



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

POOR (unacceptable & requires major revision)	UNSATISFACTORY (unacceptable & requires major revision)	SATISFACTORY (acceptable with major revision)	GOOD (acceptable with minor revisions)	EXCELLENT (acceptable with minor or no revision)	MARKS OBTAINED (Tick your marks)		
1	2	3	4	5			
Title and Abstract (5%)							
The title does not reflect the abstract of work done	The title does not reflect the proposal. The abstract fail to address the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none">the research purpose and objectivessummarize methods usedhighlight the research gap	The title reflects the proposal to some extent. The abstract attempt to address most of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none">the research purpose and objectivessummarize methods usedhighlight the research gap	The title appropriately reflects the proposal. The abstract addresses all of the following clearly: <ul style="list-style-type: none">the research purpose and objectivessummarize methods usedhighlight the research gap	The title aptly reflects the proposal. The abstract addresses all of the following very clearly : <ul style="list-style-type: none">the research purpose and objectivessummarize methods usedhighlight the research gap	(scale given / 5) * 5		
					Scale	Marks	Tick
					1	1.00	
					2	2.00	
					3	3.00	
					4	4.00	
5	5.00						
Marks:							
Introduction (15%)							
The introduction does not reflect the work done.	The introduction fails to address the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none">problem/issuesoverview of a research frameworkresearch questions /objectivessignificance of the studyoperational terms/ definitions (if applicable)	The introduction attempts to address most of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none">problem/issuesoverview of a research frameworkresearch questions /objectivessignificance of the studyoperational terms/ definitions (if applicable)	The introduction addresses all the following appropriately: <ul style="list-style-type: none">problem/issuesoverview of a research frameworkresearch questions /objectivessignificance of the studyoperational terms/ definitions (if applicable)	The introduction addresses all the following very clearly : <ul style="list-style-type: none">problem/issuesoverview of a research frameworkresearch questions /objectivessignificance of the studyoperational terms/ definitions (if applicable)	(scale given / 5) * 15		
					Scale	Marks	Tick
					1	3.00	
					2	6.00	
					3	9.00	
					4	12.00	
5	15.00						
Marks:							
Literature review (20%)							
The review fails to address the following: <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 validity, and opinion vs. evidence.	The review fails to address the following: <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 validity, and opinion vs. evidence.	The review attempts to address most of the following: <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 validity, and opinion vs. evidence.	The review appropriately addresses all of the following: <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 validity, and opinion vs. evidence.	The review aptly addresses all the following: <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 validity, and opinion vs. evidence.	(scale given / 5) * 20		
					Scale	Marks	Tick
					1	4.00	
					2	8.00	
					3	12.00	
					4	16.00	
5	20.00						
Marks:							

POOR (unacceptable & requires major revision)	UNSATISFACTORY (unacceptable & requires major revision)	SATISFACTORY (acceptable with major revision)	GOOD (acceptable with minor revisions)	EXCELLENT (acceptable with minor or no revision)	MARKS OBTAINED (Tick your marks)																		
1	2	3	4	5																			
Conceptual Framework / Methods / Approach (20%)																							
<p>The description of the conceptual framework and methodology is not clear and corresponding justification is unconvincing and not in accordance with acceptable research conventions. Fails to address all of the following, but could be more convincing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">theoretical frameworkresearch sample, sample procedure and techniqueinstrumentationdata collection procedures	<p>The descriptions of the conceptual framework and methodology fails to address the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">theoretical frameworkresearch sample, sample procedure and techniqueinstrumentationdata collection proceduresdata analysis methodResearch validity and reliability	<p>The descriptions of the conceptual framework and methodology attempts to address most of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">theoretical frameworkresearch sample, sample procedure and techniqueinstrumentationdata collection proceduresdata analysis methodResearch validity and reliability	<p>The descriptions of the conceptual framework and methodology appropriately address all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">theoretical frameworkresearch sample, sample procedure and techniqueinstrumentationdata collection proceduresdata analysis methodResearch validity and reliability	<p>The descriptions of the conceptual framework and methodology aptly address all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">theoretical frameworkresearch sample, sample procedure and techniqueinstrumentationdata collection proceduresdata analysis methodResearch validity and reliability	<p>(scale given / 5) * 20</p> <table><tr><th>Scale</th><th>Marks</th><th>Tick</th></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>4.00</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>8.00</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>12.00</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>16.00</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>20.00</td><td></td></tr></table> <p>Marks:</p>	Scale	Marks	Tick	1	4.00		2	8.00		3	12.00		4	16.00		5	20.00	
Scale	Marks	Tick																					
1	4.00																						
2	8.00																						
3	12.00																						
4	16.00																						
5	20.00																						
Preliminary Results and Discussion (15%)																							
<p>The preliminary analyses and results fail to illustrate the following:</p> <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	<p>The preliminary analyses and results fail to illustrate the following:</p> <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	<p>The analyses and results illustrate most of the following:</p> <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	<p>The analyses and results appropriately illustrate all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">align with the research questions / hypotheses raised.show fulfilment of the research objectives.interpreted and organized well	<p>The analyses and results aptly illustrate all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">align with the research questions / hypotheses raised.show fulfilment of the research objectivesinterpreted and organized well.The candidate also critically uses the best available analytical techniques and/or appropriately proposes new ones	<p>(scale given / 5) * 15</p> <table><tr><th>Scale</th><th>Marks</th><th>Tick</th></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>3.00</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>6.00</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>9.00</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>12.00</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>15.00</td><td></td></tr></table> <p>Marks:</p>	Scale	Marks	Tick	1	3.00		2	6.00		3	9.00		4	12.00		5	15.00	
Scale	Marks	Tick																					
1	3.00																						
2	6.00																						
3	9.00																						
4	12.00																						
5	15.00																						

POOR (unacceptable & requires major revision)	UNSATISFACTORY (unacceptable & requires major revision)	SATISFACTORY (acceptable with major revision)	GOOD (acceptable with minor revisions)	EXCELLENT (acceptable with minor or no revision)	MARKS OBTAINED (Tick your marks)																		
1	2	3	4	5																			
Summary / Conclusion (5%)																							
<p>The discussion and conclusion fail to address all or most of the following clearly and convincingly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Summarize the findingsProvide perspective on the findingRelate back to the introduction and ties everything together	<p>The summary / conclusion fail to address the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Clear summary of preliminary findingsDefence demonstrates a candidate's readiness for the research standard expected at PhD level.	<p>The summary / conclusion attempts to address most of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Clear summary of the preliminary findingsDefence demonstrates a candidate's readiness for the research standard expected at PhD level.	<p>The summary / conclusion appropriately addresses the following :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Clear summary of the preliminary findingsDefence demonstrates a candidate's readiness for the research expected standard at PhD level.	<p>The summary / conclusion aptly addresses all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Clear and concise summary of the preliminary findingsDefence demonstrates a candidate's readiness for the research expected standard at PhD level.	<p>(scale given / 5) * 5</p> <table><tr><th>Scale</th><th>Marks</th><th>Tick</th></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>1.00</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>2.00</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>3.00</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>4.00</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>5.00</td><td></td></tr></table> <p>Marks:</p>	Scale	Marks	Tick	1	1.00		2	2.00		3	3.00		4	4.00		5	5.00	
Scale	Marks	Tick																					
1	1.00																						
2	2.00																						
3	3.00																						
4	4.00																						
5	5.00																						
Academic Style, Language and References (10%)																							
<p>Failure to apply standard rules for manuscript presentation and language composition Errors begin to impede readability. Significant editing needed. Several errors per paragraph informal language used in multiple instances</p> <p>The reference list is incomplete and inaccuracies.</p>	<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 instancesThe 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)	<p>(scale given / 5) * 10</p> <table><tr><th>Scale</th><th>Marks</th><th>Tick</th></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>2.00</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>4.00</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>6.00</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>8.00</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>10.00</td><td></td></tr></table> <p>Marks:</p>	Scale	Marks	Tick	1	2.00		2	4.00		3	6.00		4	8.00		5	10.00	
Scale	Marks	Tick																					
1	2.00																						
2	4.00																						
3	6.00																						
4	8.00																						
5	10.00																						

POOR (unacceptable & requires major revision)	UNSATISFACTORY (unacceptable & requires major revision)	SATISFACTORY (acceptable with major revision)	GOOD (acceptable with minor revisions)	EXCELLENT (acceptable with minor or no revision)	MARKS OBTAINED (Tick your marks)																		
1	2	3	4	5																			
Communication / Presentation (Q&A) (10%)																							
<p>The candidate demonstrates the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Research information is presented in no logical sequence.Voice not clear, hesitation and no body-language	<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 / 5) * 10</p> <table><tr><th>Scale</th><th>Marks</th><th>Tick</th></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>2.00</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>4.00</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>6.00</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>8.00</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>10.00</td><td></td></tr></table> <p>Marks:</p>	Scale	Marks	Tick	1	2.00		2	4.00		3	6.00		4	8.00		5	10.00	
Scale	Marks	Tick																					
1	2.00																						
2	4.00																						
3	6.00																						
4	8.00																						
5	10.00																						
				*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 : _____