



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

**PROPOSAL  
MASTER PROJECT TWO SEMESTER  
(MASTER PROJECT 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:

<b>User</b>	<b>Functions of Instrument</b>
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.  <b>Note: Supervisors will receive instruments upon appointment by the faculty.</b>
Assessor	(i) A marking guide for report recommendations. (ii) A way to propose improvements for discussion with the supervisor.  <b>Note: Assessors will receive instruments upon appointment by the faculty.</b>

**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.

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

<b>Name of Student</b>	:	.....
<b>Matric No.</b>	:	.....
<b>Faculty</b>	:	.....
<b>Title of Project</b>	:	.....
		.....
		.....

**1.TITLE (5%)**

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

**Comments:****2.INTRODUCTION (20%)**

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

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

**3.LITERATURE REVIEW (LR) (20%)**

Criteria	Rating	Weightage	Marks (Rating X Weightage)	Signature
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LR is <b>very relevant</b> 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)</li> </ul>	<b>Excellent</b> [5]	<b>4.0</b>		
<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)</li> </ul>	<b>Good</b> [4]	<b>4.0</b>		
<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></li> </ul>	<b>Fair</b> [3]	<b>4.0</b>		
<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></li> </ul>	<b>Poor</b> [2]	<b>4.0</b>		
<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</li> </ul>	<b>Very Poor</b> [1]	<b>4.0</b>		
<b>Comments:</b>				

**4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY (35%)**

Criteria	Rating	Weightage	Marks (Rating X Weightage)	Signature
<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></li> <li>The selected methods for data analysis are <b>highly suitable</b></li> </ul>	<b>Excellent</b> [5]	<b>7.0</b>		
<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></li> <li>The selected methods for data analysis are <b>good</b></li> </ul>	<b>Good</b> [4]	<b>7.0</b>		
<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>The selected methods for data analysis are <b>suitable</b></li> </ul>	<b>Fair</b> [3]	<b>7.0</b>		
<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>The selected methods for data analysis are <b>not very suitable</b></li> </ul>	<b>Poor</b> [2]	<b>7.0</b>		
<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>	<b>Very Poor</b> [1]	<b>7.0</b>		
<b>Comments:</b>				

**5. EXPECTED FINDINGS (10%)**

Criteria	Rating	Weightage	Marks (Rating X Weightage)	Signature
<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>	<b>Excellent</b> [5]	<b>2.0</b>		
<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>	<b>Good</b> [4]	<b>2.0</b>		
<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>	<b>Fair</b> [3]	<b>2.0</b>		
<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>	<b>Poor</b> [2]	<b>2.0</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The expected key findings of the study are <b>not stated</b></li> </ul>	<b>Very Poor</b> [1]	<b>2.0</b>		
<b>Comments:</b>				

**6. REFERENCES (10%)**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Weightage</b>	<b>Marks (Rating X Weightage)</b>	<b>Signature</b>
<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> </ul>	<b>Excellent</b> [5]	<b>2.0</b>		
<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> </ul>	<b>Good</b> [4]	<b>2.0</b>		
<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> </ul>	<b>Fair</b> [3]	<b>2.0</b>		
<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> </ul>	<b>Poor</b> [2]	<b>2.0</b>		
<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>	<b>Very Poor</b> [1]	<b>2.0</b>		
<b>Comments:</b>				
			<b>Total Marks (M1)</b>	<b>/100</b>

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

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