



UPNM
National Defence University of Malaysia
Kewajipan • Melayu • Integriti

**CENTRE FOR GRADUATE STUDIES
NATIONAL DEFENCE UNIVERSITY OF MALAYSIA**

PROPOSAL DEFENCE ASSESSMENT

DATE OF PROPOSAL DEFENCE : _____

SECTION A: STUDENT INFORMATION

Name of Student			
Matric. No.		Number of registered semesters	
Programme			
Field of Study			
Faculty			
Mode of Registration	<input type="checkbox"/> Full time <input type="checkbox"/> Part Time		
Proposal Title			

SECTION B : EVALUATION (To be filled by the assessor)

NO.	ASPECT OF ASSESSMENT	MARKS (M) (please circle the appropriate mark for each section)					WEIGHTED MARKS OBTAINED (%)
		0	1-2	3	4	5	
1.	Introduction/ Research Background (5%)	0	1-2	3	4	5	($=M \times 1$)
		Introduction provided is not relevant	Introduction makes little reference to the work(s), poorly addresses the topic	Introduction makes some reference to the work(s), attempts to address the topic	Introduction makes some reference to the work(s), attempts to address the topic.	Introduction refers specifically to the work(s), clearly addresses the topic directly.	
		Comments					
						
						
						
						
2.	Problem Statement (20%)	0	1-2	3	4	5	($=M \times 2$)
		No analysis of problem	Minimal analysis of problem	Moderate analysis of problem	Clear analysis of problem	Very clear analysis of problem	
	Comments						
						
						
						
						
						
2.	a. Analysis of the problem (10%)	0	1-2	3	4	5	($=M \times 2$)
		No rationale and justification	Little rationale and justification	Moderate rationale and justification	Clear rationale and justification	Very clear rationale and justification	
	Comments						
						
						
						
						
						
3.	Research Objectives / Research Questions (10%)	0	1-2	3	4	5	($=M \times 2$)
		Research objectives/questions are not described	Research objectives and questions are described but not clear	Research objectives/questions are described but moderately clear	Research objectives/questions are described clearly	Research objectives/questions are described very clearly	
		Comments					
						
						
						
						

4.	Literature Review (20%)	0	1-2	3	4	5	(=M x 4)
		Insufficient reporting/ reviewing and outdated information	Reports on earlier literature without connecting it to the research problem and question, and/or fails to identify relevant literature	Reports on earlier literature without connecting it clearly to the research problem and questions	Reviews earlier literature relevant to the research problem and questions.	Demonstrates critical thinking, creativity and insight in reviewing earlier literature relevant to the research.	
		Comments					
						
						
						
						
5.	Research Methodology/ Research Design (20%) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Method of data collection and analysis • Sampling design • Procedure / technique / experimental setup 	0	1-2	3	4	5	(=M x 4)
		Limited data collection method / Highly inaccurate choice of sampling design / No procedures or techniques or experimental	Unclear data collection method / Inaccurate choice of sampling design / Unclear procedures or techniques or experimental setup	Moderately clear data collection method / Moderately inaccurate choice of sampling design / Moderately clear procedures or techniques or	Clear data collection method / Accurate choice of sampling design / Clear procedures or techniques or experimental setup	Very clear data collection method / Highly accurate choice of sampling design / Very clear procedures or techniques or experimental setup	
		Comments					
						
						
						
						
6.	Significance/ Applied Value of the Research (10%)	0	1-2	3	4	5	(=M x 2)
		No significance of study	Vague significance of study	Moderately clear significance of study	Clear significance of study	Very clear significance of study	
		Comments					
						
						
						
						
7.	Title of Research (5%)	0	1-2	3	4	5	(=M x 1)
		No reflection of research	Minimal reflection of research	Moderate reflection of research	Clear reflection of research	Very clear reflection of research	
		Comments					
						
						
						
						

8.	References (5%)	0	1-2	3	4	5	(=M x 1)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sources of reference are unreliable • None of the sources of citations are stated in the text and in the list of references 	<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 	<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 	<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 	<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 	
		Comments					
						
						
						
						
9.	Proposal organization and presentation (5%)	0	1-2	3	4	5	(=M x 1)
		The proposal does not follow the overall standard format	Poor proposal write-up with extensive spelling mistakes and/or grammatical errors. Some required components are missing.	The proposal is coherent but with minor spelling or grammatical errors. Some of the required components are present	The proposal is comprehensive with a few spelling or grammatical errors. Most of the required components are present	The proposal is comprehensive without spelling or grammatical errors. All of the required components are present	
		Comments					
						
						
						
						
TOTAL MARKS							

Please tick (x) one of the following:

TOTAL MARKS	RESULT		DESCRIPTION
≥ 50	Satisfactory		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Proposal accepted with no amendments.• The research proposal is recommended as a Doctoral Degree / Masters Degree proposal
			<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Proposal accepted with amendments.• The research proposal is recommended as a Doctoral Degree / Masters Degree proposal
< 50	Unsatisfactory		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Major amendments required.• Student is required to resubmit the amended proposal and present again at next PD.

Name of Assessor :

Faculty :

Signature :

Date :