UNIVERSITI MALAYA
Faculty of Engineering

TDIT(2024)/GP

GUIDELINES FOR THE CONFIRMATION DEFENCE (*Fast-Track Student*)
FACULTY OF ENGINEERING

PROCEDURE

1) The candidate **MUST** passed the Proposal Defence.

2) Candidates are required to submit the Confirmation Defence Report (**between 4,000 – 7,000 words**) through a google form submission link https://forms.office.com/r/6kfnkRwwK3 . 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) Completed literature review;
   (v) Research methodology;
   (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 Confirmation Defence Report:

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

4) The Confirmation Defence Report will be distributed to the panel one week before the presentation.

5) The time given for presentation is **20 minutes** following with question and answer session for **at least 10 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 Confirmation Defence result in the Maya Portal and candidates may check the results before the semester ends.

Confirmation Defence 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%)				
The title does not reflect the proposal. The abstract **fail to address** the following: ▪ the research purpose and objectives ▪ summarize methods used ▪ highlight the research gap	The title reflects the proposal to some extent. The abstract **attempt to address most** of the following: ▪ the research purpose and objectives ▪ summarize methods used ▪ highlight the research gap	The title appropriately reflects the proposal. The abstract addresses all of the following clearly: ▪ the research purpose and objectives ▪ summarize methods used ▪ highlight the research gap	The title aptly reflects the proposal. The abstract addresses all of the following very **clearly:** ▪ the research purpose and objectives ▪ summarize methods used ▪ highlight the research gap	(scale given / 10) * 5 **Marks:**
Introduction (15%)				
The introduction **fails to address** the following: ▪ problem/issues ▪ overview of a research framework ▪ research questions /objectives ▪ significance of the study ▪ operational terms/ definitions (if applicable)	The introduction **attempts to address most** of the following: ▪ problem/issues ▪ overview of a research framework ▪ research questions /objectives ▪ significance of the study ▪ operational terms/ definitions (if applicable)	The introduction addresses all the following appropriately: ▪ problem/issues ▪ overview of a research framework ▪ research questions /objectives ▪ significance of the study ▪ operational terms/ definitions (if applicable)	The introduction addresses all the following **very clearly:** ▪ problem/issues ▪ overview of a research framework ▪ research questions /objectives ▪ significance of the study ▪ operational terms/ definitions (if applicable)	(scale given / 10) * 15 **Marks:**
Literature review (20%)				
The **review fails to address** the following: • 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.	The review **attempts to address most** of the following: • 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.	The review appropriately addresses all of the following: • 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.	The review aptly addresses all the following: • 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.	(scale given / 10) * 20 **Marks:**

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%)				
The descriptions of the conceptual framework and methodology **fails to address** the following: • theoretical framework • research sample, sample procedure and technique • instrumentation • data collection procedures • data analysis method • Research validity and reliability	The descriptions of the conceptual framework and methodology **attempts to address most** of the following: • theoretical framework • research sample, sample procedure and technique • instrumentation • data collection procedures • data analysis method • Research validity and reliability	The descriptions of the conceptual framework and methodology appropriately address all of the following: • theoretical framework • research sample, sample procedure and technique • instrumentation • data collection procedures • data analysis method • Research validity and reliability	The descriptions of the conceptual framework and methodology aptly address all of the following: • theoretical framework • research sample, sample procedure and technique • instrumentation • data collection procedures • data analysis method • Research validity and reliability	(scale given / 10) * 20 **Marks:**
Preliminary Results and Discussion (15%)				
The preliminary analyses and results **fail to illustrate** the following: • align with the research questions / hypotheses raised. • show or has indication of partial fulfilment of the research objectives. interpreted and organized well	The analyses and results **illustrate most** of the following: • align with the research questions / hypotheses raised. • show or has indication of fulfilment of the research objectives. interpreted and organized well	The analyses and results appropriately **illustrate all** of the following : • align with the research questions / hypotheses raised. • show fulfilment of the research objectives. interpreted and organized well	The analyses and results aptly **illustrate all** of the following : • align with the research questions / hypotheses raised. • show fulfilment of the research objectives • interpreted and organized well. • The candidate also critically uses the best available analytical techniques and/or appropriately proposes new ones	(scale given / 10) * 15 **Marks:**
Summary / Conclusion (5%)				
The summary / conclusion **fail to address** the following: ▪ Clear summary of preliminary findings ▪ Defence demonstrates a candidate's readiness for the research standard expected at PhD level.	The summary / conclusion **attempts to address most** of the following: ▪ Clear summary of the preliminary findings ▪ Defence demonstrates a candidate's readiness for the research standard expected at PhD level.	The summary / conclusion appropriately **addresses** the following : ▪ Clear summary of the preliminary findings ▪ Defence demonstrates a candidate's readiness for the research expected standard at PhD level.	The summary / conclusion aptly **addresses all** of the following: ▪ Clear and concise summary of the preliminary findings ▪ Defence demonstrates a candidate's readiness for the research expected standard at PhD level.	(scale given / 10) * 5 **Marks:**

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**	
Academic Style, Language and References (10%)				
• 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)	• 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)	• 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)	• 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)	(scale given / 10) * 10 **Marks:**
Communication / Presentation (Q&A) (10%)				
The candidate fails to demonstrate the following: • Present research information in almost no logical sequence. • Express ideas clearly, fluently, and confidently. • Not able to answer most of the questions asked.	The candidate attempts to demonstrate most of the following: • Present research information in less logical sequence. • Express ideas clearly, fluently, and confidently. • Able to answer questions asked.	The candidate demonstrates all the following appropriately: • Present research information in sequence that can be followed. • Express ideas clearly, fluently, and confidently. • Good ability to answer questions asked.	The candidate demonstrates all the following very clearly: • 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.	(scale given / 10) * 10 **Marks:**
			***TOTAL MARKS:**	

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