



CENTRE FOR GRADUATE STUDIES  
UNIVERSITI TUN HUSSEIN ONN MALAYSIA

EVALUATION OF RESEARCH PROPOSAL  
PhD

Name of Student	: .....
Matric No.	: .....
Title of Thesis	: .....
	: .....
	: .....

**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 throughout the semester in their research planning. (ii) A guide for monitoring students' writing progress throughout the semester. (iii) A marking guide for progress reports.
Assessor	(i) A marking guide for report recommendations. (ii) A way to propose improvements for discussion with the supervisor.  Note: Assessors will receive instruments upon appointment by the faculty.

**ASSESSMENT GUIDELINES**

- 1) This instrument contains SIX key areas. Each section may have one or more sub-sections referring to research aspects 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 by its weightage to obtain the marks for each aspect.
- 4) Add all the marks to get the total score.

## GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATING RESEARCH PROPOSALS

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

User	Marks Obtained	Interpretation	Proposed Action
Supervisor	<65	Unsatisfactory	Discuss the shortfall with the supervisor to improve the report
	≥65	Satisfactory	Proceed to the next stage
Assessor	<65	Unsatisfactory	Discuss weaknesses, corrections and / or re-presentation with the student
	≥65	Satisfactory	Approved

## 1. TITLE (5%)

Criteria	Rating	Weightage	Marks (Rating X Weightage)	Signature
<input type="checkbox"/> The title carries the <b>exact</b> meaning and covers the study carried out Descriptive: not too short, not too long. Clear reflection of project content.	Excellent [5]	1.0		
<input type="checkbox"/> The title carries an <b>appropriate</b> meaning and covers the study carried out	Good [4]	1.0		
<input type="checkbox"/> The title carries a meaning that <b>covers</b> the study carried out but contains grammatical errors	Fair [3]	1.0		
<input type="checkbox"/> The title <b>does not</b> carry a meaning that covers the study carried out	Poor [2]	1.0		
<input type="checkbox"/> The title is <b>unsuitable</b>	Very Poor [1]	1.0		

## 2. INTRODUCTION / RESEARCH BACKGROUND (20%)

Criteria	Rating	Weightage	Marks (Rating X Weightage)	Signature
There are statements that <b>very clearly</b> include the following: • The problem being investigated (objectives / questions / hypotheses) • Supporting literature • Justification of research • Importance / Novelty of research • Limitations / scope of the study	Excellent [5]	4.0		
There are statements that <b>clearly</b> include the following: • The problem being investigated (objectives / questions / hypotheses) • Supporting literature • Justification of research • Importance / Novelty of research • Limitations / scope of the study	Good [4]	4.0		
There are statements that <b>satisfactorily</b> include the following: • The problem being investigated (objectives / questions / hypotheses) • Supporting literature • Justification of research • Importance / Novelty of research • Limitations / scope of the study	Fair [3]	4.0		
There are statements that <b>vaguely</b> include the following: • The problem being investigated (objectives / questions / hypotheses) • Supporting literature • Justification of research • Importance / Novelty of research • Limitations / scope of the study	Poor [2]	4.0		
There are <b>no</b> statements that include the following: • The problem being investigated (objectives / questions / hypotheses) • Supporting literature • Justification of research • Importance / Novelty of research • Limitations / scope of the study	Very Poor [1]	4.0		

## 3. LITERATURE REVIEW (20%)

Criteria	Rating	Weightage	Marks (Rating X Weightage)	Signature
Appraise problems in the relevant field critically using scientific <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LR is <b>very relevant</b>, inclusive and comprehensive</li> <li>The LR is <b>critically</b> written and balanced</li> <li>Its sources of reference are <b>extremely reliable</b> (from verified journals or original sources) and up to date literature.</li> </ul>	Excellent [5]	4.0		
Appraise problems in the relevant field critically using scientific <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LR is <b>relevant</b> and comprehensive</li> <li>The LR is <b>well</b> written and balanced</li> <li>Its sources of reference are <b>reliable</b> (from verified journals or original sources) and up to date literature.</li> </ul>	Good [4]	4.0		
Appraise problems in the relevant field critically using scientific <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LR is <b>only slightly relevant</b></li> <li>The LR is <b>poorly</b> written</li> <li>Its sources of reference are <b>not very reliable</b> (from verified journals or original sources) and up to date literature.</li> </ul>	Fair [3]	4.0		
Appraise problems in the relevant field critically using scientific <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LR is <b>irrelevant</b></li> <li>The LR is <b>poorly</b> written</li> <li>Its sources of reference are <b>not very reliable</b> (from verified journals or original sources) and up to date literature.</li> </ul>	Poor [2]	4.0		
Appraise problems in the relevant field critically using scientific <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LR is <b>irrelevant</b></li> <li>The LR is <b>not well</b> written</li> <li>It <b>does not have</b> any suitable sources of reference (from verified journals or original sources) and up to date literature.</li> </ul>	Very Poor [1]	4.0		

## 4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY (35%)

Criteria	Rating	Weightage	Marks (Rating X Weightage)	Signature
Adapt practical skills leading to innovative ideas in the relevant field: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The research methodology is <b>highly suitable</b> for achieving the study objectives</li> <li>Procedures are described in <b>great detail</b> and adhering to established procedures and processes.</li> <li>Giving <b>highly suitable</b> justifications for research techniques, methods, procedures etc.</li> </ul>	Excellent [5]	7.0		
Adapt practical skills leading to innovative ideas in the relevant field: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The research methodology is <b>good</b> for achieving the study objectives</li> <li>Procedures are described in <b>detail</b> and adhering to established procedures and processes.</li> <li>Giving <b>good</b> justifications for research techniques, methods, procedures etc.</li> </ul>	Good [4]	7.0		
Adapt practical skills leading to innovative ideas in the relevant field: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The research methodology is <b>satisfactory</b> for achieving the study objectives</li> <li>Procedures are described in <b>general terms</b></li> <li>Giving <b>satisfactory</b> justifications for research techniques, methods, procedures etc.</li> </ul>	Fair [3]	7.0		
Adapt practical skills leading to innovative ideas in the relevant field: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The research methodology is <b>not very suitable</b> for achieving the study objectives</li> <li>Procedures are <b>not very well</b> described</li> <li>Giving <b>not very suitable</b> justifications for research techniques, methods, procedures etc.</li> </ul>	Poor [2]	7.0		
Adapt practical skills leading to innovative ideas in the relevant field: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The research methodology is <b>unsuitable</b> for achieving the study objectives</li> <li>Procedures are <b>not well</b> described</li> <li>The selected methods for data analysis are <b>unsuitable</b></li> </ul>	Very Poor [1]	7.0		

## 5. EXPECTED FINDINGS (10%)

Criteria	Rating	Weightage	Marks (Rating X Weightage)	Signature
Provide expert advice to society in the relevant field: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The expected key findings of the study are <b>very clearly</b> stated</li> <li>The expected findings are <b>highly consistent</b> with the objectives of the study</li> </ul>	Excellent [5]	2.0		
Provide expert advice to society in the relevant field: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The expected key findings of the study are <b>clearly</b> stated</li> <li>The expected findings are <b>consistent</b> with the objectives of the study</li> </ul>	Good [4]	2.0		
Provide expert advice to society in the relevant field: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The expected key findings of the study are <b>satisfactorily</b> stated</li> <li>The expected findings are <b>in line</b> with the objectives of the study</li> </ul>	Fair [3]	2.0		
Provide expert advice to society in the relevant field: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The expected key findings of the study are <b>unclearly stated</b></li> <li>The expected findings are <b>inconsistent</b> with the objectives of the study</li> </ul>	Poor [2]	2.0		
Provide expert advice to society in the relevant field: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The expected key findings of the study are <b>not stated</b></li> </ul>	Very Poor [1]	2.0		

## 6. REFERENCES, LANGUAGE AND WRITING STYLE (10%)

Criteria	Rating	Weightage	Marks (Rating X Weightage)	Signature
Integrate information for lifelong learning: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sources of reference are <b>very reliable</b> (from verified journals or original sources)</li> <li>All sources of citations are stated in the text and in the list of references</li> <li>References are written according to the prescribed format</li> <li>Compliance to the format of UTHM's Thesis Writing Guide and the use of good and consistent writing style.</li> </ul>	Excellent [5]	2.0		
Integrate information for lifelong learning: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sources of reference are <b>reliable</b> (from verified journals or original sources)</li> <li>All sources of citations are stated in the text and in the list of references</li> <li>References are written according to the prescribed format</li> <li>Compliance to the format of UTHM's Thesis Writing Guide and the use of good and consistent writing style.</li> </ul>	Good [4]	2.0		
Integrate information for lifelong learning: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sources of reference are <b>suitable</b> (from verified journals or original sources)</li> <li>All sources of citations are stated in the text and in the list of references</li> <li>References are written according to the prescribed format</li> <li>Compliance to the format of UTHM's Thesis Writing Guide and the use of good and consistent writing style.</li> </ul>	Fair [3]	2.0		
Integrate information for lifelong learning: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sources of reference are <b>not very reliable</b></li> <li><b>Not all</b> sources of citations are stated in the text and in the list of references</li> <li>References are written according to the prescribed format.</li> <li>Compliance to the format of UTHM's Thesis Writing Guide.</li> </ul>	Poor [2]	2.0		
Integrate information for lifelong learning: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sources of reference are <b>unreliable</b></li> <li><b>None</b> of the sources of citations are stated in the text and in the list of references</li> <li>References are <b>not written according to</b> the prescribed format</li> </ul>	Very Poor [1]	2.0		

Total Marks (M1)	/ 100
---------------------	-------

Name: ..... Position : Assessor / Supervisor

Signature: ..... Date: .....

KEY AREAS	Comments:
TITLE	
INTRODUCTION	
LITERATURE REVIEW	
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	
EXPECTED FINDINGS	
REFERENCES	
Total Mark	