clearly communicated in your own words. • Similarity percentage (turnitin) <20%
Technical soundness	• Method chosen is somewhat appropriate to aims • Extremely poor explanation of work/process and results • No diagrams or poorly represented ones.	• Method chosen is appropriate to aims • Poor explanation of work/process and results • Provides diagrams but does not facilitates better understanding	• Method chosen is appropriate to aims • Somewhat detailed explanation of work/process and results • Provides diagrams for better understanding	• Method chosen is appropriate to aims • Detailed explanation of work/process and results • Provides diagrams for better understanding
Clarity of presentation	• Extremely poorly written, not supported or organized idea, hard to understand • Results not highlighted nor analysed well; shown in appropriate graphs and charts.	• Poorly written, not supported or organized idea, not easy to understand • Results highlighted but not analysed well; shown in appropriate graphs and charts.	• Not well written or supported, but well organized idea, somewhat easy to understand • Results highlighted and analysed somewhat acceptably well; shown in appropriate graphs and charts.	• Well written, well organized and well supported ideas, easy to understand • Results highlighted and analysed well; shown in appropriate graphs and charts.
Format, citation and references	• Facts and information are not cited or with missing references • Do not follow paper format • Direct translation	• Most facts and information are not clearly cited or with missing references • Somewhat follows paper format • Some direct translation	• Some facts and information are not clearly cited or with missing references • Follows paper format • No direct translation	• All facts and information are clearly cited with references • Follows paper format • No direct translation

Section B(5a): Final Report System Development - 25% (SUPERVISOR/EXAMINERS)

Criteria	1: Minimal	2: Satisfactory	3: Good	4: Excellent
Abstract	• Not very informative or understandable	• Somewhat informative and understandable • Does not comprehend the implemented project	• Informative, complete and understandable • Comprehend the implemented project	• Highly informative, complete and understandable • Comprehend the implemented project very well

Introduction	• Contents incomplete and poorly written • Mismatched understanding of project	• Contents are somewhat complete but not clearly written • Contents fairly reflect project understanding	• Contents are complete but not clearly written • Contents fairly reflect project understanding	• Contents are complete and clearly written • Contents reflect project understanding
Literature review	• Poor investigation into existing systems/techniques/technology, and no comparison between them. Literature review is insufficient and not relevant to the project aims.	• Somewhat complete investigation into existing systems/techniques/technology, but weak/no comparison between them. Literature review is insufficient and relevant to the project aims.	• Somewhat complete investigation into existing systems/techniques/technology, and a comparison between them. Literature review is sufficient and relevant to the project aims	• Complete investigation into existing systems/techniques/technology, and a comparison between them. Literature review is sufficient and relevant to the project aims.
Methodology	• Methodology not presented well nor explained clearly, most/all of these are missing: all phases, work done and deliverables. Does not reflect nor support project progress.	• Methodology presented but not explained well, two of these are missing: all phases, work done and deliverables. Insufficient to support project progress.	• Methodology presented but not explained clearly, one of these are missing: all phases, work done and deliverables. Insufficient to support project progress.	• Methodology presented and explained clearly, which include all phases, work done and deliverables. Sufficiently supports project progress
System design	• Poor and incomplete system design, does not cover all the different users of the system. • System flow not explained. • Network, hardware and database design not explained well/at all	• Inappropriate and incomplete system design does not sufficiently cover all the different users of the system. • System flow not explained clearly. • Network, hardware and database design are not explained clearly	• Appropriate and somewhat complete system design, somewhat sufficiently covers all the different users of the system. • System flow explained clearly. • Network, hardware and database design are explained in detail	• Appropriate and complete system design, sufficiently covers all the different users of the system. • System flow explained clearly. • Network, hardware and database design are explained in detail.
System implementation	• Most activities in the project are not explained. • Most major modules are not explained in detail or at all: coding, GUI, input/output. • Client/Server connections are not mentioned. • Sample data size <30; and/or does not cover all different aspects of the project. • There is no/insufficient search function	• Some activities in the project are explained. • Some major modules are explained in detail: coding, GUI, input/output. • Client/Server connections are not explained clearly. • Sample data size >30; covering all different aspects of the project. • There is a sufficient search function	• All activities in the project are explained somewhat clearly. • Major modules are explained in detail: coding, GUI, input/output. • Client/Server connections are somewhat clearly explained. • Sample data size >35; covering all different aspects of the project. • Search function is somewhat complete and efficient for project purpose	• All activities in the project are explained clearly. • Major modules are explained in detail: coding, GUI, input/output. • Client/Server connections are clearly explained. • Sample data size >40; covering all different aspects of the project. • Search function is complete and efficient for project purpose.

Testing	• Completed 1-2 of these tests:
	  - Input/Output
	  - System Flow
	  - Error messages
	  - User Acceptance Test (UAT)
	  - Testing of Network and security elements
		• Completed 2-3 of these tests in detail:
		  - Input/Output
		  - System Flow
		  - Error messages
		  - User Acceptance Test (UAT)
		  - Testing of Network and security elements
			• Completed 3-4 of these tests in detail:
			  - Input/Output
			  - System Flow
			  - Error messages
			  - User Acceptance Test (UAT)
			  - Testing of Network and security elements
				• Completed all of these tests in detail:
				  - Input/Output
				  - System Flow
				  - Error messages
				  - User Acceptance Test (UAT)
				  - Testing of Network and security elements

Criteria				
Conclusion (discussion and analysis)	• Limited/minimal discussion on project achievements, limitations and contributions • Limited/minimal suggestions for future works	• Somewhat clear discussion on project achievements, limitations and contributions • Insufficient or irrelevant suggestions for future works	• Clear discussion on project achievements, limitations and contributions • Somewhat relevant suggestions for future works	• Clear discussion on project achievements, limitations and contributions • Relevant suggestions for future works
Writing style, format and clarity	• Ideas are not communicated well, hard to understand, with many spelling and grammar mistakes • Does not follow thesis format • Figures and tables are not captioned and referred	• Ideas are not communicated well, but easily understood, with some spelling and grammar mistakes • Follows thesis format • Inappropriate use of figures and tables • Figures and tables are captioned but not referred	• Ideas are somewhat clearly communicated, easily understood, with minimal spelling and grammar mistakes • Follows thesis format • Inappropriate use of figures and tables • Figures and tables are captioned and referred	• Ideas are clearly communicated, easily understood, with no spelling and grammar mistakes • Follows thesis format • Appropriate use of figures and tables • Figures and tables are captioned and referred
Citation and references	• No citations • Missing references • Direct translation	• Minimal citations • Missing references • No direct translation	• Some facts and information are not clearly cited • Some missing references • No direct translation	• All facts and information are clearly cited with references • No direct translation

Section B(5b): Final Report Research Based - 25% (SUPERVISOR/EXAMINERS)

Criteria	1: Minimal	2: Satisfactory	3: Good	4: Excellent
Abstract	• Not very informative or understandable	• Somewhat informative and understandable • Does not comprehend the implemented project	• Informative, complete and understandable • Comprehend the implemented project	• Highly informative, complete and understandable • Comprehend the implemented project very well
Introduction	• Contents incomplete and poorly written • Mismatched understanding of project	• Contents are somewhat complete but not clearly written • Contents fairly reflect project understanding	• Contents are complete but not clearly written • Contents fairly reflect project understanding	• Contents are complete and clearly written • Contents reflect project understanding
Literature review	• Literature lacks relevance, quality and depth • Critical reviews not included	• Limited literature from quality resources, limited relevance and insufficiently supports project aims • Critical reviews not included	• Literature are from somewhat relevant and quality resources, supports project aims • Critical reviews included but not done well	• Literature are from relevant and quality resources, supports project aims • Critical reviews are included
Research methodology	• Incorrect selection of methodology and solution • Phases, process and deliverables are poorly stated and does not reflect nor support project	• Inappropriate selection of methodology and solution to project aims/objectives • Phases, process and deliverables are minimally stated and insufficient to support project	• Appropriate selection of methodology and solution to project aims/objectives • Phases, process and deliverables are not clearly stated and only somewhat sufficient to support project	• Appropriate selection of methodology and solution to project aims/objectives • Phases, process and deliverables are clearly stated and sufficient to support project
Experiment design and testing	• Minimal explanations of the activities involved in research experiment and testing, are these are poorly done. Very minimal of	• Most of the activities involved in research experiment and testing are not clearly explained or insufficient. Most of these are missing:	• Not all activities involved in research experiment and testing are clearly explained. Some of these are missing: Coding and	• All activities involved in research experiment and testing are clearly explained. This includes : Coding and implementation, data

Criteria	1: Minimal	2: Satisfactory	3: Good	4: Excellent
	none of these are included: Coding and implementation, data collection and sanitization, data analysis methods/techniques, testing environments	Coding and implementation, data collection and sanitization, data analysis methods/techniques, testing environments	implementation, data collection and sanitization, data analysis methods/techniques, testing environments	collection and sanitization, data analysis methods/techniques, testing environments.
Result and discussion / analysis and finding	• Limited explanation on research analysis • Results representations (graphs, tables, charts, graphics, etc) are minimal and insufficient to support understanding • Results comparison/benchmarking (with other methods/techniques/approach) is not done or very limited	• Somewhat clear explanation on research analysis • Results representations (graphs, tables, charts, graphics, etc) are done but not very clear, meaningful and appropriate • Results comparison/benchmarking (with other methods/techniques/approach) is not done or insufficient	• Somewhat clear explanation on research analysis • Results representations (graphs, tables, charts, graphics, etc) are somewhat clear, meaningful and appropriate • Results comparison/benchmarking (with other methods/techniques/approach) is done but not in detail	• Clear explanation on research analysis • Results representations (graphs, tables, charts, graphics, etc) are clear, meaningful and appropriate • Results comparison/benchmarking (with other methods/techniques/approach) are clearly detailed
Conclusion (discussion and analysis)	• Limited discussion on project achievements, limitations and contributions • Limited suggestions for future works	• Insufficient discussion on project achievements, limitations and contributions • Insufficient or irrelevant suggestions for future works	• Somewhat clear discussion on project achievements, limitations and contributions • Somewhat relevant suggestions for future works	• Clear discussion on project achievements, limitations and contributions • Relevant suggestions for future works
Writing style, format and clarity	• Ideas are not communicated well, hard to understand, with many spelling and grammar mistakes • Does not follow thesis format • Figures and tables are not captioned and referred	• Ideas are not communicated well, but easily understood, with some spelling and grammar mistakes • Follow thesis format • Inappropriate use of figures and tables • Figures and tables are captioned but not referred	• Ideas are somewhat clearly communicated, easily understood, with minimal spelling and grammar mistakes • Follow thesis format • Inappropriate use of figures and tables • Figures and tables are captioned and referred	• Ideas are clearly communicated, easily understood, with no spelling and grammar mistakes • Follow thesis format • Appropriate use of figures and tables • Figures and tables are captioned and referred
Citation and references	• No citations • Missing references • Direct translation	• Minimal citations • Missing references • No direct translation	• Some facts and information are not clearly cited • Some missing references • No direct translation	• All facts and information are clearly cited with references • No direct translation

Section B(6a): System - 30% (SUPERVISOR/EXAMINERS)

Criteria	1: Minimal	2: Satisfactory	3: Good	4: Excellent
Fulfilled aim, objectives and scope	• Does not fulfil aim, objectives and scope of project	• Somewhat fulfilled aim, objectives and scope of project	• Aim, objectives and scope of project fairly fulfilled	• Completely fulfilled aim, objectives and scope of project
Coding programming	• Does not follow coding standards • Limited understanding of program code	• Somewhat follow coding standards • Somewhat understand program code	• Mostly follow coding standards • Program code quite understood	• Strictly follow coding standards • Clearly understand program code
Completeness	• Minimal modules function correctly and meet project	• Some modules function correctly and meet project requirements	• Some modules function correctly and meet project	• All modules function correctly and meet project requirements

	requirements • Limited module integration • Limited testing and validation	• Some module integration • Some testing and validation	requirements • All modules are integrated • Some testing and validation	• All modules fully integrated • Complete testing and validation

Enhanced service and/or commercialization	• No commercial value
	• No effect on quality of service or of life
		• 1 of these:
		  - Has commercial value
		  - Enhances quality of service
		  - Increases quality of life
			• 2 of these:
			  - Has commercial value
			  - Enhances quality of service
			  - Increases quality of life
				• Has commercial value
				• Enhances quality of service
				• Increases quality of life

Course curriculum elements SCSR: Network and security elements *** devices include the following : IoT, embedded, fingerprint reader, RFID scanner, etc.	• Minimal and missing many.	• Has a few, but not done well.	• Has most, but not complete and done fairly well.	• Has a complete set and done well. • Network elements: Full system integration between Client/server (web/database/etc) and devices – if any); no localhost (mandatory); admin features/services are complete. • Security elements: Password and database encryption (mandatory); flow control of system and access control,

Creativity / interface and user experience	• Limited graphical user interface
	• Does not reflect project requirements
	• Poor or insufficient user experience
		• At least one of these designs are completed:
		  - Screen / menu
		  - Content (buttons, pages etc.)
		  - System / page navigation
		• Somewhat reflects project requirements
		• Acceptable user experience
			• Any 2 of these designs are completed:
			  - Screen / menu
			  - Content (buttons, pages etc.)
			  - System / page navigation
			• Reflects project requirements
			• Good user experience
				• All of these designs are fully completed:
				  - Screen / menu
				  - content (buttons, pages, etc.)
				  - System / page navigation
				• Reflects project requirements
				• Good user experience

Section B(6b): Research Output - 30% (SUPERVISOR/EXAMINERs)

Criteria	1: Minimal	2: Satisfactory	3: Good	4: Excellent
Achievement of research objectives	• Does not fulfil aim, objectives and scope of research project	• Somewhat fulfilled aim, objectives and scope of research project	• Aim, objectives and scope of research project fairly fulfilled	• Completely fulfilled aim, objectives and scope of research project
Data collection and cleansing/ research design	• Data collection process is poorly done (how the data was collected, what/how many data sources were analyzed, etc) • Data collected is missing important aspects to fit the research aims and objectives • Data cleansing/sanitization (if required by research context) is poorly done (how the data was sanitized, what	• Data collection process is insufficiently exhibited (how the data was collected, what/how many data sources were analyzed, etc) • Data collected is somewhat suitable for the research aims and objectives • Data cleansing/sanitization (if required by research context) is insufficiently shown (how the data was sanitized, what methods/techniques	• Data collection process is exhibited though not in detail (how the data was collected, what/how many data sources were analyzed, etc) • Data collected is suitable for the research aims and objectives • Data cleansing/sanitization (if required by research context) is explain in detail (how the data was sanitized, what	• Data collection process is exhibited in detail (how the data was collected, what/how many data sources were analyzed, etc) • Data collected is suitable for the research aims and objectives • Data cleansing/sanitization (if required by research context) is clearly explain in detail (how the data was sanitized, what methods/techniques used, etc)

	methods/techniques used, etc)	used, etc)	methods/techniques used, etc)	
Experiment/ procedure/ process	• Experiment procedures lack thoroughness fail to accurately generate valid and reliable data, and poorly done. • Experiment environment and/or process were neither appropriate nor suitable for research context. • Experiment environment were not taken into consideration nor planned (where applicable) • Measurement instrument validity is questionable and not supported	• Experiment procedures were somewhat thorough, manageable, accurately generate valid and reliable data, and replicable. • Experiment environment and/or process were somewhat appropriate and suitable for research context. • Experiment done in a controlled environment to ensure data reliability and accuracy (where applicable) • Valid and supported measurement instrument is used in research	• Experiment procedures were fairly thorough, manageable, accurately generate valid and reliable data, and replicable. • Experiment environment and/or process were fairly appropriate and suitable for research context. • Experiment done in a controlled environment to ensure data reliability and accuracy (where applicable) • Valid and supported measurement instrument is used in research	• Experiment procedures were thorough, manageable, accurately generate valid and reliable data, and replicable. • Experiment environment and/or process were appropriate and suitable for research context. • Experiment done in a controlled environment to ensure data reliability and accuracy (where applicable) • Valid and supported measurement instrument is used in research
Research results representation	• Results are not clearly explained, level of detail is severely insufficient, and there are serious organizational issues • Tables/figures are not clear/concise in conveying the data. • Statistical analyses (if used) are inappropriate tests and/or are not accurately interpreted.	• Results are not very clearly explained, level of detail is insufficient, and there are more organizational issues • Tables/figures are not clear/concise in conveying the data. • Statistical analyses (if used) are inappropriate tests and/or are not accurately interpreted.	• Results are explained but not as clearly, level of detail is not as sufficient, and there are some organizational issues • Tables/figures are not as clear/concise in conveying the data. • Statistical analyses (if used) are appropriate tests but are not accurately interpreted.	• Results are clearly shown in a comprehensive level of detail and are well-organized • Tables/figures clearly and concisely convey the data. • Statistical analyses (if used) are appropriate tests and are accurately interpreted
Result analysis and discussion	• Interpretations/ analysis of results severely lacking in thoughtfulness and insight, are not informed by the study's results, and do not address how they supported, refuted, and/or informed the hypotheses/ propositions • Discussion of how the study relates to and/or enhances the present scholarship in this area is severely limited and/or absent altogether. • Suggestions for further research in this area are severely limited and/or absent altogether.	• Interpretations/ analysis of results lacking in thoughtfulness and insight, are not clearly informed by the study's results, and do not adequately address how they supported, refuted, and/or informed the hypotheses/ propositions • Discussion of how the study relates to and/or enhances the present scholarship in this area is limited. • Suggestions for further research in this area are very limit	• Interpretations/ analysis of results are sufficient but somewhat lacking in thoughtfulness and insight, are not as clearly informed by the study's results, and do not as thoroughly address how they supported, refuted, and/or informed the hypotheses/ proposition • Discussion of how the study relates to and/or enhances the present scholarship/study in this area is adequate. • Suggestions for further research in this area are adequate	• Interpretations/ analysis of results are thoughtful and insightful, are clearly informed by the study's results, and thoroughly address how they supported, refuted, and/or informed the hypotheses/ propositions • Insightful discussion of how the study relates to and/or enhances the present scholarship/study in this area • Suggestions for further research in this area are insightful and thoughtful
Contribution to knowledge	• Has no publication value • Has no effect on quality of service or of life	• 1 of these: • Has minor publication value (contribution to knowledge)	• 2 of these: • Has some publication value (contribution to knowledge)	• Has significant publication value (contribution to knowledge) • Can enhance quality of

		• Can enhance quality of service • Can increase quality of life	• Can enhance quality of service • Can increase quality of life	service • Can increase quality of life

Section B(7): Presentation - 10% (EXAMINER)

Criteria	1: Minimal	2: Satisfactory	3: Good	4: Excellent
Appearance and attitude	• Does not follow UTM Smart Day dress code • Impolite to examiners	• Casually dressed • Polite to examiners • Passive attitude	• Partly follow UTM Smart Day dress code • Polite to examiners • Positive attitude	• Follow UTM Smart Day dress code • Polite to examiners • Positive attitude
Project understanding / Content	• Shows little understanding of the project and unable to sufficiently present topic, problem background, suggested solution and its significance. • Poorly explain process, analysis and findings in manner that reflects poorly on basic understanding of content	• Shows some understanding of the project and able to present topic, problem background, suggested solution and its significance. • Able to sufficiently explain process, analysis and findings in manner that shows some basic understanding of content	• Have a fair understanding of the project and able to confidently present topic, problem background, suggested solution and its significance. • Able to explain process, analysis and findings in manner that shows understanding of content	• Clearly understood the project and able to clearly and confidently present topic, problem background, suggested solution and its significance. • Able to explain process, analysis and findings in manner that shows clear understanding of content.
Clarity of presentation	• Not clear communication • Ideas and information not communicated well and hampers understanding • Presentation is unorganised	• Somewhat clear communication • Ideas and information are somewhat unclear and hampers understanding • Presentation is sufficiently organised	• Ideas and information communicated fairly clearly • Presentation is organised	• Ideas and information communicated clearly • Presentation is well organised
Question and answer session	• Unable or not attempting to answer questions or answers reflect lack of project understanding	• Able to answer some questions • Some answers are irrelevant to project objectives	• Able to answer most questions • Answers fairly reflect project understanding	• Able to answer all questions • Answers reflect project understanding

Section B(8): Ethics - 5% (COORDINATOR)

Criteria	1: Minimal	2: Satisfactory	3: Good	4: Excellent
Similarity Percentage	• Non or very minimal (less than 2 chapters) have been verified for similarities percentage using *Turnitin*, and endorsed by supervisor, with each chapter having less than 20% each.	• Not all chapters (less than 4) have been verified for similarities percentage using *Turnitin*, and endorsed by supervisor, with each chapter having less than 20% each.	• Not all chapters have been verified for similarities percentage using *Turnitin*, and endorsed by supervisor, with each chapter having less than 20% each.	• All chapters have been verified for similarities percentage using *Turnitin*, and endorsed by supervisor, with each chapter having less than 20% each.
Submission	• Does not follow all submissions (form/ report) process, procedure and deadline	• Somewhat follow submissions (form/ report) process, procedure and deadline	• Follow submissions (form/ report) process, procedure and deadline	• Follow all submissions (form/ report) process, procedure and deadline

Notes:

Mark calculation:

e.g.: *Section B(1) – Supervisor (10 %)*

If mark given is 1: 1/4*10 = 2.5 %

If mark given is 2: 2/4 *10 = 5.0 %

If mark given is 3: 3/4*10 = 7.5 %

If mark given is 4: 4/4 *10 = 10.0 %