



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			
Name:		Matric Number:	
Programme:	<input type="checkbox"/> Doctoral <input type="checkbox"/> Masters		
Mode of Programme:	<input type="checkbox"/> Research <input type="checkbox"/> Mixed Mode <input type="checkbox"/> Coursework <input type="checkbox"/> Clinical		
Mode of Study:	<input type="checkbox"/> Full Time <input type="checkbox"/> Part Time	Current Semester:	
Title of Thesis / Dissertation:			
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	<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 / 5) * 5</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Scale</th> <th>Marks</th> <th>Tick</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <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> </tbody> </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																						
Introduction (25%)																							
The introduction does not reflect the work done.	<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 / 5) * 25</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Scale</th> <th>Marks</th> <th>Tick</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>5.00</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>10.00</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>15.00</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>20.00</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>25.00</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Marks:</p>	Scale	Marks	Tick	1	5.00		2	10.00		3	15.00		4	20.00		5	25.00	
Scale	Marks	Tick																					
1	5.00																						
2	10.00																						
3	15.00																						
4	20.00																						
5	25.00																						
Literature review (25%)																							
<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 validity, and opinion vs. evidence. 	<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 validity, and opinion vs. evidence. 	<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 validity, and opinion vs. evidence. 	<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 validity, and opinion vs. evidence. 	<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 validity, and opinion vs. evidence. 	<p>(scale given / 5) * 25</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Scale</th> <th>Marks</th> <th>Tick</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>5.00</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>10.00</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>15.00</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>20.00</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>25.00</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Marks:</p>	Scale	Marks	Tick	1	5.00		2	10.00		3	15.00		4	20.00		5	25.00	
Scale	Marks	Tick																					
1	5.00																						
2	10.00																						
3	15.00																						
4	20.00																						
5	25.00																						

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																			
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 framework • research sample, sample procedure and technique • instrumentation • data collection procedures 	<p>The descriptions of the conceptual framework and methodology fails to address the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • theoretical framework • research sample, sample procedure and technique • instrumentation • data collection procedures • data analysis method 	<p>The descriptions of the conceptual framework and methodology attempts to address most of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • theoretical framework • research sample, sample procedure and technique • instrumentation • data collection procedures • data analysis method 	<p>The descriptions of the conceptual framework and methodology appropriately address all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • theoretical framework • research sample, sample procedure and technique • instrumentation • data collection procedures • data analysis method 	<p>The descriptions of the conceptual framework and methodology aptly address all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • theoretical framework • research sample, sample procedure and technique • instrumentation • data collection procedures • data analysis method 	<p style="text-align: center;">(scale given / 5) * 20</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1832 517 2072 675"> <thead> <tr> <th>Scale</th> <th>Marks</th> <th>Tick</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <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> </tbody> </table> <p style="text-align: center;">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																						
Summary / Conclusion (5%)																							
<p>The discussion and conclusion fail to address all of the following clearly and convincingly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Summarize the findings ▪ Provide perspective on the finding ▪ Relate back to the introduction and ties everything together 	<p>The summary/conclusion fails to address the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ expected research outcome ▪ coherent connection between parts of the proposal ▪ preliminary findings (if applicable). 	<p>The summary/conclusion attempts to address most of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ expected research outcome ▪ coherent connection between parts of the proposal ▪ preliminary findings (if applicable) 	<p>The summary/conclusion appropriately addresses all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ expected research outcome ▪ coherent connection between parts of the proposal ▪ preliminary findings (if applicable) 	<p>The summary/conclusion aptly addresses all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ expected research outcome ▪ coherent connection between parts of the proposal ▪ preliminary findings (if applicable) 	<p style="text-align: center;">(scale given / 5) * 5</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1832 1050 2072 1208"> <thead> <tr> <th>Scale</th> <th>Marks</th> <th>Tick</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <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> </tbody> </table> <p style="text-align: center;">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																						

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																			
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>	<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) 	<p style="text-align: center;">(scale given / 5) * 10</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1825 606 2069 762"> <thead> <tr> <th>Scale</th> <th>Marks</th> <th>Tick</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <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> </tbody> </table> <p style="text-align: center;">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 border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Scale</th> <th>Marks</th> <th>Tick</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <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> </tbody> </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 Proposal Defence Seminar		

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 : _____