

**GUIDELINES FOR THE PROPOSAL DEFENCE
FACULTY OF ENGINEERING**

PROCEDURE

- 1) The candidate **MUST** have completed Research Methodology course. For those who are applying for Research Methodology credit transfer, please contact the Postgraduate Office and comply with credit transfer applications procedures.

- 2) Candidates are required to submit the Proposal Defence Report (**between 3,000 – 7,000 words**) at the end of Week 14 of the semester through a google form submission link <https://forms.office.com/r/ZeDgRWu3g2> . The report and slides presentation must contain the following aspects:
 - (i) Abstract;
 - (ii) Introduction;
 - (iii) Objective;
 - (iv) Literature Review;
 - (v) Conceptual Framework/Methods/Approach;
 - (vi) Importance and relevance of the study;
 - (vii) preliminary findings / pilot test (if any);
 - (viii) Work Schedule in the form of Gantt Chart; and
 - (ix) Concise bibliography (references).

- 3) Checklist for the Submission of Research Proposal:

<input type="checkbox"/>	Cover Page
<input type="checkbox"/>	A4 Size Layout
<input type="checkbox"/>	Font 12, Times New Roma
<input type="checkbox"/>	Double Spacing
<input type="checkbox"/>	Margin (Top, Bottom, Right Side = 2cm and Left Side = 4cm)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Page Number
<input type="checkbox"/>	In between 8-12 pages (excluding cover page)

- 4) The research proposal will be distributed to the panel one week before the presentation.

- 5) The time given for presentation is **15 minute** following with question and answer session for **at least 10 minute**.

- 6) The details of the marking scheme can be found in the Rubric attached.

- 7) Panels are required to evaluate the research proposal and presentation based on the given rubric and evaluations are to be made through given Google Form Link within a

week after presentation.

- 8) Postgraduate Office will update the Proposal Defence result in the Maya Portal and candidates may check the results before the semester ends.

EXCELLENT (acceptable with minor or no revision)	GOOD (acceptable with minor revision)	SATISFACTORY (acceptable with major revision)	UNSATISFACTORY (unacceptable & requires major revision)	MARKS OBTAINED
6 scale	5 scale	4 scale	3-1 scale	
Title and Abstract (5%)				
<p>The title and abstract clearly and precisely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ state the research purpose and objectives ▪ summarize methods used ▪ describe major findings in relation to the objectives ▪ highlight major implications/findings ▪ abstracts must not exceed 500 words 	<p>The title and abstract clearly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ state the research purpose and objectives ▪ summarize methods used ▪ describe major findings ▪ highlight major implication ▪ abstracts must not exceed 500 words 	<p>The title and abstract attempt to address all or most of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ state the research purpose and objectives ▪ summarize methods used ▪ describe major findings ▪ highlight major implication ▪ abstracts must not exceed 500 words 	<p>The title and abstract fail to address all or most of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ state the research purpose and objectives ▪ summarize methods used ▪ describe major findings ▪ highlight major implication ▪ abstracts must not exceed 500 words 	<p>(scale given / 6) * 5</p> <p>Marks:</p>
Introduction (25%)				
<p>The introduction clearly, convincingly and precisely (in relation to or within the research context) provides the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ states the problem/issues ▪ provides a research framework ▪ gives the research questions/objectives ▪ states the significance of the study ▪ defines operational terms/ definitions 	<p>The introduction clearly provides the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ states the problem/issues ▪ provides a research framework ▪ gives the research questions/objectives ▪ states the significance of the study ▪ defines operational terms/ definitions 	<p>The introduction attempts to address all or most of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ states the problem/issues ▪ provides a research framework ▪ gives the research questions/objectives ▪ states the significance of the study ▪ defines operational terms/ definitions 	<p>The introduction fails to address all or most of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ states the problem/issues ▪ provides a research framework ▪ gives the research questions/objectives ▪ states the significance of the study ▪ defines operational terms/ definitions 	<p>(scale given / 6) * 25</p> <p>Marks:</p>
Literature review (25%)				
<p>The review achieves the following:</p> <p>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>	<p>The review achieves most of the following:</p> <p>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>	<p>The review attempts to address all or most of the following:</p> <p>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>	<p>The review fails to address all or most of the following:</p> <p>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>	<p>(scale given / 6) * 25</p> <p>Marks:</p>
Conceptual Framework / Methods / Approach (20%)				
<p>The description of the conceptual framework and methodology is clear and corresponding justification is convincing and in accordance with acceptable research conventions. This includes:</p>	<p>The description of the conceptual framework and methodology is quite clear and corresponding justification is mostly convincing and in accordance with acceptable research</p>	<p>The description of the conceptual framework and methodology is somewhat clear and corresponding justification is marginally convincing and in accordance with</p>	<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</p>	<p>(scale given / 6) * 20</p> <p>Marks:</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> theoretical framework research sample, sample procedure and technique instrumentation data collection procedures 	<p>conventions. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> theoretical framework research sample, sample procedure and technique instrumentation data collection procedures 	<p>acceptable research conventions. Attempts to address all or most 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>address all or most 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 	
---	--	---	--	--

Discussion and Conclusion (5%)

<p>The discussion and conclusion clearly, convincingly and precisely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summarize the findings Provide perspective on the findings Relate back to the introduction and tie everything together 	<p>The discussion and conclusion quite clearly, convincingly and precisely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summarize the findings Provides perspective on the finding Relate back to the introduction and ties everything together 	<p>The discussion and conclusion attempts to address all or most of the following, but could be more clear and convincing:</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 discussion and conclusion fail to address all or most 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>(scale given / 6) * 5</p> <p>Marks:</p>
--	---	---	--	---

Academic Style, Language and References (10%)

<p>Consistently applied standards of language composition, and APA guidelines, especially in regards to citations, references, headings, table of contents, page numbers, and running headers. Limited errors in spelling, grammar, word order, word usage, sentence structure, and/or punctuation.</p> <p>The reference list is complete and accurate.</p>	<p>Manuscript conformed to most standards of language composition and APA guidelines. Few errors per page that do not impede the meaning in spelling, grammar, word order, word usage, sentence structure, and/or punctuation</p> <p>The reference list is mostly complete and accurate.</p>	<p>Weak, ambiguous, incomplete, or inconsistent application of APA; manuscript organization, rules of language composition. Noticeable errors that do not impede readability. Moderate editing needed.</p> <p>The reference list is incomplete and / or contains some inaccuracies.</p>	<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>	<p>(scale given / 6) * 10</p> <p>Marks:</p>
---	--	---	---	--

Communication / Presentation (Q&A) (10%)

<p>The candidate demonstrates the following:</p> <p>Research information is presented in logical, interesting and effective sequence and easy to follow. Very clear voice, fluent, confident, very good body-language.</p>	<p>The candidate demonstrates the following:</p> <p>Research information is presented in sequence that can be followed. Clear voice, fluent, confident, good body-language.</p>	<p>The candidate demonstrates the following:</p> <p>Research information is presented in less logical sequence. Clear voice, fluent, confident, good body-language.</p>	<p>The candidate demonstrates the following:</p> <p>Research information is presented in no logical sequence. Voice not clear, hesitation and no body-language</p>	<p>(scale given / 6) * 10</p> <p>Marks:</p>
--	---	---	--	--

TOTAL MARKS: