

Article Honorarium

Performance Areas	Excellent [10-7 Marks]	Good [6-4 Marks]	Needs Improvement [3-2 Marks]	Unacceptable [1-0 Marks]	MARKS
<i>Content/Development (50%)</i>	<p>Essay has a specific central idea and arguments that is clearly stated in the opening paragraph; appropriate, concrete details support the central idea and show originality and focus.</p> <p>(40%-50%)</p>	<p>Central idea is vague; somewhat sketchy and non-supportive to the topic; lacks focus.</p> <p>(30%-39%)</p>	<p>Unable to find specific supporting details more than 2-3 errors in information.</p> <p>(20%-29%)</p>	<p>Essay had no central idea or supporting details.</p> <p>(0%-19%)</p>	
<i>Accuracy of Content (20%)</i>	<p>Essay is logically organised and well-structured displaying a beginning, a body, and a conclusion. Critical thinking skills are evident.</p> <p>Cited researched information; introduced personal ideas to enhance essay cohesiveness.</p> <p>(15%-20%)</p>	<p>Essay somewhat digresses from the central idea; ideas do not logically follow each other.</p> <p>Some research of the topic was done but was inconclusive to support topic.</p> <p>(10%-14%)</p>	<p>Central point and flow of essay is lost; lacks organization and continuity.</p> <p>Did little or no gathering of information on the topic; did not cite information.</p> <p>(5%-9%)</p>	<p>Ideas were unorganized and vague; no particular flow was followed.</p> <p>No research of the topic was done.</p> <p>(0%-4%)</p>	

<i>Language (10%)</i>	Writing is smooth, coherent, and consistent with central idea. Sentences are strong and expressive with varied structure. Diction is consistent and words well-chosen. (10%-8%)	Sentences are varied and inconsistent with central idea, vocabulary, and word choices. (7%-6%)	Lacks creativity and focus. Unrelated work choice to central idea. Diction is inconsistent. (5%-3%)	Writing is confusing, hard to follow. Contains fragment and/or run-on sentences. In appropriate diction. (0%-2%)	
<i>Grammar (10%)</i>	Professional and technically accurate technical language with an appropriately formal tone used throughout. Correct use of grammar, spelling and punctuation throughout. (10%-8%)	Some misuse of grammar, spelling and punctuation but limited impact on readability. (7%-6%)	Use of informal tone and language. Technical language sometimes used incorrectly. Misuse of grammar, spelling and punctuation that mars the quality of the prose. (5%-3%)	Regular misuse of grammar, spelling and punctuation leading to difficulty in discerning meaning. Informal tone and language used often. (0%-2%)	
<i>Use of Reference (10%)</i>	Appropriate use of recommended referencing style. (10%-8%)	Inconsistent use of prescribed referencing style. (7%-6%)	Insufficient use of the recommended referencing style. (5%-3%)	No references provided. (0%-2%)	
TOTAL MARKS (100 Marks)					

Infographic Competition

Performance Areas	Excellent [10-7 Marks]	Good [6-4 Marks]	Needs Improvement [3-2 Marks]	Unacceptable [1-0 Marks]	MARKS
Content and technicality (50%)	Thorough, detailed illustration of theme and many detailed examples related to the Malaysia Palm Oil industry in contributing to towards Malaysia's UN SDGs. (40%-50%)	Somewhat detailed illustration of theme and few if any examples given related to the Malaysia Palm Oil industry in contributing to towards Malaysia's UN SDGs. (30%-39%)	Lacking detailed illustration of theme, lacking detailed examples related to the Malaysia Palm Oil industry in contributing to towards Malaysia's UN SDGs. (20%-29%)	Little or no illustration of theme and little or no examples related to the Malaysia Palm Oil industry in contributing to towards Malaysia's UN SDGs. (0%-19%)	
Poster design & Layout (30%)	The infographic is exceptionally attractive in terms of design, layout, and neatness. The overall organization and use of colour and space make the poster interesting. (30%-25%)	The infographic is attractive in terms of design, layout, and neatness. Colour and space use is good but a little disorganized. (20%-24%)	The infographic is acceptably attractive though it may be a bit messy. (15%-19%)	The infographic is distractingly messy or very poorly designed. It is not attractive. (0%-14%)	
Language (10%)	Technical and comprehensive. Short and precise points provided. (98%-10%)	Technical but not comprehensive. (6%-7%)	Minimal technical points and general points are provided. (4%-5%)	No technical points provided and language used needs plenty of improvement. (0%-3%)	
Support on social media (10%)	Available in Facebook and Instagram. Have hashtags #SustainableMalaysianPalmOil2023 (10%)	Available in Facebook or Instagram. Have hashtags #SustainableMalaysianPalmOil2023 (8%)	Available in Facebook or Instagram. (5%)	Not available in Facebook or Instagram. No hashtag #SustainableMalaysianPalmOil2023 (0%)	
TOTAL MARKS (100 Marks)					

Video Competition

Performance Areas	Excellent [10-7 Marks]	Good [6-4 Marks]	Needs Improvement [3-2 Marks]	Unacceptable [1-0 Marks]	MARKS
Content (50%)	The scientific context and relevance to the topic of discussion are clearly established and explicitly used to justify the research. Clear evidence of the necessity for this research is presented with consideration of relevant holistic aspects. The scope, limitations and place within the field of endeavour are made clear. 40%-50%	A well-developed topic of discussion has been clearly identified with links to the engineering/science context and any relevant holistic aspect. 30%-39%	The scientific/engineering context and relevance of the topic of discussion are described and linked to the research problem. The need for the research is stated and where appropriate its professional/environmental/ethical/cultural impact (i.e. holistic aspects) have been considered. 20%-29%	The research problem is not clearly or adequately explained, justified, and or/linked to a scientific/engineering context. 0%-19%	
Design (30%)	The video is exceptionally attractive in terms of design, layout, and neatness. The overall organization and use of colour and space make the video interesting. 25%-30%	The video is attractive in terms of design, layout, and neatness. Colour and space use is good but a little disorganized. 20%-24%	The video is acceptably attractive though it may be a bit messy. 10%-19%	The video is distractingly messy or very poorly designed. It is not attractive. 0%-9%	
Layout (20%)	All graphics are related to the topic and make it easier to understand. All borrowed graphics have a source of citation. The video consists information such as abstract, introduction, methodology, results, conclusions, and references.	All graphics are related to the topic and most make it easier to understand. All borrowed graphics have a source citation. Almost all the information required in the video such as abstract, introduction, methodology, results,	All graphics relate to the topic. Most borrowed graphics have a source citation. The video consists of missing more than 3 information of abstract, introduction,	Graphics do not relate to the topic or several borrowed graphics do not have a source citation. Most of this information are not available in the video (abstract, introduction, methodology, results, conclusions, references).	

	15%-20%	conclusions, references are available in the video. 10%-14%	methodology, results, conclusions, references. 5%-9%	0%-4%	
Language (10%)	Professional and technically accurate technical language with an appropriately formal tone used throughout. Correct use of grammar, spelling and punctuation throughout. 8%-10%	Some misuse of grammar, spelling and punctuation but limited impact on readability. Appropriate use of recommended referencing style. 6%-7%	Use of informal tone and language. Technical language sometimes used incorrectly. Misuse of grammar, spelling and punctuation that mars the quality of the prose. Inconsistent compliance with template and formatting. Inconsistent use of prescribed referencing style. 4%-5%	Regular misuse of grammar, spelling and punctuation leading to difficulty in discerning meaning. Informal tone and language used often. Non-compliance of template and formatting. Incorrect or insufficient use of the recommended referencing style. 0%-3%	
TOTAL MARKS (100 Marks)					