



**CENTRE FOR GRADUATE STUDIES
UNIVERSITI TUN HUSSEIN ONN MALAYSIA**

**EVALUATION OF RESEARCH PROPOSAL
MASTER AND PhD
(EVALUATION 1)**

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. Note: Supervisors will receive instruments upon appointment by the faculty.
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 (10 sections) to get the total score.
- 5) Assessors need to complete sections 1 to 6 only.
- 6) Supervisors need to complete all sections.

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

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

1.TITLE (5%)

Criteria	Rating	Weightage	Marks (Rating X Weightage)	Signature
• The title carries the exact meaning and covers the study carried out	Excellent [5]	1.0		
• The title carries an appropriate meaning and covers the study carried out	Good [4]	1.0		
• The title carries a meaning that covers the study carried out but contains grammatical errors	Fair [3]	1.0		
• The title does not carry a meaning that covers the study carried out	Poor [2]	1.0		
• The title is unsuitable	Very Poor [1]	1.0		
Comments:				

2.INTRODUCTION (20%)

Criteria	Rating	Weightage	Marks (Rating X Weightage)	Signature
There are statements that very clearly include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The problem being investigated (objectives / questions / hypotheses) • Supporting literature • Justification for the study • Importance of the study • Limitations / scope of the study 	Excellent [5]	4.0		
There are statements that clearly include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The problem being investigated (objectives / questions / hypotheses) • Supporting literature • Justification for the study • Importance of the study • Limitations / scope of the study 	Good [4]	4.0		
There are statements that satisfactorily include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The problem being investigated (objectives / questions / hypotheses) • Supporting literature • Justification for the study • Importance of the study • Limitations / scope of the study 	Fair [3]	4.0		

There are statements that vaguely include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The problem being investigated (objectives / questions / hypotheses) • Supporting literature • Justification for the study • Importance of the study • Limitations / scope of the study 	Poor [2]	4.0		
There are no statements that include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The problem being investigated (objectives / questions / hypotheses) • Supporting literature • Justification for the study • Importance of the study • Limitations / scope of the study 	Very Poor [1]	4.0		
Comments:				

3.LITERATURE REVIEW (LR) (20%)

Criteria	Rating	Weightage	Marks (Rating X Weightage)	Signature
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LR is very relevant and comprehensive • The LR is critically written and balanced • Its sources of reference are extremely reliable (from verified journals or original sources) 	Excellent [5]	4.0		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LR is relevant and comprehensive • The LR is well written and balanced • Its sources of reference are reliable (from verified journals or original sources) 	Good [4]	4.0		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LR is only slightly relevant • The LR is poorly written • Its sources of reference are not very reliable 	Fair [3]	4.0		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LR is irrelevant • The LR is poorly written • Its sources of reference are not very reliable 	Poor [2]	4.0		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LR is irrelevant • The LR is not well written • It does not have any suitable sources of reference 	Very Poor [1]	4.0		
Comments:				

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY (35%)

Criteria	Rating	Weightage	Marks (Rating X Weightage)	Signature
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The research methodology is highly suitable for achieving the study objectives Procedures are described in great detail The selected methods for data analysis are highly suitable 	Excellent [5]	7.0		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The research methodology is good for achieving the study objectives Procedures are described in detail The selected methods for data analysis are good 	Good [4]	7.0		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The research methodology is satisfactory for achieving the study objectives Procedures are described in general terms The selected methods for data analysis are suitable 	Fair [3]	7.0		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The research methodology is not very suitable for achieving the study objectives Procedures are not very well described The selected methods for data analysis are not very suitable 	Poor [2]	7.0		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The research methodology is unsuitable for achieving the study objectives Procedures are not well described The selected methods for data analysis are unsuitable 	Very Poor [1]	7.0		
Comments:				

5. EXPECTED FINDINGS (10%)

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

6. REFERENCES (10%)

Criteria	Rating	Weightage	Marks (Rating X Weightage)	Signature
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sources of reference are very reliable (from verified journals or original sources) All sources of citations are stated in the text and in the list of references References are written according to the prescribed format 	Excellent [5]	2.0		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sources of reference are reliable (from verified journals or original sources) All sources of citations are stated in the text and in the list of references References are written according to the prescribed format 	Good [4]	2.0		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sources of reference are suitable (from verified journals or original sources) All sources of citations are stated in the text and in the list of references References are written according to the prescribed format 	Fair [3]	2.0		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sources of reference are not very reliable Not all sources of citations are stated in the text and in the list of references References are written according to the prescribed format 	Poor [2]	2.0		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sources of reference are unreliable None of the sources of citations are stated in the text and in the list of references References are not written according to the prescribed format 	Very Poor [1]	2.0		
Comments:				
Total Marks (M1)			/100	

Name: **Position :** Assessor / Supervisor

Signature: **Date:**