



**CENTRE FOR GRADUATE STUDIES
UNIVERSITI TUN HUSSEIN ONN MALAYSIA**

**EVALUATION FOR
UPGRADING FROM MASTER 'S TO PhD**

Description of instrument:

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

The functions of this instrument are as follows:

User	Functions of Instrument
Assessor	(i) A marking guide for upgrading from Master's to PhD.

ASSESSMENT GUIDELINES

1. This instrument contains SIX key areas. Each section may have one or more sub-sections referring to research aspects to be evaluated.
2. For each aspect evaluated, please give a rating of 1 to 5, according to the stipulated criteria.
3. Multiply the rating by its weightage to obtain the marks for each aspect.
4. Add all the marks to get the total score.

GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATING RESEARCH PROPOSALS

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

User	Marks Obtained	Interpretation	Proposed Action
Assessor	<80	Unsatisfactory	No upgrading required
	≥80	Satisfactory	Proceed to the next stage

Personal Details of Student

Name of Student :

Matric No. :

Faculty :

Title of Research :

/ Thesis Draft :

.....

1. INTRODUCTION (15%)

Criteria	Rating	Weightage	Marks (Rating x Weightage)	Signature
There are statements that very clearly include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The problem being investigated (objectives / questions / hypotheses) • Supporting literature • Justification for the study • Importance of the study • Limitations / scope of the study 	Excellent (5)	3.0		
There are statements that are clearly include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The problem being investigated (objectives / questions / hypotheses) • Supporting literature • Justification for the study • Importance of the study • Limitations / scope of the study 	Good (4)	3.0		
There are statements that satisfactorily include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The problem being investigated (objectives / questions / hypotheses) • Supporting literature • Justification for the study • Importance of the study • Limitations / scope of the study 	Fair (3)	3.0		
There are statements that vaguely include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The problem being investigated (objectives / questions / hypotheses) • Supporting literature • Justification for the study • Importance of the study • Limitations / scope of the study 	Poor (2)	3.0		
There are no statements that include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The problem being investigated (objectives / questions / hypotheses) • Supporting literature • Justification for the study • Importance of the study • Limitations / scope of the study 	Very Poor (1)	3.0		
Comments:				

2. LITERATURE REVIEW (LR) (25%)

Criteria	Rating	Weightage	Marks (Rating x Weightage)	Signature
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LR is very relevant and comprehensive The LR is critically written and balance Its sources of reference are extremely reliable (from verified journals or original sources) 	Excellent (5)	5.0		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LR is relevant and comprehensive The LR is well written and balance Its sources of reference are reliable (from verified journals or original sources) 	Good (4)	5.0		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LR is only slightly relevant The LR is poorly written Its sources of reference are not very reliable 	Fair (3)	5.0		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LR is irrelevant The LR is poorly written Its sources of reference are not very reliable 	Poor (2)	5.0		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LR is irrelevant The LR is not well written It does not have any suitable sources of reference 	Very Poor (1)	5.0		

Comments:

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY (25%)

Criteria	Rating	Weightage	Marks (Rating x Weightage)	Signature
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The research methodology is highly suitable for achieving the study objectives Procedures are described in great detail The selected methods for data analysis are highly suitable 	Excellent (5)	5.0		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The research methodology is good for achieving the study objectives Procedures are described in detail The selected methods for data analysis are good 	Good (4)	5.0		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The research methodology is satisfactory for achieving the study objectives Procedures are described in general terms The selected methods for data analysis are suitable 	Fair (3)	5.0		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The research methodology is not very suitable for achieving the study objectives Procedures are not very well described The selected methods for data analysis are not very suitable 	Poor (2)	5.0		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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)	5.0		
Comments:				

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS (25%)

Criteria	Rating	Weightage	Marks (Rating x Weightage)	Signature
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data is analyzed using highly suitable methods Data is presented using highly suitable techniques Discussion of findings is highly structured and critical, taking into account the findings of previous researchers Interpretation of findings is very accurate and is comprehensively linked to the overall objectives / hypotheses 	Excellent (5)	5.0		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data is analyzed using good methods Data is presented using good techniques Discussion of findings is structured and critical, taking into account the findings of previous researchers Interpretation of findings is accurate and is linked to the objectives / hypotheses 	Good (4)	5.0		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data is analyzed using satisfactory methods Data is presented using satisfactory techniques Discussion of findings is structured and critical, taking into account the findings of previous researchers Interpretation of findings is good and is linked to the objectives / hypotheses 	Fair (3)	5.0		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data is analyzed using methods that are not quite suitable Data is presented using techniques that are not quite suitable Discussion of findings is inadequately structured and critical, and did not take into account the findings of previous researchers Interpretation of findings is not linked to the objectives / hypotheses 	Poor (2)	5.0		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data is analyzed using unsuitable methods Data is presented using unsuitable techniques Discussion of findings is unstructured and uncritical The findings are not interpreted 	Very Poor (1)	5.0		
Comments:				

5. REFERENCES (5%)

Criteria	Rating	Weightage	Marks (Rating x Weightage)	Signature
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	Excellent (5)	1.0		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	Good (4)	1.0		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	Fair (3)	1.0		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	Poor (2)	1.0		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sources of reference are unreliable None all 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)	1.0		
Comments:				

6. WRITING FORMAT (5%)

Criteria	Rating	Weightage	Marks (Rating x Weightage)	Signature
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Follows the format of UTHM's Thesis Writing Guide very closely • Uses a very good and consistent writing style • There is continuity and a very accurate unity of ideas 	Excellent (5)	1.0		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Follows the format of UTHM's Thesis Writing Guide closely • Uses a good and consistent writing style • There is continuity and an accurate unity of ideas 	Good (4)	1.0		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Follows the format of UTHM's Thesis Writing Guide reasonably • Uses an appropriate writing style • There is continuity and an reasonable unity of ideas 	Fair (3)	1.0		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roughly follows the format of UTHM's Thesis Writing Guide • Uses a not very appropriate writing style • Lacks continuity and unity of ideas 	Poor (2)	1.0		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not follow the format of UTHM's Thesis Writing Guide • Uses an inappropriate writing style • There is no continuity and unity of ideas 	Very Poor (1)	1.0		
Comments:				
TOTAL MARKS (M1)				/100

7. ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

7.1 Does the candidate qualify to be upgraded from Master's to PhD?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes. Please fill in the Supporting Report attached.
<input type="checkbox"/>	No.
	<p>Remarks :</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p>

Prepared by the Assessor:

Endorsed by Dean of Faculty :

Signature :

Name :

Position :

Date :

Signature :

Name :

Official Stamp :

Date :

SUPPORTING REPORT

a) Originality of research

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

b) Contribution to knowledge

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

Prepared by the Assessor:

Endorsed by Dean of Faculty :

Signature :
Name :
Position :
Date :

Signature :
Name :
Official Stamp :
Date :