

Name of Student		Program: <input type="checkbox"/> SSCE <input type="checkbox"/> SSCM
Proposal Title		
Supervisor's Name		

Chapter/ Criteria	Sub-criteria	Level of Achievement				Marks
		0-1 Incomplete	2-3 Needs Improvement	4 Good	5 Excellent	
CLO1/PLO3 (15%)						
Chapter 1	Introduction/ Research background	Lacks a proper introduction/research background. There is no substantive evidence to support the topic.	Introduction/research background is not well constructed and provides a few (< 5) sources of weak evidence to support the topic.	Fairly well formulated introduction/research background that has some evidence (>5) to support the topic but the evidence is a mixture of strong and weak sources.	Well formulated introduction based on facts that are supported with 8 or more strong sources of evidence specific to the topic.	
	Problem statement	Lacks a proper statement of the problem. Evidence presented does not support the thesis or problem statement.	Statement of the problem is not clearly stated and/or lacks quality evidence to support the problem	Fairly well posed statement of the problem that provides evidence but the evidence is not as strong as it could be.	Very clearly posed statement of the problem and supported with high quality (strong) evidence. Plus provides motivation for undertaking the research.	
	Objectives and scope of study	No information on what to expect in the proposal. The objectives and scope of study do not pertain to the introduction and/or the statement of the problem.	Objectives and scope of study are quite misleading and do not connect well with the introduction and the statement of the problem.	Fairly well stated of objective and scope of study that connect well to the introduction and the statement of the problem.	Very clearly stated objectives and scope of study that are scientifically sound and connect very well to the introduction and the statement of the problem.	
Chapter 2	Literature coverage	Most information is obtained from internet or textbook sources. Lack of scientific values.	Major sections of important content have been omitted or greatly run-on. The literature topic is of little significance to the proposal.	All major sections of the important content are included, but not covered in as much depth, or as explicit, as expected. Significance to the proposal is evident.	The appropriate content in consideration is covered in depth without being redundant. Sources are cited when specific statements are made. Significance to the proposal is unquestionable.	
	Arrangement or flow of literature review	Lack of connection in between subsections in Chapter 2. Some parts of the subsections are redundancy.	Lack of connection in between subsections in Chapter 2.	The arrangement or flow of literature review is generally good.	Literature review are arrange in proper order. Transitions tie sections together, as well as adjacent paragraphs.	
	Citation/ references	References are given for 1-5 relevant sources and are cited correctly (only minor mistakes) or 10-15 sources but most of them are not cited correctly.	References are given for 6-10 relevant sources (including latest 5 years), and are cited correctly (only minor mistakes) or 10-15 sources but most of them are not cited correctly.	References are given for 10-15 relevant sources (including latest 5 years), and cited correctly (only minor mistakes) or more than 15 sources but most of them are not cited correctly.	References are given for more than 15 relevant sources (including latest 5 years) and are cited correctly (only minor mistakes).	
CLO2/PLO3 (7.5%)						
Chapter 3	Methodology/ Experimental Design and Analysis	Unable to describe clearly the methodology/ experimental procedure.	The overall description of methodology/ experimental material is clear, however lack of detail explanations or citations.	Clear description on materials and/or methods, but occasionally unclear or wordy. Number and type of references could be more clearly stated.	Concise details are provided for methodology/ experimental procedure and the references are included clearly.	
	Research framework	No research framework has been defined.	Research framework has been defined in an unclear manner and it is not particularly successful with regard to the research task.	Research framework is fairly linked with the research topic. Key concepts are recognized.	Research framework is clearly linked with the topic studied and appropriately defined. Also clearly defines the key concept related to the research topic.	
	Gantt Chart/ Timeline	Unable to plan at all and poor timeline planning. (Please assign 0 if Gantt Chart/Timeline is not included)	The description within Gantt Chart is acceptable, but occasionally not clear.	The description on methodology/experimental design is clear and the Gantt Chart is reasonable	The description within Gantt Chart is Self-explanatory. The methodology/ experimental design flow smoothly and clearly linked to one each other. The time line is well plan.	

Chapter/ Criteria	Sub-criteria	Level of Achievement				Marks
		0-1 Incomplete	2-3 Needs Improvement	4 Good	5 Excellent	
CLO4/PLO3 (2.5%)						
Chapter 4	Expected findings/ preliminary results	Nearly no evidence of expected findings or preliminary results.	Expected findings or preliminary results are appropriately documented but some part is missing.	Expected findings or preliminary results are properly documented.	Excellent evidence of expected findings or preliminary results.	
CLO5/PLO5 (5%)						
Writing style	Clarity	Writing disorganized and difficult to read and understand.	Readable writing style, but difficult to follow	Writing style indicates planning that makes reading easy	Writing style indicates planning that makes reading easy and flow of material makes understanding easy	
Format	According to UTM thesis format *See format below	The setting of format is inconsistent throughout the proposal.	Inconsistent of the format and at least an editing error per page	Most of the format setting are followed, but with a few careless mistakes	Consistent and follow strictly the format set by UTM	
CLO3/PLO7 (10%)						
Working Quality	Self-initiative	The student did not understand the project and did not show any self-initiative at all.	The student did not understand some parts of the project and did not show self-initiative in handling and planning of the tasks for the project.	The student understood most parts of the project and showed some self-initiative in handling and planning of the tasks for the project	The student understood the project well and showed self-initiative in handling and planning of the tasks for the project	
	Commitment	The student did not demonstrate any form of commitment in the work (e.g never meet deadline, only 1 discussion meeting with supervisor (out of 7 weeks), etc)	The student was not committed and did not perform most tasks in the project (e.g seldom met deadline, only 2-3 discussion meetings with supervisor(out of 7 weeks), etc)	The student was committed and performed the tasks in the project in a satisfactory manner (e.g usually met deadline, 4-5 discussion meetings with supervisor(out of 7 weeks), etc)	The student was very committed and diligent in performing the tasks in the project (e.g consistently met deadline, more than 5 discussion meetings with supervisor(out of 7 weeks), etc)	
	Research ethics	The work was directly copied from previous works.	Most parts of the report were plagiarised, and if applicable, expected findings/ preliminary results reported did not reflect ethical responsibility (e.g: forged results, results not presented clearly)	Some parts of the report were plagiarised, and if applicable, expected findings/ preliminary results reported reflected satisfactory ethical responsibility (e.g: no forging of results, results presented in a satisfactory manner)	No apparent plagiarism, and if applicable, expected findings/ preliminary results reported reflected ethical responsibility (e.g: no forging of results, results presented in a professional manner)	
	Logbook	No/inadequate entry, entries do not reflect project progress	Weekly entry, entries somewhat reflect project progress	Meaningful weekly entry, entries reflect project progress	Meaningful weekly entry, entries reflect project progress, includes project planning	
Total marks (80 Marks)						
Actual Marks (Total marks ÷ 2)						

* Format thesis UTM: e.g Paper setting A4 (not letter); 1.5 spacing; Font 12 Times New Romans; Page margin (3.25 cm each for left & right, 2.5 cm each for top & bottom); Heading of Tables are placed on top, Legend of Figures are placed below; bold titles/subtitles, italic equations/genus/species/*et al.*; Equations numbered according to chapters; Reference format using Harvard or Number (Vancouver) style with UTM modifications; etc

Supervisor Signature:

Date: