



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

PROCEDURE

- 1) The candidate **MUST** have completed Research Methodology course.
- 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/r13m3a1f7z> . The report and slides presentation must contain the following aspects:
 - (i) Abstract (500 words in Bahasa Malaysia and English;
 - (ii) Introduction, Statement of Problem, Scope of Research;
 - (iii) Research Objective;
 - (iv) Summary of the literature review;
 - (v) Description Conceptual Framework/Summary of Methods/Summary of Research;
 - (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
- 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 minutes** following with question and answer session for **at least 15 minutes**.
- 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 the presentation.
- 8) Postgraduate Office will update the Proposal Defence result in the Maya Portal and candidates may check the results before the semester ends.

PD Rubric

UNSATISFACTORY (unacceptable & requires major revision)	SATISFACTORY (acceptable with major revision)	GOOD (acceptable with minor revisions)	EXCELLENT (acceptable with minor or no revision)	MARKS OBTAINED
0 – 4	5 – 6	7 – 8	9 – 10	
Title and Abstract (5%)				
<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 / 10) * 5</p> <p>Marks:</p>
Introduction (25%)				
<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 / 10) * 25</p> <p>Marks:</p>
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 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 / 10) * 25</p> <p>Marks:</p>

UNSATISFACTORY (unacceptable & requires major revision)	SATISFACTORY (acceptable with major revision)	GOOD (acceptable with minor revisions)	EXCELLENT (acceptable with minor or no revision)	MARKS OBTAINED
0 – 4	5 – 6	7 – 8	9 – 10	
Conceptual Framework / Methods / Approach (20%)				
<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>(scale given / 10) * 20</p> <p>Marks:</p>
Summary / Conclusion (5%)				
<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>(scale given / 10) * 5</p> <p>Marks:</p>
Academic Style, Language and References (10%)				
<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>(scale given / 10) * 10</p> <p>Marks:</p>

UNSATISFACTORY (unacceptable & requires major revision)	SATISFACTORY (acceptable with major revision)	GOOD (acceptable with minor revisions)	EXCELLENT (acceptable with minor or no revision)	MARKS OBTAINED
0 – 4	5 – 6	7 – 8	9 – 10	
Communication / Presentation (Q&A) (10%)				
<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 / 10) * 10</p> <p>Marks:</p>
*TOTAL MARKS:				

*Note – Based on UM grading scheme, the passing mark is 65.00 and above.