



EXAMINATION AND GRADUATION DIVISION
ACADEMIC AND ADMINISTRATION SERVICES DEPARTMENT
UNIVERSITI MALAYA, 50603 KUALA LUMPUR
Email: bpp_aasd@um.edu.my

CONFIRMATION DEFENCE EVALUATION
[For Doctor of Philosophy programme fast track candidates only]

Note:

1. The objective of the defence is to evaluate the candidate's research progress.
2. This form is to be completed by the panel of assessor in response to a candidate's confirmation defence.
3. The panel of assessors would have received and read the candidate's written proposal in order to be able to support the confirmation.

Candidate's Details			
Name:		Matric Number:	
Mode of Study:	<input type="checkbox"/> Full Time	<input type="checkbox"/> Part Time	Current Semester:
Title of Thesis:			
Date of Presentation:			
Supervisor (s):			

Marking Rubric

UNSATISFACTORY (unacceptable & requires major revision)	SATISFACTORY (acceptable with major revision)	GOOD (acceptable with minor revisions)	EXCELLENT (acceptable with minor or no revision)	MARKS OBTAINED
0 – 4	5 – 6	7 – 8	9 – 10	
Title and Abstract (5%)				
<p>The title does not reflect the proposal.</p> <p>The abstract fail to address the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ the research purpose and objectives ▪ summarize methods used ▪ highlight the research gap 	<p>The title reflects the proposal to some extent.</p> <p>The abstract attempt to address most of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ the research purpose and objectives ▪ summarize methods used ▪ highlight the research gap 	<p>The title appropriately reflects the proposal.</p> <p>The abstract addresses all of the following clearly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ the research purpose and objectives ▪ summarize methods used ▪ highlight the research gap 	<p>The title aptly reflects the proposal.</p> <p>The abstract addresses all of the following very clearly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ the research purpose and objectives ▪ summarize methods used ▪ highlight the research gap 	<p>(scale given / 10) * 5</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Marks:</p>
Introduction (15%)				
<p>The introduction fails to address the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ problem/issues ▪ overview of a research framework ▪ research questions /objectives ▪ significance of the study ▪ operational terms/ definitions (if applicable) 	<p>The introduction attempts to address most of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ problem/issues ▪ overview of a research framework ▪ research questions /objectives ▪ significance of the study ▪ operational terms/ definitions (if applicable) 	<p>The introduction addresses all the following appropriately:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ problem/issues ▪ overview of a research framework ▪ research questions /objectives ▪ significance of the study ▪ operational terms/ definitions (if applicable) 	<p>The introduction addresses all the following very clearly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ problem/issues ▪ overview of a research framework ▪ research questions /objectives ▪ significance of the study ▪ operational terms/ definitions (if applicable) 	<p>(scale given / 10) * 15</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Marks:</p>
Literature review (20%)				
<p>The review fails to address the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Narrative integrates critical and logical details from the peer-reviewed theoretical and research literature. • Attention is given to different perspectives, threats to 	<p>The review attempts to address most of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Narrative integrates critical and logical details from the peer-reviewed theoretical and research literature. • Attention is given to different perspectives, threats to 	<p>The review appropriately addresses all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Narrative integrates critical and logical details from the peer-reviewed theoretical and research literature. • Attention is given to different perspectives, threats to 	<p>The review aptly addresses all the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Narrative integrates critical and logical details from the peer-reviewed theoretical and research literature. • Attention is given to different perspectives, threats to 	<p>(scale given / 10) * 20</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Marks:</p>

UNSATISFACTORY (unacceptable & requires major revision)	SATISFACTORY (acceptable with major revision)	GOOD (acceptable with minor revisions)	EXCELLENT (acceptable with minor or no revision)	MARKS OBTAINED
0 – 4	5 – 6	7 – 8	9 – 10	
validity, and opinion vs. evidence.	validity, and opinion vs. evidence.	validity, and opinion vs. evidence.	validity, and opinion vs. evidence.	
Conceptual Framework / Methods / Approach (20%)				
The descriptions of the conceptual framework and methodology fails to address the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • theoretical framework • research sample, sample procedure and technique instrumentation • data collection procedures • data analysis method • Research validity and reliability 	The descriptions of the conceptual framework and methodology attempts to address most of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • theoretical framework • research sample, sample procedure and technique instrumentation • data collection procedures • data analysis method • Research validity and reliability 	The descriptions of the conceptual framework and methodology appropriately address all of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • theoretical framework • research sample, sample procedure and technique instrumentation • data collection procedures • data analysis method • Research validity and reliability 	The descriptions of the conceptual framework and methodology aply address all of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • theoretical framework • research sample, sample procedure and technique instrumentation • data collection procedures • data analysis method • Research validity and reliability 	(scale given / 10) * 20 Marks:
Preliminary Results and Discussion (15%)				
The preliminary analyses and results fail to illustrate the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • align with the research questions / hypotheses raised. • show or has indication of partial fulfilment of the research objectives. interpreted and organized well 	The analyses and results illustrate most of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • align with the research questions / hypotheses raised. • show or has indication of fulfilment of the research objectives. interpreted and organized well 	The analyses and results appropriately illustrate all of the following : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • align with the research questions / hypotheses raised. • show fulfilment of the research objectives. interpreted and organized well 	The analyses and results aply illustrate all of the following : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • align with the research questions / hypotheses raised. • show fulfilment of the research objectives • interpreted and organized well. • The candidate also critically uses the best available analytical techniques and/or appropriately proposes new ones 	(scale given / 10) * 15 Marks:

UNSATISFACTORY (unacceptable & requires major revision)	SATISFACTORY (acceptable with major revision)	GOOD (acceptable with minor revisions)	EXCELLENT (acceptable with minor or no revision)	MARKS OBTAINED
0 – 4	5 – 6	7 – 8	9 – 10	
Summary / Conclusion (5%)				
The summary / conclusion fail to address the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clear summary of preliminary findings ▪ Defence demonstrates a candidate's readiness for the research standard expected at PhD level. 	The summary / conclusion attempts to address most of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clear summary of the preliminary findings ▪ Defence demonstrates a candidate's readiness for the research standard expected at PhD level. 	The summary / conclusion appropriately addresses the following : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clear summary of the preliminary findings ▪ Defence demonstrates a candidate's readiness for the research expected standard at PhD level. 	The summary / conclusion aptly addresses all of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clear and concise summary of the preliminary findings ▪ Defence demonstrates a candidate's readiness for the research expected standard at PhD level. 	(scale given / 10) * 5 Marks:
Academic Style, Language and References (10%)				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No consistent use of style for references, in-text citations, proposal structure and specific mechanics. • The academic language carries inappropriate tone and use of vague as well as inaccurate terminology, expressions and signposting. Language inaccuracies impede the readability of the proposal. • Significant editing needed. • Several errors per paragraph and informal language used in multiple instances • The reference list is incomplete and inaccurate. • No adherence to word limit; not more than 500 words (abstract), 7,000 words (proposal report excluding reference) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inconsistent use of style for references, in-text citations, proposal structure and specific mechanics. • The academic language clearly lacks formal and objective tone and use of clear, precise and accurate terminology, expressions and signposting. Language inaccuracies impede the full understanding of the proposal. • Moderate editing needed. • The reference list is incomplete and / or contains some inaccuracies. • Adherence to word limit; not more than 500 words (abstract), 7,000 words (proposal report excluding reference) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slightly lacking in consistent use of style for references, in-text citations, proposal structure and specific mechanics. • The academic language slightly lacks formal and objective tone and use of clear, precise and accurate terminology, expressions and signposting. Some language errors are present but they do not affect a full understanding of the proposal. • The reference list is mostly complete and accurate. • Adherence to word limit; not more than 500 words (abstract), 7,000 words (proposal report excluding reference) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent use of style for references, in-text citations, proposal structure and specific mechanics. • The academic language demonstrates formal and objective tone and use of clear, precise and accurate terminology, expressions and signposting. There might be minimal first draft slips. • The reference list is complete and accurate. • Adherence to word limit; not more than 500 words (abstract); 7,000 words (proposal report excluding reference) 	(scale given / 10) * 10 Marks:

UNSATISFACTORY (unacceptable & requires major revision)	SATISFACTORY (acceptable with major revision)	GOOD (acceptable with minor revisions)	EXCELLENT (acceptable with minor or no revision)	MARKS OBTAINED
0 – 4	5 – 6	7 – 8	9 – 10	
Communication / Presentation (Q&A) (10%)				
<p>The candidate fails to demonstrate the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Present research information in almost no logical sequence. Express ideas clearly, fluently, and confidently. Not able to answer most of the questions asked. 	<p>The candidate attempts to demonstrate most of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Present research information in less logical sequence. Express ideas clearly, fluently, and confidently. Able to answer questions asked. 	<p>The candidate demonstrates all the following appropriately:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Present research information in sequence that can be followed. Express ideas clearly, fluently, and confidently. Good ability to answer questions asked. 	<p>The candidate demonstrates all the following very clearly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Present research information in a logical, interesting and effective sequence and easy to follow. Express ideas clearly, fluently, and confidently. Very good ability to answer questions asked. 	<p>(scale given / 10) * 10</p> <p>Marks:</p>
*TOTAL MARKS:				

*Note – Based on UM grading scheme, the passing mark is 65.00 and above.

Marking Scheme

Marks	Grade	Grade Point	Interpretation
90.00 – 100.00	A+	4.00	PASS
80.00 – 89.99	A	4.00	
75.00 – 79.99	A-	3.70	
70.00 – 74.99	B+	3.30	
65.00 – 69.99	B	3.00	
0.00 – 64.99	FAIL and Repeat Confirmation Defence Seminar Or Recommended for Master's Degree		

Originality

*Turnitin – Similarity Index Percentage : _____ %

*Please refer to the University/Faculty guideline for the acceptable similarity index percentage.

Overall Comments

Signature : _____
Name : _____
Date : _____
Official Stamp : _____