



**FACULTY OF HOTEL AND TOURISM MANAGEMENT
UNIVERSITI TEKNOLOGI MARA
HTM655 UNDERGRADUATE PROJECT
(Creative / Innovative Product Project)**

**REPORT, PRODUCT,
PACKAGING AND PRESENTATION EVALUATION**

Student Name :

Student ID :

Program Code:

Topic :

.....

.....

Examiners

Name <i>(Examiner 1)</i>	:		Signature:
Name <i>(Examiner 2)</i>	:		Signature:
Name <i>(Examiner 3)</i>	:		Signature:

A: REPORT/ PRODUCT/PACKAGING EVALUATION (40%)

REPORT	INTRODUCTION					
STATEMENT	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	SCORE
Introduction	Absent, no evidence or very minimally stated	No clear introduction / main topic and the structure of the paper is missing	States the main topic but does not adequately preview the structure of the paper	States the main topic and previews the structure of the paper	Engaging, states the main topic and previews the structure of the paper	
Problem Statement	Absent, no evidence or very vaguely stated	Incomplete and/or unfocused	States the problem statement	Clearly states the problem statement	Clearly and concisely states the problem statement	
Research Objectives/ Question	Absent, no evidence or very vaguely stated	Incomplete and/or unfocused	States the research objective	Clearly states the research objective	Clearly and concisely states the research objective	
Significance Of Study Described In Terms Of Its Implication:						
a) Practical	Absent/Vague	Minimal	Adequate	Good	Excellent	
b) Academics	Absent/Vague	Minimal	Adequate	Good	Excellent	

LITERATURE REVIEW						
STATEMENT	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	SCORE
The review of related literature.....	Not/Vaguely related to the problem	Minimally related to the problem	Sufficiently related to the problem	Clearly related to the problem	Clearly and concisely related to the problem	
	Did not/Barely include current/latest related and most relevant literature	Minimally include current/latest related and most relevant literature	Adequately include current/latest related and most relevant literature	Highly include current/latest related and most relevant literature	Superiorly include current/latest related and most relevant literature	
	Did not/Barely demonstrate sound knowledge of literature in the area and of prior work on the problem	Minimally demonstrated sound knowledge of literature in the area and of prior work on the problem	Adequately demonstrated sound knowledge of literature in the area and of prior work on the problem	Highly demonstrated sound knowledge of literature in the area and of prior work on the problem	Excellent demonstrated sound knowledge of literature in the area and of prior work on the problem	

METHODOLOGY						
STATEMENT	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	SCORE
Methodology <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sample • Procedures • Measures • Data analytic plan (if applicable) 	Methodologies described are either not suited or poorly suited to test hypotheses. The methodology is under-developed and/or is not feasible.	Minimally identified appropriate methodologies and research techniques but many details are missing or vague. The methodology is largely incomplete	Sufficiently identified appropriate methodologies and research techniques but some details are missing or vague	Clearly identified appropriate methodologies and research techniques (e.g., justifies the sample, procedures, and measures). Data analytic plan is suitable to test study hypotheses. Provides appropriate justification for controls.	Concisely identified appropriate methodologies and research techniques (e.g., justifies the sample, procedures, and measures). Data analytic plan is suitable to test study hypotheses. Provides appropriate justification for controls.	

RESULT AND FINDINGS						
STATEMENT	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	SCORE
The analysis used was (if applicable)	Not / Lowly appropriate	Marginally appropriate	Adequately appropriate	Appropriate	Very appropriate	
The interpretation of the data (if applicable)	Not /Lowly accurate	Marginally accurate	Adequately accurate	Accurate	Highly accurate	
Discussion:	None/Lack of discussion of detail. Non/Lack of insight and analysis	Minimal discussion of detail. Insufficient insight and analysis	Adequate discussion of detail. Adequate depth of insight/analysis.	Clear discussion of details. Impressive depth of insight /analysis	Excellent discussion of details. Very Impressive depth of insight /analysis	
Findings:	None or little evidence of connection of findings to data, research question(s) and related literature, if present, not well developed	Some findings mentioned, but there are no connections to data, research question(s) or existing research	Sufficiently connected to data, research question(s) and related literature	Clearly connected to data, research question(s) and related literature	Clearly and concisely connected to data, research question(s) and related literature	

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION						
STATEMENT	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	SCORE
Recapitulation of findings and discussion	None/Little	Minimal	Adequate	Good	Excellent	
Inferences and Conclusion	Draw inferences and conclusion which are not justified and not supported by findings/outcome. Little discussion of findings or outcomes. Displayed poor grasp of material.	Draws reasonable conclusion from the research. Major concepts inaccurately described. Considerable relevant discussion missing. Conclusions not entirely supported by findings.	Draws adequately sound conclusion from the research. Discussion sufficient and with few errors. Conclusions based on outcomes and appropriate	Draws good conclusion from the research. Discussion sufficient and with only few errors. Conclusions based on outcomes and appropriate.	Draws excellent conclusion from the research. Discussion was superior, accurate, and engaging. Conclusions are appropriate and clearly based on outcomes	
Limitations are clearly addressed.	None/Little	Minimal	Adequate	Good	Excellent	
Future studies are clearly addressed.	None/Little	Minimal	Adequate	Good	Excellent	
Relevant recommendations are provided.	None/Little	Minimal	Adequate	Good	Excellent	

OVERALL ASSESMENT OF PROJECT						
STATEMENT	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	SCORE
Writing style and quality	Poor	Acceptable	Adequate	Good	Superior	
Grammar, clarity, and organization	Poorly written and confusing. Ideas are not communicated effectively.	Although unclear in some areas, writing is not as confusing. Ideas are moderately communicated	Ideas are communicated adequately. However, there are some grammatical errors. Many	Ideas are communicated effectively. The writing is grammatically correct, but some sections lack clarity.	Well written and ideas are well developed and explained. Sentences and paragraphs	

			sections lack clarity.		are grammatically correct. Uses subheadings appropriately.	
References and citations	Very poor and improper citations. Too many missing citations.	Lacks proper citations. Many missing citations.	Has several instances of improper use of citations. Contains several statements without appropriately citing.	Properly and explicitly cited following an accepted style (e.g. APA). May have a few instances in which proper citations are missing	Excellently and explicitly cited following an accepted style (e.g. APA). Reference list matches citations	
TOTAL						

PRODUCT EVALUATION

CRITERIA	Poor (1)	Acceptable (2)	Fair (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	SCORE
Product concept						
Product name						
Novelty						
Creativity						
Taste/Flavor						
Texture						
Appeal						
Overall acceptability						
Commercial value/marketability						
Cost/economic effectiveness						
TOTAL						

PACKAGING EVALUATION

CRITERIA	Poor (1)	Acceptable (2)	Adequate (3)	Good (4)	Superior (5)	SCORE
Design						
Content (information)						
Material suitability						
Size						
Creativity						
TOTAL						
The Total Mark of this section will be converted to 40% of the overall marks						

B: PRESENTATION EVALUATION (30%)

ORAL PRESENTATION AND DEFENSE OF PROJECT						
STATEMENT	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	SCORE
Disposal	Unprofessional	Minimally Professional	Somewhat Professional	Professional	Very Professional	
Oral Presentation	<p>Does not adequately defend research/project. Does not answer key questions</p> <p>Very frequently shows a need for deeper reflection on vital points.</p> <p>Reads the material from presentation entirely to make the report</p> <p>Is clearly not comfortable with the topic.</p> <p>Totally avoid eye contact with audience</p>	<p>Marginally defend research/ project. Does not fully answer key questions.</p> <p>Quite frequently shows a need for deeper reflection on vital points.</p> <p>Frequently reads the material from presentation to make the report</p> <p>Is somewhat not comfortable with the topic.</p> <p>Very minimal eye contact with audience</p>	<p>Adequately defends research/ project Answers questions, but often with little insight.</p> <p>Frequently shows a need for deeper reflection on minor points.</p> <p>Relies too much on presentation and has difficulty speaking freely to the audience</p> <p>Is somewhat comfortable with the topic.</p> <p>Minimal eye contact with audience</p>	<p>Competently defends research / project by providing very helpful answers to questions.</p> <p>May occasionally manifest need for further reflection on minor points.</p> <p>Uses presentation resources as a guide. Is easily understandable .</p> <p>Comfortable with the topic.</p> <p>Keeps appropriate eye contact with the audience.</p>	<p>Masterfully defends research/ project by providing clear and insightful answers to questions.</p> <p>Uses presentation resources as a guide.</p> <p>Gives detailed Explanations. Is easily understandable.</p> <p>Very comfortable with the topic.</p> <p>Maintain eye contact with audience at all time</p>	
Quality of Visual Aids Used	Poor quality, not easily interpretable, unfocused and inappropriate subject matters	Minimal quality, fairly easily interpretable,s ufficiently focused and appropriate to subject matters	Acceptable quality, quite easily interpretable, reasonably focused and appropriate to subject matters	High quality, easily interpretable, focused and appropriate to subject matters	Very high quality, very easily interpretable, very focused and appropriate to subject matters	
TOTAL						
The Total Mark of this section will be converted to 30% of the overall marks.						

