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PENILAI/*ASSESSOR*

FAKULTI KEJURUTERAAN AWAM DAN ALAM BINA

UNIVERSITI TUN HUSSEIN ONN MALAYSIA

EVALUATION OF RESEARCH PROPOSAL

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN CIVIL ENGINEERING (PFA)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Student's Name** | **:** |  |
| **Matriculation No.** | **:** |  |
| **Title** | **:** |  |
| **Method of Writing** | **:** | **□** Conventional **□** Industry **□** Publication |

1. **Pembentangan/ *Presentation***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Item** | **Weightage** | **Rating\***  **Please Tick [√]** | | | | | **Mark** |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| 1 | Content and Information | 6.0 |  |  |  |  |  | **/ 30** |
| 2 | Quality of Presentation | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |  | **/ 20** |
| 3 | Mastery of Knowledge | 5.0 |  |  |  |  |  | **/ 25** |
| 4 | Aptitude and Verbal Ability | 5.0 |  |  |  |  |  | **/ 25** |
| **TOTAL** | | | | | | | | **/100** |

1. **Laporan/ *Report***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Item** | **Weightage** | **Rating\***  **Please Tick [√]** | | | | | **Mark** |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| 1 | Title | 1.0 |  |  |  |  |  | **/ 5** |
| 2 | Introduction / Project background | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |  | **/ 20** |
| 3 | Literature review / Review on current practices | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |  | **/ 20** |
| 4 | Methodology / Methodology based on project outcome | 7.0 |  |  |  |  |  | **/ 35** |
| 5 | Expected research outcome / Expected project findings | 2.0 |  |  |  |  |  | **/ 10** |
| 6 | Reference | 2.0 |  |  |  |  |  | **/ 10** |
| **TOTAL** | | | | | | | | **/100** |

\* Very Poor [1]; Poor [2]; Fair [3]; Good [4]; Excellent [5]

1. **Recommendation**

After examining this research proposal report, I recommend that:

|  |
| --- |
| Satisfactory (pass research probation and student can proceed with progress) |
| Revise the proposal as stated in the comments (resubmit for recommendation) |
| Unsatisfactory, rewrite and representation are required |

\* Note:

Students who receive marks below 65% also need to resubmit and represent

1. **Comment**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Signature** | **:** |
| **Assessor's Name** | **:** |
| **Date** | **:** |

**GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATION**

1. 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. Assessors need to select the items being assessed according to the suitability of the student's writing method.
3. Below is the guide for interpreting scores and the corresponding proposed action in evaluating the research proposal of student.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **User** | **Mark** | **Interpretation** | **Proposed Action** |
| Assessor | **<65**  **≥65** | Unsatisfactory  Satisfactory | Discuss weaknesses, corrections and /or re-presentation with the student.  Approved |

EVALUATION OF RESEARCH PROPOSAL

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN CIVIL ENGINEERING (PFA)

This form will be returned to the student for the improvement work. Please provide comprehensive comments. Students need to respond to every comment given by the Panel and discuss with the Supervisor regarding the corrections made. Use an attachment if required.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Chapter** | **Comment** | **Correction / Response from Student** |
| 1 | Title |  |  |
| 2 | Introduction / Project background |  |  |
| 3 | Review on current practices |  |  |
| 4 | Methodology / Methodology based on project outcome |  |  |
| 5 | Expected research outcome / Expected project findings |  |  |
| 6 | Reference |  |  |



FACULTY OF CIVIL ENGINEERING AND BUILT ENVIRONMENT

UNIVERSITI TUN HUSSEIN ONN MALAYSIA

EVALUATION OF RESEARCH PROPOSAL

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN CIVIL ENGINEERING (PFA)

Description of instrument:

This assessment instrument is to be used by the assessor. Its purpose is to help improve the validity of the assessment system in terms of its reliability and transparency.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| User | Functions of Instrument |
| 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

Assessor <65 Unsatisfactory Discuss weaknesses, corrections and /

or re-presentation with the student

≥65 Satisfactory Approved

**PRESENTATION**

1.0 CONTENT AND INFORMATION (30%) PLO6 PLO9

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Rating | Weightage |
| Competently 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 |
| Competently 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 |
| Competently 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 |
| Competently 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 |
| Competently 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 PLO5

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Rating | Weightage |
| Demonstrate effective communication skills 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 skills via oral presentation   * Presentation is not solid and almost does 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 skills via oral presentation   * Presentation is very weak and does 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/project that broadens the frontier  of knowledge in the relevant field   * Show a high ability in mastering of knowledge. * Know highly detail on the study / project was conducted   + Show a high ability to undertake and analyze the problem * with a 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/project 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 analyze the problem with a true method of evaluation, supporting by the literature   + Able to justify the importance/contribution of the study | Good  [4] | 5 |
| Demonstrated contributing to research/project 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/project 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/project that broadens the frontier  of knowledge in the relevant field   * + Does not mastering of knowledge.   + Does not know on study/project was conducted   + Does not know to undertake and analysis with a 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 for PhD level  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 project carried out for PhD level | Good  [4] | 1.0 |
|  The title carries a meaning that covers the project carried out but contains grammatical errors | Fair  [3] | 1.0 |
|  The title does not carry a meaning that covers the project carried out | Poor  [2] | 1.0 |
|  The title is unsuitable | Very Poor  [1] | 1.0 |

2.0 INTRODUCTION / PROJECT BACKGROUND (20%) PLO1

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Rating | Weightage |
| There are statements that very clearly include the following:  • The problem being investigated (objectives / concepts /hypotheses)  • Supporting literature / justification of project  • Novelty / Originality  • Contribution of project / critical evaluation/ synthesis of complex information  • Limitations / scope of the project | Excellent  [5] | 4.0 |
| There are statements that clearly include the following:  • The problem being investigated (objectives / concepts / hypotheses)  • Supporting literature /justification of project  • Novelty / Originality  • Contribution of project / critical evaluation/ synthesis of complex information  • Limitations / scope of the project | Good  [4] | 4.0 |
| There are statements that satisfactorily include the following:  • The problem being investigated (objectives / concepts / hypotheses)  • Supporting literature /theory/ justification of project  • Novelty / Originality  • Contribution of project / critical evaluation/ synthesis of complex information  • Limitations / scope of the project | 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 |
| Critically 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 |
| Critically 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 |
| Critically 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 |
| Critically 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 |
| Critically 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 |
| Mastery 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 |
| Mastery 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 |
| Mastery 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 |
| Mastery 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 |
| Mastery 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 |
| Critically relate ideas to solve and manage complex Civil Engineering problem by:  • The expected key findings of the study are very clearly  stated  • The expected findings are highly consistent with the  objectives of the study | Excellent  [5] | 2.0 |
| Critically 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 |
| Critically relate ideas to solve and manage complex Civil Engineering problem by:  • The expected key findings of the study are satisfactorily  stated  • The expected findings are in line with the objectives of the study | Fair  [3] | 2.0 |
| Critically 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 |
| Critically 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 |
| Competently 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 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. | Excellent  [5] | 2.0 |
| Competently use a wide range of suitable digital technologies and appropriate software by:  • Sources of reference are reliable (from verified journals or  original 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 |
| Competently use a wide range of suitable digital technologies and appropriate software by:  • Sources of reference are suitable (from verified journals or  original 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 |
| Competently 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 |
| Competently 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 prescribed  format | Very Poor  [1] | 2.0 |