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PENILAI/*ASSESSOR*

FAKULTI KEJURUTERAAN AWAM DAN ALAM BINA

 UNIVERSITI TUN HUSSEIN ONN MALAYSIA

PENILAIAN CADANGAN PENYELIDIKAN (KFA)

*EVALUATION OF RESEARCH PROPOSAL (KFA)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Nama Pelajar*****Student's Name*** | **:** |
| **Nombor Matrik*****Matriculation No.*** | **:** |
| **Tajuk Penyelidikan*****Title of Research*** | **:** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Penilaian/ *Evaluation*** | **:** |

1. **Pembentangan/ *Presentation***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Perkara*****Item*** | **Pemberat*****Weightage*** | **Nilai / *Rating*\*****Sila Tanda / *Please Tick* [√]** | **Markah*****Mark*** |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| 1 | Kandungan dan Maklumat*Content and Information* | 6.0 |  |  |  |  |  | **/ 30** |
| 2 | Kualiti Pembentangan*Quality of Presentation* | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |  | **/ 20** |
| 3 | Penguasaan Pengetahuan*Mastery of Knowledge* | 5.0 |  |  |  |  |  | **/ 25** |
| 4 | Kemampuan Soal-Jawab*Aptitude and Verbal Ability* | 5.0 |  |  |  |  |  | **/ 25** |
| **JUMLAH/ *TOTAL*** | **/100** |

1. **Laporan/ *Report***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Perkara*****Item*** | **Pemberat*****Weightage*** | **Nilai / *Rating*\*****Sila Tanda / *Please Tick* [√]** | **Markah*****Mark*** |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| 1 | Tajuk*Title* | 1.0 |  |  |  |  |  | **/ 5** |
| 2 | Pengenalan*Introduction* | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |  | **/ 20** |
| 3 | Kajian Literatur*Literature Review* | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |  | **/ 20** |
| 4 | Metodologi Kajian*Research Methodology* | 7.0 |  |  |  |  |  | **/ 35** |
| 5 | Jangkaan Keputusan*Expected Finding* | 2.0 |  |  |  |  |  | **/ 10** |
| 6 | Rujukan*Reference* | 2.0 |  |  |  |  |  | **/ 10** |
| **JUMLAH/ *TOTAL*** | **/100** |

\* Sangat Lemah/ *Very Poor* [1]; Lemah/ *Poor* [2]; Sederhana/ *Fair* [3]; Baik/ *Good* [4]; Cemerlang/ *Excellent* [5]

1. **Perakuan/ *Recommendation***

Setelah memeriksa laporan cadangan penyelidikan ini, saya memperakukan bahawa:

*After examining this research proposal report, I recommend that:*

|  |
| --- |
| Memuaskan (lulus cadangan penyelidikan dan boleh meneruskan kajian)/ *Satisfactory (pass research probation and student can proceed with progress)* |
| Semak semula cadangan penyelidikan berdasarkan komen (hantar semula untuk perakuan)/*Revise the proposal as stated in the comments (resubmit for recommendation)* |
| Tidak memuaskan, memerlukan penulisan dan pembentangan semula/ *Unsatisfactory, rewrite and representation are required* |

\*Nota*/ Note:*

Pelajar yang memperolehi markah kurang 65% juga perlu menghantar dan membuat pembentangan semula/ *Student who receive mark below than 65% also need to resubmit and represent*

1. **Komen/ *Comment***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Tandatangan*****Signature*** | **:** |
| **Nama Penilai*****Assessor's Name*** | **:** |
| **Tarikh*****Date*** | **:** |

**PANDUAN KEPADA PENYELIAAN/ PEMANTAUAN**

***GUIDELINES FOR SUPERVISION/MONITORING***

1. Bagi setiap aspek yang dinilai, sila pilih salah satu nilai, di antara 1 - 5 yang bertepatan dengan kriteria yang ditetapkan. Darabkan nilai dengan pemberat untuk mendapatkan markah bagi aspek berkenaan/ *For each aspect evaluated, please give a rating of 1 - 5, according to the stipulated criteria. Multiply the rating with its weightage to obtain the marks for each aspect.*
2. Berikut adalah panduan untuk menginterpretasi markah dan cadangan tindakan susulan dalam pemantauan terhadap cadangan penyelidikan pelajar/ *Below is the guide for interpreting scores and the corresponding proposed action in evaluating the research proposal of student.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Pelaksana*****User*** | **Markah*****Mark*** | **Interpretasi*****Interpretation*** | **Cadangan Tindakan Susulan*****Proposed Action*** |
| Penyelia*Supervisor* | ***<65******≥65*** | Kurang memuaskan*Unsatisfactory*Baik Satisfactory | Bincang kelemahan laporan projek dengan pelajar, perbaiki dan/atau pembentangan semula.*Discuss weaknesses, corrections and / or re-presentation with the student.*Diperakukan lulus*Approved* |
| Penilai*Assessor* | ***<65******≥65*** | Kurang memuaskan*Unsatisfactory*Baik*Satisfactory* | Bincang kelemahan laporan projek dengan pelajar, perbaiki dan/atau penilaian semula.*Discuss weaknesses, corrections and /or re-presentation with the student.*Diperakukan lulus*Approved* |

PENILAIAN CADANGAN PENYELIDIKAN (KFA)

*EVALUATION OF RESEARCH PROPOSAL (KFA)*

Borang ini akan dikembalikan kepada pelajar untuk penambahbaikan. Sila sediakan komen yang komprehensif/ *This form will be returned to student for the improvement works*. *Please provide comprehensive comments.* Sila guna lampiran jika tidak mencukupi*/ Please use attachment if required.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Bab/ *Chapter*** | **Komen/ *Comment*** |
| 1 | Tajuk*Title* |  |
| 2 | Pengenalan*Introduction* |  |
| 3 | Kajian Literatur*Literature Review* |  |
| 4 | Metodologi Kajian*Research Methodology* |  |
| 5 | Jangkaan Keputusan*Expected Finding* |  |
| 6 | Rujukan*Reference* |  |

 

FACULTY OF CIVIL ENGINEERING AND BUILT ENVIRONMENT

UNIVERSITI TUN HUSSEIN ONN MALAYSIA

 EVALUATION OF RESEARCH PROGRESS

MASTER BY RESEARCH

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 in research implementationthroughout the semester.(ii) A guide for monitoring students’ writing progress throughout the semester(iii) A marking guide for approving thesis reports to the next level.Note: Supervisors will receive instruments upon appointment by the faculty. |
| Assessor | A marking guide for approving thesis reports to the next level.Note: Assessors will receive instruments upon appointment by the faculty. |

GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATING THESIS

Below is the guide for interpreting scores and the corresponding proposed action when this instrument is used in evaluating thesis.

User Marks

Obtained

Interpretation Proposed Action

Supervisor <65 Unsatisfactory Discuss weaknesses, corrections and /

or re-presentation with the student

≥65 Satisfactory Approved

Assessor <65 Unsatisfactory Discuss weaknesses, corrections and /

or re-presentation with the student

≥65 Satisfactory Approved

**PRESENTATION**

1.0 CONTENT AND INFORMATION (30%) PLO6

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Rating | Weightage |
|  Integrate information for long life learning:* Structure of content is very systematic
* Information is very solid
* Its sources are from verified journals or original sources, relevant and up to date literature
 | Excellent[5] | 6 |
|  Integrate information for long life learning:* Structure of content is systematic
* Information is solid
* Its sources of reference are from verified journals or original
* sources, relevant and up to date literature
 | Good[4] | 6 |
|  Integrate information for long life learning:* Structure of content is satisfactory
* Information is satisfactory
* Its sources of reference are from verified journals or original sources, relevant and up to date literature
 | Fair[3] | 6 |
|  Integrate information for long life learning:* Structure of content is unsystematic
* Information is not solid
* I Its sources of reference are from verified journals or original sources, relevant and up to date literature
 | Poor[2] | 6 |
| Integrate information for long life learning:* Structure of content is are not consistent
* Information is very weak
* I Its sources of reference are from verified journals or original sources, relevant and up to date literature
 | Very Poor[1] | 6 |

2.0 QUALITY OF PRESENTATION (20%)PLO 9

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Rating | Weightage |
|  Demonstrate effective communication skill via oral  presentation* + Presentation is very solid and fully cover the main content
	+ Content arrangement is very good
	+ Time management is very good
	+ Shows a very good confidence level, eye contact and posture.
 | Excellent[5] | 4 |
| Demonstrate effective communication skill via oral presentation* Presentation is solid and almost fully cover the main content
* Content arrangement is good
* Time management is good
* Shows a good confidence level, eye contact and posture.
 | Good[4] | 4 |
| Demonstrate effective communication skill via oral presentation* + Presentation is satisfactory and partially cover the main content
	+ Content arrangement is satisfactory
	+ Time management is satisfactory
	+ Shows a satisfactory confidence level, eye contact and posture.
 | Fair[3] | 4 |
| Demonstrate effective communication skill via oral presentation* Presentation is not solid and almost not cover the main content
* Content arrangement is poor
* Time management is poor
* Shows a poor confidence level, eye contact and posture.
 | Poor[2] | 4 |
| Demonstrate effective communication skill via oral presentation* Presentation is very weak and not cover the main content
* No time management at all
* Shows a very weak confidence level, eye contact and posture.
 | Very Poor[1] | 4 |

3.0 MASTERY OF KNOWLEDGE (25%) PLO 1

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Rating | Weightage |
|  Demonstrated contributing to research that broadens the frontier  of knowledge in the relevant field * Show the high ability in mastering of knowledge.
* Know highly detail on study was conducted
	+ Show the high ability to undertake and analysis the problem
* with true method of evaluation, supporting by the literature
	+ High ability to justify the importance/contribution of the study
 | Excellent[5] | 5 |
|  Demonstrated contributing to research that broadens the frontier  of knowledge in the relevant field * Show the ability in mastering of knowledge.
	+ Know detail on study was conducted
	+ Show the ability to undertake and analysis the problem

 with true method of evaluation, supporting by the literature * + Able to justify the importance/contribution of the study
 | Good[4] | 5 |
|  Demonstrated contributing to research that broadens the frontier  of knowledge in the relevant field * + Show the less ability in mastering of knowledge.
	+ Know less detail on study was conducted
	+ Show less ability to undertake and analysis the problem with true method of evaluation, supporting by the literature
	+ Weak ability to give justification for the results
	+ Know less detail the Importance/contribution of the study
 | Fair[3] | 5 |
|  Demonstrated contributing to research that broadens the frontier  of knowledge in the relevant field * + Show the no ability in mastering of knowledge.
	+ Know less on study was conducted
	+ Show no ability to undertake and analysis the problem with true method of evaluation, supporting by the literature
	+ Very weak ability to justify the importance/contribution of the study
 | Poor[2] | 5 |
|  Demonstrated contributing to research that broadens the frontier  of knowledge in the relevant field * + Does not mastering of knowledge.
	+ Does not know on study was conducted
	+ Does not know to undertake and analysis with true method of evaluation, supporting by the literature
	+ Not able to justify the importance/contribution of the study
 | Very Poor[1] | 5 |

4.0 ATITUDE AND VERBAL ABILITY (25%) PLO11

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Rating | Weightage |
| Ability to answer technical questions in a concise and precise manner.• Able to answer all questions very effectively• The answers given are highly relevant* Able to elaborate the answer with highly relevant supporting sources
 | Excellent[5] | 5 |
| Ability to answer technical questions in a concise and precise manner.* + Able to answer all questions effectively
	+ The answers given are relevant
	+ Able to elaborate the answer with relevant supporting sources
 | Good[4] | 5 |
| Ability to answer technical questions in a concise and precise manner.* + Able to answer all questions moderately well
	+ Some of the answers given are irrelevant
* Elaborate the answer with irrelevant supporting
 | Fair[3] | 5 |
| • Unable to answer some questions | Poor[2] | 5 |
| • Unable to answer all questions | Very Poor[1] | 5 |

**REPORT**

1.0 TITLE (5%) PLO1

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Rating | Weightage |
|  The title carries the exact meaning and covers the study carried out Descriptive: not too short, not too long. Clear reflection of project content. | 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 |

2.0 INTRODUCTION (20%) PLO1

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Rating | Weightage |
| There are statements that very clearly include the following:• The problem being investigated (objectives / concepts /hypotheses)• Supporting literature /theory/ justification of research• Contribution of research/ critical evaluation/ synthesis of complex information• Limitations / scope of the study | Excellent[5] | 4.0 |
| There are statements that clearly include the following:• The problem being investigated (objectives / concepts /hypotheses)• Supporting literature /theory/ justification of research• Contribution of research/ critical evaluation/ synthesis of complex information• Limitations / scope of the study | Good[4] | 4.0 |
| There are statements that satisfactorily include the following:• The problem being investigated (objectives / concepts /hypotheses)• Supporting literature /theory/ justification of research• Contribution of research/ critical evaluation/ synthesis of complex information• Limitations / scope of the study | Fair[3] | 4.0 |
| There are statements that vaguely include the following:• The problem being investigated (objectives / concepts /hypotheses)• Supporting literature /theory/ justification of research• Contribution of research/ critical evaluation/ synthesis of complex information• Limitations / scope of the study | Poor[2] | 4.0 |
| There are no statements that include the following:• The problem being investigated (objectives / concepts /hypotheses)• Supporting literature /theory/ justification of research• Contribution of research/ critical evaluation/ synthesis of complex information• Limitations / scope of the study | Very Poor[1] | 4.0 |

3.0 LITERATURE REVIEW (20%) PLO2

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Rating | Weightage |
| Manage information for complex Civil Engineering problem through knowledge and understanding in latest development: • The LR is very relevant, inclusive and comprehensive• The LR is critically written and balanced• Its sources of reference are extremely reliable (from verified journals or original sources) and up to date literature. | Excellent[5] | 4.0 |
| Manage information for complex Civil Engineering problem through knowledge and understanding in latest development:• The LR is relevant, inclusive and comprehensive• The LR is well written and balanced• Its sources of reference are reliable (from verified journals or original sources) and up to date literature. | Good[4] | 4.0 |
| Manage information for complex Civil Engineering problem through knowledge and understanding in latest development:• The LR is only slightly relevant, inclusive and comprehensive• The LR is poorly written and balanced• Its sources of reference are not very reliable (from verified journals or original sources) and up to date literature. | Fair[3] | 4.0 |
| Manage information for complex Civil Engineering problem through knowledge and understanding in latest development: • The LR is irrelevant, inclusive and comprehensive• The LR is poorly written and balanced• Its sources of reference are not very reliable (from verified journals or original sources) and up to date literature. | Poor[2] | 4.0 |
| Manage information for complex Civil Engineering problem through knowledge and understanding in latest development: lifelong learning: • The LR is irrelevant• The LR is not well written• It does not have any suitable sources of reference (from verified journals or original sources) and up to date literature. | Very Poor[1] | 4.0 |

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY (35%) PLO3

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Rating | Weightage |
| Apply practical skills professionally in related works using appropriate methods:• The research methodology is highly suitable for achieving the study objectives• Procedures are described in great detail and adhering to established procedures and processes. • Giving highly suitable justifications for research techniques, methods, procedures etc.   | Excellent[5] | 7.0 |
| Apply practical skills professionally in related works using appropriate methods:• The research methodology is good for achieving the study objectives• Procedures are described in detail and adhering to established procedures and processes. • Giving good justifications for research techniques, methods, procedures etc. | Good[4] | 7.0 |
| Apply practical skills professionally in related works using appropriate methods:• The research methodology is satisfactory for achieving the study objectives• Procedures are described in general terms and adhering to established procedures and processes.• Giving satisfactory justifications for research techniques, methods, procedures etc. | Fair[3] | 7.0 |
| Apply practical skills professionally in related works using appropriate methods:• The research methodology is not very suitable for achieving the study objectives• Procedures are not very well described• Giving not very suitable justifications for research techniques, methods, procedures etc. | Poor[2] | 7.0 |
| Apply practical skills professionally in related works using appropriate methods:• 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 |

5. EXPECTED FINDINGS (10%) PLO2

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Rating | Weightage |
| Relate ideas to solve and manage complex Civil Engineering problem by: • The expected key findings of the study are very clearlystated• The expected findings are highly consistent with theobjectives of the study | Excellent[5] | 2.0 |
| Relate ideas to solve and manage complex Civil Engineering problem by: • 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 |
| Relate ideas to solve and manage complex Civil Engineering problem by: • The expected key findings of the study are satisfactorilystated• The expected findings are in line with the objectives of the study | Fair[3] | 2.0 |
| Relate ideas to solve and manage complex Civil Engineering problem by: Relate ideas to solve and manage complex Civil Engineering problem by: • 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 |
| Relate ideas to solve and manage complex Civil Engineering problem by: • The expected key findings of the study are not stated | Very Poor[1] | 2.0 |

6.0 REFERENCES, LANGUAGE AND WRITING STYLE (10%) PLO6

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Rating | Weightage |
| Use a wide range of suitable digital technologies and appropriate software by:• Sources of reference are very reliable (from verified journals or original sources)• All sources of citations are stated in the text and in the listof references• References are written according to the prescribed format• Compliance to the format of UTHM’s Thesis Writing Guide and the use of good and consistent writing style. | Excellent[5] | 2.0 |
| Use a wide range of suitable digital technologies and appropriate software by:• Sources of reference are reliable (from verified journals ororiginal sources)• All sources of citations are stated in the text and in the list of references• References are written according to the prescribed format.• Compliance to the format of UTHM’s Thesis Writing Guide and the use of good and consistent writing style. | Good[4] | 2.0 |
| Use a wide range of suitable digital technologies and appropriate software by:• Sources of reference are suitable (from verified journals ororiginal sources)• All sources of citations are stated in the text and in the list of references• References are written according to the prescribed format.• Compliance to the format of UTHM’s Thesis Writing Guide and the use of good and consistent writing style. | Fair[3] | 2.0 |
| Use a wide range of suitable digital technologies and appropriate software by:• 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.• Compliance to the format of UTHM’s Thesis Writing Guide. | Poor[2] | 2.0 |
| Use a wide range of suitable digital technologies and appropriate software by:• 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 prescribedformat | Very Poor[1] | 2.0 |