

STUDENT PROJECT EVALUATION RUBRIC

Evaluate the student's Project employing the following range-scored criteria (best is on right)

Performance indicators	Inadequate	Average	Admirable	Outstanding	Score
	1	2	3	4	
P1 1 Project Significance	Problem, aim and objectives were not identified and presented	Problem not clearly identified/inaccurate and explanation is too brief, aim and objectives were vague and not addressing research problem	Problem was identified and addressed in a satisfactory manner, aim and objectives were stated and presented the research problem in a satisfactory manner	Problem was clearly addressed, aim and objectives were clearly stated and strongly related to research problem	
P1 2 Adequacy of Engineering Component in the Project	Application of engineering elements such as design, synthesis, mathematical modelling, or simulation in the project is lacking.	Application of engineering elements such as design, synthesis, mathematical modelling, or simulation in the project is adequate.	Application of engineering elements such as design, synthesis, mathematical modelling, or simulation in the project is good.	Application of engineering elements such as design, synthesis, mathematical modelling, or simulation in the project is strongly used.	
P1 3 Literature Review - Relevance of information presented	The pieces of evidence are relevant and accurate, but are isolated, addressing one aspect of the project.	The evidence is relevant, accurate and covers several aspects of the project. Little evidence of an overall view of the causes.	The evidence presents a good appreciation of the general trust of the project. Good coverage with relevant and accurate support.	As in "Good" but with higher degree of originality and evidence of internalization into personal model of practice.	

1

Student Rubric

Performance indicators		Inadequate 1	Average 2	Admirable 3	Outstanding 4	Score
PI 4	Methodology - Accuracy of information presented and availability of equipments.	Methods are not described, or incorrectly described. Process flow of the experiments/simulations is confused.	Overview of methods is omitted, methodological details are emphasized. Process flow of the experiments/simulations is partly explained.	Methods are generally described. Process flow of the experiments / simulations that strengthen or contribute to results is explained.	Methods are clearly described. Process flow of the experiments/simulations that strengthen or contribute to results is strongly supported with suitable detail.	
PI 5	Use of modern tools/devices	Does not make use of analytical tools and/or devices relevant to the project	Employ some analytical tools and/or devices acquired.	Employ appropriate analytical tools and/or devices acquired in his course of study to the project at hand	Employ appropriate analytical tools and/or devices. Clearly demonstrates mastery of several areas of the curriculum	
PI 6	Results & explanations (figures, graphs, tables, etc.)	Some figures hard to read Some in inappropriate format Some explanations lacking	Majority of figures clear Majority appropriately formatted Reasonably explained	Most figures clear Most appropriately formatted Well explained	All figures clear All appropriately formatted Exceptionally explained	
PI 7	Planning of Project Activities	No project schedule provided	Project activities were poorly identified and not arranged practically in a project schedule with timeline	Project activities were identified but some were not arranged practically in a project schedule with timeline	Project activities were clearly identified and arranged practically in a project schedule with timeline	
PI 8	Originality	The work was entirely adapted for previous works	Most work was adapted from previous works, did not demonstrate creativity and critical thinking	Some work was adapted from previous work and/or demonstrated creativity and critical thinking in a satisfactory manner	The concept of the work is original/ novel and/or demonstrated creativity and critical thinking.	
PI 9	References	No references provided	Most references were not reliable (e.g internet content) and relevant	Some references were not reliable (e.g internet content) and relevant	All references were apparently reliable (e.g journals) and relevant	

(7)