CENTRE FOR GRADUATE STUDIES
UNIVERSITI TUN HUSSEIN ONN MALAYSIA

PRESENTATION OF MASTER PROJECT
TWO SEMESTERS
(MASTER PROJECT EVALUATION 2)

Description of Instrument:

This assessment instrument is to be used by the supervisor, the assessor and students. Its purpose is to help improve the validity of the assessment system in terms of its reliability and transparency.

Master Programmes by Coursework

User	Functions of Instrument
Student	(i) A guide in preparing presentation of Master Project. (ii) Self assessment to evaluate readiness to do presentation **Note:** Student may obtain instruments from faculty
Supervisor	(i) A guide for monitoring student progress in preparing their thesis presentations.
Assessor	(i) A marking guide in evaluating the presentation of student theses. **Note: Assessors will receive instruments upon appointment by the faculty.**

GUIDELINES FOR USING THIS FORM

1. This instrument consists of two parts, each referring to an aspect of the presentation to be assessed.
2. For each aspect evaluated, please give a rating of 1 to 5, according to the stipulated criteria.
3. Multiply the rating by its weightage to obtain the marks for each aspect.
4. Add all the marks to get the total score.
5. Sign in the given column.

PRESENTATION OF MASTER PROJECT
TWO SEMESTERS
(MASTER PROJECT EVALUATION 2)

Name of Student :	....
Matric No. :	....
Faculty :	....
Title of Project :	....
	....
	....

1.0 PRESENTATION (50%)

Criteria	Rating	Weightage	Marks (Rating X Weightage)	Signature
• Presentation materials are **very systematic** and very interesting • Presentation is **very solid** • Time management is **very good**	Excellent [5]	10.0		
• Presentation materials are **systematic** and interesting • Presentation is **solid** • Time management is **good**	Good [4]	10.0		
• Presentation materials are **satisfactory** • Presentation is **satisfactory** • Time management is **satisfactory**	Fair [3]	10.0		
• Presentation materials are **unsystematic** • Presentation is **not solid** • Time management is **poor**	Poor [2]	10.0		
• Presentation materials **are not consistent** with the content • Presentation is **very weak** • **No** time management at all	Very Poor [1]	10.0		
Comments:				

2.0   QUESTIONS & ANSWERS (50%)

Criteria	Rating	Weightage	Marks (Rating X Weightage)	Signature
• Able to answer all questions **very effectively** • The answers given are **highly relevant**	Excellent [5]	10.0		
• Able to answer all questions **effectively** • The answers given are **relevant**	Good [4]	10.0		
• Able to answer all questions **moderately well** • Some of the answers given are **irrelevant**	Fair [3]	10.0		
• Unable to answer **some** questions	Poor [2]	10.0		
• Unable to answer **all** questions	Very Poor [1]	10.0		

Comments:

Total   **M2 =**   **/100**

Examiner's Name: ……………………………………………….   Position: Chairman / Panel

Signature: ……………………………………………   Date: …………………………………………