



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

## PROPOSAL DEFENCE EVALUATION

### Note:

1. The objective of the defence is to evaluate the candidate's research proposal after completing the Research Methodology Course and as a fulfilment of the seminar presentation requirement no later than 2nd or 3rd semester. (Please refer to latest Guideline for Seminar Presentation)
2. This form is to be completed by the panel of assessors in response to a candidate making a progress update defence presentation. 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			
<b>Name:</b>		<b>Matric Number:</b>	
<b>Programme:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Doctoral	<input type="checkbox"/> Masters	
<b>Mode of Programme:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Research	<input type="checkbox"/> Mixed Mode	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Coursework	<input type="checkbox"/> Clinical	
<b>Mode of Study:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Full Time	<input type="checkbox"/> Part Time	<b>Current Semester:</b>
<b>Title of Thesis / Dissertation:</b>			
<b>Date of Presentation:</b>			
<b>Supervisor (s):</b>			

## 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	
<b>Title and Abstract (5%)</b>				
<p>The title does not reflect the proposal.</p> <p>The abstract <b>fail to address</b> the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ the research purpose and objectives</li> <li>▪ summarize methods used</li> <li>▪ highlight the research gap</li> </ul>	<p>The title reflects the proposal to some extent</p> <p>The abstract <b>attempt to address most</b> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ the research purpose and objectives</li> <li>▪ summarize methods used</li> <li>▪ highlight the research gap</li> </ul>	<p>The title appropriately reflects the proposal</p> <p>The abstract addresses all of the following clearly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ the research purpose and objectives</li> <li>▪ summarize methods used</li> <li>▪ highlight the research gap</li> </ul>	<p>The title aptly reflects the proposal.</p> <p>The abstract addresses all of the following very <b>clearly</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ the research purpose and objectives</li> <li>▪ summarize methods used</li> <li>▪ highlight the research gap</li> </ul>	<p>(scale given / 10) * 5</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Marks:</b></p>
<b>Introduction (25%)</b>				
<p>The introduction <b>fails to address</b> the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ problem/issues</li> <li>▪ overview of a research framework</li> <li>▪ research questions /objectives</li> <li>▪ significance of the study</li> <li>▪ operational terms/ definitions (if applicable)</li> </ul>	<p>The introduction <b>attempts to address most</b> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ problem/issues</li> <li>▪ overview of a research framework</li> <li>▪ research questions /objectives</li> <li>▪ significance of the study</li> <li>▪ operational terms/ definitions (if applicable)</li> </ul>	<p>The introduction addresses all the following appropriately:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ problem/issues</li> <li>▪ overview of a research framework</li> <li>▪ research questions /objectives</li> <li>▪ significance of the study</li> <li>▪ operational terms/ definitions (if applicable)</li> </ul>	<p>The introduction addresses all the following <b>very clearly</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ problem/issues</li> <li>▪ overview of a research framework</li> <li>▪ research questions /objectives</li> <li>▪ significance of the study</li> <li>▪ operational terms/ definitions (if applicable)</li> </ul>	<p>(scale given / 10) * 25</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Marks:</b></p>
<b>Literature review (25%)</b>				
<p>The <b>review fails to address</b> the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Narrative integrates critical and logical details from the peer-reviewed theoretical and research literature.</li> <li>• Attention is given to different perspectives, threats to</li> </ul>	<p>The review <b>attempts to address most</b> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Narrative integrates critical and logical details from the peer-reviewed theoretical and research literature.</li> <li>• Attention is given to different perspectives, threats to</li> </ul>	<p>The review appropriately addresses all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Narrative integrates critical and logical details from the peer-reviewed theoretical and research literature.</li> <li>• Attention is given to different perspectives, threats to</li> </ul>	<p>The review aptly addresses all the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Narrative integrates critical and logical details from the peer-reviewed theoretical and research literature.</li> <li>• Attention is given to different perspectives, threats to</li> </ul>	<p>(scale given / 10) * 25</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Marks:</b></p>

**CONFIDENTIAL  
(ASSESSOR SHEET)**

<b>UNSATISFACTORY</b> (unacceptable & requires major revision)	<b>SATISFACTORY</b> (acceptable with major revision)	<b>GOOD</b> (acceptable with minor revisions)	<b>EXCELLENT</b> (acceptable with minor or no revision)	<b>MARKS OBTAINED</b>
<b>0 – 4</b>	<b>5 – 6</b>	<b>7 – 8</b>	<b>9 – 10</b>	
validity, and opinion vs. evidence.	validity, and opinion vs. evidence.	validity, and opinion vs. evidence.	validity, and opinion vs. evidence.	
<b>Conceptual Framework / Methods / Approach (20%)</b>				
<p>The descriptions of the conceptual framework and methodology <b>fails to address</b> the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• theoretical framework</li> <li>• research sample, sample procedure and technique</li> <li>• instrumentation</li> <li>• data collection procedures</li> <li>• data analysis method</li> </ul>	<p>The descriptions of the conceptual framework and methodology <b>attempts to address most</b> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• theoretical framework</li> <li>• research sample, sample procedure and technique</li> <li>• instrumentation</li> <li>• data collection procedures</li> <li>• data analysis method</li> </ul>	<p>The descriptions of the conceptual framework and methodology appropriately address all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• theoretical framework</li> <li>• research sample, sample procedure and technique</li> <li>• instrumentation</li> <li>• data collection procedures</li> <li>• data analysis method</li> </ul>	<p>The descriptions of the conceptual framework and methodology aptly address all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• theoretical framework</li> <li>• research sample, sample procedure and technique</li> <li>• instrumentation</li> <li>• data collection procedures</li> <li>• data analysis method</li> </ul>	<p>(scale given / 10) * 20</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Marks:</b></p>
<b>Summary / Conclusion (5%)</b>				
<p>The summary/conclusion <b>fails to address</b> the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ expected research outcome</li> <li>▪ coherent connection between parts of the proposal</li> <li>▪ preliminary findings (if applicable).</li> </ul>	<p>The summary/conclusion <b>attempts to address most</b> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ expected research outcome</li> <li>▪ coherent connection between parts of the proposal</li> <li>▪ preliminary findings (if applicable)</li> </ul>	<p>The summary/conclusion appropriately addresses all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ expected research outcome</li> <li>▪ coherent connection between parts of the proposal</li> <li>▪ preliminary findings (if applicable)</li> </ul>	<p>The summary/conclusion aptly addresses all of the following :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ expected research outcome</li> <li>▪ coherent connection between parts of the proposal</li> <li>▪ preliminary findings (if applicable)</li> </ul>	<p>(scale given / 10) * 5</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Marks:</b></p>
<b>Academic Style, Language and References (10%)</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No consistent use of style for references, in-text citations, proposal structure and specific mechanics.</li> <li>• The academic language carries inappropriate tone and use of vague as well as inaccurate terminology,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inconsistent use of style for references, in-text citations, proposal structure and specific mechanics.</li> <li>• The academic language clearly lacks formal and objective tone and use of clear, precise and accurate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Slightly lacking in consistent use of style for references, in-text citations, proposal structure and specific mechanics.</li> <li>• The academic language slightly lacks formal and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent use of style for references, in-text citations, proposal structure and specific mechanics.</li> <li>• The academic language demonstrates formal and objective tone and use of</li> </ul>	<p>(scale given / 10) * 10</p>

**CONFIDENTIAL  
(ASSESSOR SHEET)**

<b>UNSATISFACTORY</b> (unacceptable & requires major revision)	<b>SATISFACTORY</b> (acceptable with major revision)	<b>GOOD</b> (acceptable with minor revisions)	<b>EXCELLENT</b> (acceptable with minor or no revision)	<b>MARKS OBTAINED</b>
<b>0 – 4</b>	<b>5 – 6</b>	<b>7 – 8</b>	<b>9 – 10</b>	
<p>expressions and signposting. Language inaccuracies impede the readability of the proposal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significant editing needed.</li> <li>• Several errors per paragraph and informal language used in multiple instances</li> <li>• The reference list is incomplete and inaccurate.</li> <li>• No adherence to word limit; not more than 500 words (abstract), 7,000 words (proposal report excluding reference)</li> </ul>	<p>terminology, expressions and signposting. Language inaccuracies impede the full understanding of the proposal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Moderate editing needed.</li> <li>• The reference list is incomplete and / or contains some inaccuracies.</li> <li>• Adherence to word limit; not more than 500 words (abstract), 7,000 words (proposal report excluding reference)</li> </ul>	<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The reference list is mostly complete and accurate.</li> <li>• Adherence to word limit; not more than 500 words (abstract), 7,000 words (proposal report excluding reference)</li> </ul>	<p>clear, precise and accurate terminology, expressions and signposting. There might be minimal first draft slips.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The reference list is complete and accurate.</li> <li>• Adherence to word limit; not more than 500 words (abstract); 7,000 words (proposal report excluding reference)</li> </ul>	<b>Marks:</b>
<b>Communication / Presentation (Q&amp;A) (10%)</b>				
<p>The candidate fails to demonstrate the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Present research information in almost no logical sequence.</li> <li>• Express ideas clearly, fluently, and confidently.</li> <li>• Not able to answer most of the questions asked.</li> </ul>	<p>The candidate attempts to demonstrate most of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Present research information in less logical sequence.</li> <li>• Express ideas clearly, fluently, and confidently.</li> <li>• Able to answer questions asked.</li> </ul>	<p>The candidate demonstrates all the following appropriately:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Present research information in sequence that can be followed.</li> <li>• Express ideas clearly, fluently, and confidently.</li> <li>• Good ability to answer questions asked.</li> </ul>	<p>The candidate demonstrates all the following very clearly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Present research information in a logical, interesting and effective sequence and easy to follow.</li> <li>• Express ideas clearly, fluently, and confidently.</li> <li>• Very good ability to answer questions asked.</li> </ul>	(scale given / 10) * 10  <b>Marks:</b>
<b>*TOTAL MARKS:</b>				

\*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	<b>PASS</b>
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	<b>FAIL and Repeat Proposal Defence Seminar</b>		

**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** : \_\_\_\_\_