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# FAKULTI KEJURUTERAAN AWAM DAN ALAM BINA

# UNIVERSITI TUN HUSSEIN ONN MALAYSIA

**PENILAIAN KEMAJUAN PENYELIDIKAN (PFA)**

## EVALUATION OF RESEARCH PROGRESS (PFA)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Nama Pelajar*****Student's Name*** | **:** |
| **Nombor Matrik*****Matriculation No.*** | **:** |
| **Tajuk Projek*****Title of Project*** | **:** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Penilaian/ *Evaluation*** | **:** |

1. **Pembentangan/ *Presentation***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Perkara*****Item*** | **Pemberat*****Weightage*** | **Nilai / *Rating*\*****Sila Tanda / *Please Tick* [√]** | **Markah*****Mark*** |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| 1 | Kandungan dan Maklumat*Content and Information* | 6.0 |  |  |  |  |  | **/ 30** |
| 2 | Kualiti Pembentangan*Quality of Presentation* | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |  | **/ 20** |
| 3 | Penguasaan Pengetahuan*Mastery of Knowledge* | 5.0 |  |  |  |  |  | **/ 25** |
| 4 | Kemampuan Soal-Jawab*Aptitude and Verbal Ability* | 5.0 |  |  |  |  |  | **/ 25** |
| **JUMLAH/ *TOTAL*** | **/100** |

1. **Laporan/ *Report***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Perkara*****Item*** | **Pemberat*****Weightage*** | **Nilai/ *Rating* \*****Sila Tanda/ *Please Tick* [√]** | **Markah*****Mark*** |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| 1 | Abstrak*Abstract* | 2.0 |  |  |  |  |  | **/ 10** |
| 2 | Pengenalan*Introduction* | 2.0 |  |  |  |  |  | **/ 10** |
| 3 | Kajian Literatur*Literature Review* | 3.0 |  |  |  |  |  | **/ 15** |
| 4 | Metodologi Kajian*Research Methodology* | 3.0 |  |  |  |  |  | **/ 15** |
| 5 | Keputusan dan Perbincangan*Result and Discussion* | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |  | **/ 20** |
| 6 | Kesimpulan dan Cadangan*Conclusion and Recommendation* | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |  | **/ 20** |
| 7 | Rujukan*Reference* | 1.0 |  |  |  |  |  | **/ 5** |
| 8 | Format Penulisan*Writing Format* | 1.0 |  |  |  |  |  | **/ 5** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **JUMLAH/ *TOTAL*** | **/100** |

\* Sangat Lemah/ *Very Poor* [1]; Lemah/ *Poor* [2]; Sederhana/ *Fair* [3]; Baik/ *Good* [4]; Cemerlang/ *Excellent* [5]

**Komen / *Comment*:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Tandatangan*****Signature*** | **:** |
| **Nama Penilai*****Assessor's Name*** | **:** |
| **Tarikh*****Date*** | **:** |

**PANDUAN KEPADA PENYELIAAN/ PEMANTAUAN**

***GUIDELINES FOR SUPERVISION/MONITORING***

Bagi setiap aspek yang dinilai, sila pilih salah satu nilai, di antara 1 - 5 yang bertepatan dengan kriteria yang ditetapkan. Darabkan nilai dengan pemberat untuk mendapatkan markah bagi aspek berkenaan.

*For each aspect evaluated, please give a rating of 1 to 5, according to the stipulated criteria. Multiply the rating with its weightage to obtain the marks for each aspect.*

Berikut adalah panduan untuk menginterpretasi markah dan cadangan tindakan susulan dalam pemantauan terhadap kemajuan penyelidikan pelajar.

*Below is the guide for interpreting scores and the corresponding proposed action in evaluating the research progress of students.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Pelaksana*****User*** | **Markah*****Mark*** | **Interpretasi*****Interpretation*** | **Cadangan Tindakan Susulan*****Proposed Action*** |
| Penyelia*Supervisor* | ***<65******≥65*** | Kurang memuaskan*Unsatisfactory*Baik Satisfactory | Bincang kelemahan laporan projek dengan pelajar, perbaiki dan/atau pembentangan semula.*Discuss weaknesses, corrections and / or re-presentation with the student.*Diperakukan lulus*Approved* |
| Penilai*Assessor* | ***<65******≥65*** | Kurang memuaskan*Unsatisfactory*Baik*Satisfactory* | Bincang kelemahan laporan projek dengan pelajar, perbaiki dan/atau penilaian semula.*Discuss weaknesses, corrections and /or re-presentation with the student.*Diperakukan lulus*Approved* |

# PENILAIAN LAPORAN KEMAJUAN PENYELIDIKAN (PhD)

## EVALUATION OF RESEARCH PROGRESS (PhD)

Borang ini akan dikembalikan kepada pelajar untuk penambahbaikan. Sila sediakan komen yang komprehensif/ *This form will be returned to student for the improvement works*. *Please provide comprehensive comments.* Sila guna lampiran jika tidak mencukupi*/ Please use attachment if required.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Bab/ *Chapter*** | **Komen/ *Comment*** |
| 1 | Tajuk*Title* |  |
| 2 | Abstrak*Abstract* |  |
| 3 | Pengenalan*Introduction* |  |
| 4 | Kajian Literatur*Literature Review* |  |
| 5 | Kaedah Kajian*Research Methodology* |  |
| 6 | Keputusan dan Perbincangan *Results and Discussion* |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Bab / *Chapter*** | **Komen / *Comment*** |
| 7 | Kesimpulan dan Cadangan *Conclusion and Recommendation* |  |
| 8 | Rujukan*References* |  |
| 9 | Format Penulisan*Writing Format* |  |
| 10 | Terbitan*Publication* |   *Student’s article suitable to be published in (please tick one) :*1. *Journal*
2. *Proceeding*
3. *None of the above*
 |



FACULTY OF CIVIL ENGINEERING AND BUILT ENVIRONMENT

UNIVERSITI TUN HUSSEIN ONN MALAYSIA

 EVALUATION OF RESEARCH PROGRESS

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Description of instrument:

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

The functions of this instrument are as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| User | Functions of Instrument |
| Supervisor | (i) A guide for monitoring student progress in research implementationthroughout the semester.(ii) A guide for monitoring students’ writing progress throughout the semester(iii) A marking guide for approving thesis reports to the next level.Note: Supervisors will receive instruments upon appointment by the faculty. |
| Assessor | A marking guide for approving thesis reports to the next level.Note: Assessors will receive instruments upon appointment by the faculty. |

ASSESSMENT GUIDELINES

1) This instrument comprises EIGHT key areas as well as three aspects of presentation to be evaluated.

2) For each aspect evaluated, please give a rating of 1 to 5, according to the stipulated criteria.

3) Multiply the rating with its weightage to obtain the marks for each aspect.

4) Add all the marks (3 parts) to get the total score.

5) Sign in the given column.

GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATING THESIS

Below is the guide for interpreting scores and the corresponding proposed action when this instrument is used in evaluating thesis.

User Marks

Obtained

Interpretation Proposed Action

Supervisor <65 Unsatisfactory Discuss weaknesses, corrections and /

or re-presentation with the student

≥65 Satisfactory Approved

Assessor <65 Unsatisfactory Discuss weaknesses, corrections and /

or re-presentation with the student

≥65 Satisfactory Approved

**PRESENTATION**

1.0 CONTENT AND INFORMATION (30%) PLO6

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Rating | Weightage |
|  Integrate information for long life learning:* Structure of content is very systematic
* Information is very solid
* Its sources are from verified journals or original sources, relevant and up to date literature
 | Excellent[5] | 6 |
|  Integrate information for long life learning:* Structure of content is systematic
* Information is solid
* Its sources of reference are from verified journals or original
* sources, relevant and up to date literature
 | Good[4] | 6 |
|  Integrate information for long life learning:* Structure of content is satisfactory
* Information is satisfactory
* Its sources of reference are from verified journals or original sources, relevant and up to date literature
 | Fair[3] | 6 |
|  Integrate information for long life learning:* Structure of content is unsystematic
* Information is not solid
* I Its sources of reference are from verified journals or original sources, relevant and up to date literature
 | Poor[2] | 6 |
| Integrate information for long life learning:* Structure of content is are not consistent
* Information is very weak
* I Its sources of reference are from verified journals or original sources, relevant and up to date literature
 | Very Poor[1] | 6 |

2.0 QUALITY OF PRESENTATION (20%)PLO 9

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Rating | Weightage |
|  Demonstrate effective communication skill via oral  presentation* + Presentation is very solid and fully cover the main content
	+ Content arrangement is very good
	+ Time management is very good
	+ Shows a very good confidence level, eye contact and posture.
 | Excellent[5] | 4 |
| Demonstrate effective communication skill via oral presentation* Presentation is solid and almost fully cover the main content
* Content arrangement is good
* Time management is good
* Shows a good confidence level, eye contact and posture.
 | Good[4] | 4 |
| Demonstrate effective communication skill via oral presentation* + Presentation is satisfactory and partially cover the main content
	+ Content arrangement is satisfactory
	+ Time management is satisfactory
	+ Shows a satisfactory confidence level, eye contact and posture.
 | Fair[3] | 4 |
| Demonstrate effective communication skill via oral presentation* Presentation is not solid and almost not cover the main content
* Content arrangement is poor
* Time management is poor
* Shows a poor confidence level, eye contact and posture.
 | Poor[2] | 4 |
| Demonstrate effective communication skill via oral presentation* Presentation is very weak and not cover the main content
* No time management at all
* Shows a very weak confidence level, eye contact and posture.
 | Very Poor[1] | 4 |

3.0 MASTERY OF KNOWLEDGE (25%) PLO 1

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Rating | Weightage |
|  Demonstrated contributing to research that broadens the frontier  of knowledge in the relevant field * Show the high ability in mastering of knowledge.
* Know highly detail on study was conducted
	+ Show the high ability to undertake and analysis the problem
* with true method of evaluation, supporting by the literature
	+ High ability to justify the importance/contribution of the

study | Excellent[5] | 5 |
|  Demonstrated contributing to research that broadens the frontier  of knowledge in the relevant field * Show the ability in mastering of knowledge.
	+ Know detail on study was conducted
	+ Show the ability to undertake and analysis the problem

 with true method of evaluation, supporting by the literature * + Able to justify the importance/contribution of the study
 | Good[4] | 5 |
|  Demonstrated contributing to research that broadens the frontier  of knowledge in the relevant field * + Show the less ability in mastering of knowledge.
	+ Know less detail on study was conducted
	+ Show less ability to undertake and analysis the problem with true method of evaluation, supporting by the literature
	+ Weak ability to give justification for the results
	+ Know less detail the Importance/contribution of the study
 | Fair[3] | 5 |
|  Demonstrated contributing to research that broadens the frontier  of knowledge in the relevant field * + Show the no ability in mastering of knowledge.
	+ Know less on study was conducted
	+ Show no ability to undertake and analysis the problem with true method of evaluation, supporting by the literature
	+ Very weak ability to justify the importance/contribution of the study
 | Poor[2] | 5 |
|  Demonstrated contributing to research that broadens the frontier  of knowledge in the relevant field * + Does not mastering of knowledge.
	+ Does not know on study was conducted
	+ Does not know to undertake and analysis with true method of evaluation, supporting by the literature
	+ Not able to justify the importance/contribution of the study
 | Very Poor[1] | 5 |

4.0 ATITUDE AND VERBAL ABILITY (25%) PLO11

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Rating | Weightage |
| Ability to answer technical questions in a concise and precise manner.• Able to answer all questions very effectively• The answers given are highly relevant* Able to elaborate the answer with highly relevant supporting sources
 | Excellent[5] | 5 |
| Ability to answer technical questions in a concise and precise manner.* + Able to answer all questions effectively
	+ The answers given are relevant
	+ Able to elaborate the answer with relevant supporting sources
 | Good[4] | 5 |
| Ability to answer technical questions in a concise and precise manner.* + Able to answer all questions moderately well
	+ Some of the answers given are irrelevant
* Elaborate the answer with irrelevant supporting
 | Fair[3] | 5 |
| • Unable to answer some questions | Poor[2] | 5 |
| • Unable to answer all questions | Very Poor[1] | 5 |

**REPORT**

1. ABSTRACT (10%) – PLO1

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Rating | Weightage | Marks (Rati ng XWeightage) | Signature |
| There are statements that very clearly include the following:• Background of research.• Purpose / objectives of research.• Methodology.• Results.• Conclusion. | Excellent[5] | 2.0 |  |  |
| There are statements that clearly include the following:• Background of research.• Purpose / objectives of research.• Methodology.• Results.• Conclusion. | Good[4] | 2.0 |  |  |
| There are statements that satisfactorily include the following:• Background of research.• Purpose / objectives of research.• Methodology.• Results.• Conclusion. | Fair[3] | 2.0 |  |  |
| There are statements that vaguely include the following:• Background of research.• Purpose / objectives of research.• Methodology.• Results.• Conclusion. | Poor[2] | 2.0 |  |  |
| There are no statements that include the following:• Background of research.• Purpose / objectives of research.• Methodology.• Results.• Conclusion. | Very Poor[1] | 2.0 |  |  |

2. INTRODUCTION (10%) - PLO1

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Rating | Weightage |
| Originality of research is well demonstrated contributing to research that broadens the frontier of knowledge in the relevant field; through very clearly defined:• The analytical of problem being investigated (objectives/questions/ hypotheses)• Supporting literature• Justification for the study• Importance / contribution of the study• Limitations / scope of the study | Excellent[5] | 2.0 |
| Originality of research is well demonstrated contributing to research that broadens the frontier of knowledge in the relevant field; through clearly defined:• The analytical of problem being investigated (objectives/questions/ hypotheses)• Supporting literature• Justification for the study• Importance / contribution of the study• Limitations / scope of the study | Good[4] | 2.0 |
| Originality of research is well demonstrated contributing to research that broadens the frontier of knowledge in the relevant field; through satisfactory defined:• The analytical of problem being investigated (objectives/questions/ hypotheses)• Supporting literature• Justification for the study• Importance / contribution of the study• Limitations / scope of the study | Fair[3] | 2.0 |
| Originality of research is well demonstrated contributing to research that broadens the frontier of knowledge in the relevant field; through vaguely defined:• The analytical of problem being investigated (objectives/questions/ hypotheses)• Supporting literature• Justification for the study• Importance / contribution of the study• Limitations / scope of the study | Poor[2] | 2.0 |
| There are no statements on the originality of research that include the following:• The problem being investigated (objectives / questions / hypotheses)• Supporting literature• Justification for the study• Importance of the study• Limitations / scope of the study | Very Poor[1] | 2.0 |

3. LITERATURE REVIEW (15%) – PLO1

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Rating | Weightage |
| Specialized research approaches on the solutions to the problems in the relevant field are generated using scientific skills through:• Very relevant and comprehensive literature review.• Critically written literature review.• Relevant and up to date literature.• Its sources of reference are extremely reliable (from verified journals or original sources), relevant, balance and up to date literature. | Excellent[5] | 3.0 |
| Specialized research approaches on the solutions to the problems in the relevant field are generated using scientific skills through:• Relevant and comprehensive literature review.• Well written literature review.• Relevant and up to date literature.• Its sources of reference are reliable (from verified journals or original sources), relevant, balance and up to date literature. | Good[4] | 3.0 |
| Specialized research approaches on the solutions to the problems in the relevant field are generated using scientific skills through:• Only slightly relevant and slightly comprehensive literature review.• General terms written literature review.• Its sources of reference are less reliable. | Fair[3] | 3.0 |
| Specialized research approaches on the solutions to the problems in the relevant field are generated using scientific skills through:• Irrelevant literature review.• Not well written literature review.• Its sources of reference are unreliable. | Poor[2] | 3.0 |
| Specialized research approaches on the solutions to the problems in the relevant field are generated using scientific skills through:• Irrelevant literature review.• Poorly written literature review.• Does not have any suitable sources of reference | Very Poor[1] | 3.0 |

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY (15%) – PLO3

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Rating | Weightage |
| Conduct practical work skills professionally with minimal supervision and adhere to legal, ethical and professional codes of practice demonstrated by: • Highly adhering to established procedures and processes (including ethics).• Selecting highly suitable techniques, methods etc. for achieving research objectives.• Giving great detail justifications for research techniques, methods, procedures etc. | Excellent[5] | 3.0 |
| Conduct practical work skills professionally with minimal supervision and adhere to legal, ethical and professional codes of practice demonstrated by: • Adhering to established procedures and processes (including ethics).Selecting good techniques, methods etc. for achieving research objectives.• Giving detail justifications for research techniques, methods, procedures etc. | Good[4] | 3.0 |
| Conduct practical work skills professionally with minimal supervision and adhere to legal, ethical and professional codes of practice demonstrated by: • Less adhering to established procedures and processes (including ethics).Selecting suitable techniques, methods etc. for achieving research objectives.• Giving general terms justifications for research techniques, methods, procedures etc. | Fair[3] | 3.0 |
| Conduct practical work skills professionally with minimal supervision and adhere to legal, ethical and professional codes of practice demonstrated by: • Not adhering to established procedures and processes (including ethics).• Selecting less suitable techniques, methods etc. for achieving research objectives.• Giving not very well justifications for research techniques, methods, procedures etc. | Poor[2] | 3.0 |
| Conduct practical work skills professionally with minimal supervision and adhere to legal, ethical and professional codes of practice demonstrated by: • Not state procedures and processes.• Not state techniques, methods etc. for achieving research objectives.• Not state justifications for research techniques, methods, procedures etc. | Very Poor[1] | 3.0 |

5. RESULT AND DISCUSSION (20%) – PLO2

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Rating | Weightage |
| Conduct standard and specialized research approaches to innovative ideas through knowledge and understanding in latest development demonstrated by: • Data is analyzed using highly suitable methods• Data is presented using highly suitable techniques• Discussion of findings is highly structured and critical, taking into account the findings of previous researchers• Interpretation of findings is very accurate and is comprehensively linked to the overall objectives / hypotheses | Excellent[5] | 4.0 |
| Conduct standard and specialized research approaches to innovative ideas through knowledge and understanding in latest development demonstrated by • Data is analyzed using good methods• Data is presented using good techniques• Discussion of findings is structured and critical, taking into account the findings of previous researchers• Interpretation of findings is accurate and is linked to the objectives / hypotheses | Good[4] | 4.0 |
| Conduct standard and specialized research approaches to innovative ideas through knowledge and understanding in latest development demonstrated by• Data is analyzed using satisfactory methods• Data is presented using satisfactory techniques• Discussion of findings is structured and critical, taking into account the findings of previous researchers• Interpretation of findings is good and is linked to the objectives /hypotheses | Fair[3] | 4.0 |
| Conduct standard and specialized research approaches to innovative ideas through knowledge and understanding in latest development demonstrated by• Data is analyzed using methods that are not quite suitable• Data is presented using techniques that are not quite suitable• Discussion of findings is inadequately structured and critical, and did not take into account the findings of previous researchers• Interpretation of findings is not linked to the objectives / hypotheses | Poor[2] | 4.0 |
| Conduct standard and specialized research approaches to innovative ideas through knowledge and understanding in latest development demonstrated by• Data is analyzed using unsuitable methods• Data is presented using unsuitable techniques• Discussion of findings is unstructured and uncritical• The findings are not interpreted | Very Poor[1] | 4.0 |

6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS (20%) – PLO2

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Rating | Weightage |
| Relate knowledge and understanding in latest development in the relevant field demonstrated by: • The conclusion very clearly describes the key findings of the study• The conclusion is highly consistent with and is linked to the objectives of the study• The proposed follow-up actions are extremely significant | Excellent[5] | 4.0 |
| Relate knowledge and understanding in latest development in the relevant field demonstrated by: • The conclusion clearly describes the key findings of the study• The conclusion is consistent with and is linked to the objectives of the study• The proposed follow-up actions are significant | Good[4] | 4.0 |
| Relate knowledge and understanding in latest development in the relevant field demonstrated by: • The conclusion satisfactorily describes the key findings of the study• The conclusion is satisfactory and is linked to the objectives of the study• The proposed follow-up actions are satisfactory | Fair[3] | 4.0 |
| Relate knowledge and understanding in latest development in the relevant field demonstrated by: • The conclusion vaguely describes the key findings of the study• The conclusion is not quite suitable• The proposed follow-up actions are not quite suitable | Poor[2] | 4.0 |
| Relate knowledge and understanding in latest development in the relevant field demonstrated by: • The conclusion does not describe the key findings of the study• The conclusion is unsuitable• The proposed follow-up actions are unsuitable | Very Poor[1] | 4.0 |

7. REFERENCE (5%) – PLO6

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Rating | Weightage |
| Manage information by using suitable digital technologies and appropriate software demonstrated by: • Sources of reference are very reliable (from verified journals or original sources)• All sources of citations are stated in the text and in the list of references• References are written according to the prescribed format | Excellent[5] | 1.0 |
| Manage information by using suitable digital technologies and appropriate software demonstrated by: • Sources of reference are reliable (from verified journals or original sources)• All sources of citations are stated in the text and in the list of references• References are written according to the prescribed format | Good[4] | 1.0 |
| Manage information by using suitable digital technologies and appropriate software demonstrated by: • Sources of reference are suitable (from verified journals or original sources)• All sources of citations are stated in the text and in the list of references• References are written according to the prescribed format | Fair[3] | 1.0 |
| Manage information by using suitable digital technologies and appropriate software demonstrated by: • Sources of reference are not very reliable• Not all sources of citations are stated in the text and in the list of references• References are written according to the prescribed format | Poor[2] | 1.0 |
| Manage information by using suitable digital technologies and appropriate software demonstrated by: • Sources of reference are unreliable• None of the sources of citations are stated in the text and in the list of references• References are not written according to the prescribed format | Very Poor[1] | 1.0 |

8. LANGUAGE AND WRITING STYLE (5%) – PLO11

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Rating | Weightage |
| Demonstrate adherence to legal, ethical and professional codes of practice demonstrated by: • Follows the format of UTHM’s Thesis Writing Guide very closely• Uses a very good and consistent writing style• There is continuity and a very accurate unity of ideas | Excellent[5] | 1.0 |
| Demonstrate adherence to legal, ethical and professional codes of practice demonstrated by: • Follows the format of UTHM’s Thesis Writing Guide closely• Uses a good and consistent writing style• There is continuity and an accurate unity of ideas | Good[4] | 1.0 |
| Demonstrate adherence to legal, ethical and professional codes of practice demonstrated by: • Follows the format of UTHM’s Thesis Writing Guide reasonably• Uses an appropriate writing style• There is continuity and an reasonable unity of ideas | Fair[3] | 1.0 |
| Demonstrate adherence to legal, ethical and professional codes of practice demonstrated by: • Roughly follows the format of UTHM’s Thesis Writing Guide• Uses a not very appropriate writing style• Lacks continuity and unity of ideas | Poor[2] | 1.0 |
| Demonstrate adherence to legal, ethical and professional codes of practice demonstrated by: • Does not follow the format of UTHM’s Thesis Writing Guide• Uses an inappropriate writing style• There is no continuity and unity of ideas | Very Poor[1] | 1.0 |