Institute of Postgraduate Studies
Institut Pengajian Siswazah

EXAMINERS REPORT FOR PRE-VIVA VOCE

Student's Particular and Examination's Details:

Student's Name	:	
Student ID	:	
Programme	:	
Faculty	:	
Research Title	:	
Main Supervisor's Name	:	
Examiner's Name	:	

INSTRUCTION FOR COMPLETING THE PRE-VIVA VOCE EXAMINER'S REPORT FORM

The Pre-Viva Examiner's Report consists of TWO (2) sections:

SECTION A: GUIDED REPORT
SECTION B: APPENDIX A (DETAILS FOR THESIS RUBRIC)

- All examiners are required to submit their reports using the Pre-Viva Voce Examiner's Report form (SECTION A)
- The examiners may use the rubric as a guide to evaluate the thesis (SECTION B).

GUIDED REPORT

The examiners may use the rubric as a guide to evaluate the thesis

Not Appropriate at all				*Most Appropriate*
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

1. Abstract **(PLO1)**

Comments				
1	2	3	4	5

2. Introduction **(PLO1)**

Comments				
1	2	3	4	5

3. Literature Review **(PLO1)**

Comments				
1	2	3	4	5

4. Methodology **(PLO6)**

Comments				
1	2	3	4	5

5. Results and Discussion **(PLO6)**

Comments				
1	2	3	4	5

6. Conclusion and Recommendation **(PLO6)**

Comments				
1	2	3	4	5

Comments for Student's Thesis

Please state your comments in the space provided. You may refer to the Rubric in Appendix A.

Comments:

(If necessary, extra pages may be attached)

Signature:
Examiner's Name:
Date:

APPENDIX A

Items Assessed	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Good	Very good	Excellent
Abstract **(PLO1)**	Missed two or more of the following items and badly written: • Introduction • Methodology • Results • Discussion	Missed one of the following items and badly written: • Introduction • Methodology • Results • Discussion	Has all the following items but written badly: • Introduction • Methodology • Results • Discussion	Has all the following items but points are not connected properly: • Introduction • Methodology • Results • Discussion • Potential use • Fairly written	Has all the following items excellently written: • Introduction • Methodology • Results • Discussion • Potential use • Points are connected properly
Introduction **(PLO1)**	Very little background information or information is incorrect. Poor understanding of topic, inadequate research. Statement of problem is erroneous or irrelevant. Objective and scope are not clear.	Has the following items: • Background • Motivation (current issue and potential solution) • Objective and scope **But** • Unclear problem statement • Objective and scope is not clear • Writing is bad • Points are not connected properly	Has the following items: • Background • Motivation (current issue and potential solution) • Problem statement well defined • Objective and scope **But** • Objective and scope are not clear • Writing is bad • Points are not connected properly	Has the following items but points are not connected properly: • Background • Motivation (current issue and potential solution) • Problem statement well defined • Objective and scope are well defined • Writing is acceptable	Has the following items: • Background • Motivation (current issue and potential solution) • Problem statement well defined • Objective and scope are well defined • Well written • Points are connected properly from paragraph to another
Literature Review **(PLO1)**	Poor understanding of topic, inadequate research or very little research. No external literature research.	Has the following items: • General overview of the project • Literature review is concise, well-written and references cited correctly • Literature review argues findings and/or methods from previous work without suggesting potential solution • Insufficient literature to develop problem statement • Summary of literature review **But** • Writing is bad • Points are not connected properly	Has the following items: • General overview of the project • Extensive review: concise, well-written and references cited correctly • Literature review argues findings and/or methods from previous work • Literature review led towards the formulation of the problem statement but in most cases tinged with confusion • Summary of literature review **But** • Writing is bad • Points are not connected properly	Has the following items: • General overview of the project • Extensive review: is concise, well-written and references cited correctly • Literature review critically argues findings and/or methods from previous work • Literature review leads towards the formulation of the problem statement • Summary of literature review • Acceptable writing **But** • Points are not connected properly	Has the following items: • General overview of the project • Extensive review with citation • Literature review is concise, well-written and reference cited correctly • Literature review critically argues findings and/or methods from previous work and suggesting potential solution • Literature review leads towards the formulation of the problem statement • Summary of literature review • Well written • Points are connected properly from one paragraph to another
Methodology **(PLO6)**	Missing several important explanations of materials and/or methodology. Not sequential. Most steps are missing or are confusing.	Has the following items: • Materials/method description • Method/model/theory description with citation **But** • Badly written • Procedures are difficult to follow • Methods are confusing and lacking many details.	Has the following items: • Materials description • Complete method/model description with explanation and citation • Justification to use the method/model • Procedure is well written **But** contain • Some confusing sentences	Has the following items: • Materials/model/theory description • Complete method description with explanation and citation • Justification to use the method/model • Procedures are well written **But** contain • Some confusing sentences	Has the following items: • Materials description • Complete method description with explanation and citation • Justification to use the method/model • Procedures are well written • Well organised, logical and easy to follow.

APPENDIX A

Items Assessed	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Good	Very good	Excellent
Results and Discussion **(PLO6)**	All figures, graphs, tables contain errors or are poorly constructed, missing titles, captions or numbers, units missing or incorrect, etc. Lacking discussion	Has the following items: • Results (figures & tables) are presented in acceptable clarity • Discussion on the result trend • Validation: Comparison with theory or previous work or explanation for discrepancy **But** • Badly written • Discussion is difficult to follow • Confusing and lacking many details	Has the following items: • Results (figures & tables) are presented in acceptable clarity • Discussion on the result trend • Validation: Comparison with theory or previous work • Discussion is easy to follow • Explanation for discrepancy **But** • Badly written • Confusing and lacking some details	Has the following items: • Results (figures & tables) are presented in acceptable clarity • Discussion on the result trend • Validation: Comparison with theory or previous work • Explanation for discrepancy but not supported with relevant literature • Discussion is easy to follow • Well written	Has the following items: • Results (figures & tables) are presented in excellent clarity • Discussion on the result trend • Validation: Comparison with theory or previous work • Explanation for discrepancy supported with relevant literature • Discussion is easy to follow • Well written
Conclusion and Recommendation **(PLO6)**	Conclusion is not related to the objective. Recommendation is not related to the project. Badly written.	Conclusion is related to the objective. Recommendation is not related to the project. Badly written.	Conclusion is related to the objective. Recommendation is related to the project. Fairly well written.	Conclusion is related to the objective. Recommendation is related to the project. Well written.	Conclusion is related to the objective. Mention potential application of the study. Recommendation is related to the project. Well written.

MASTER OF SCIENCE							
NEC	**PROGRAMME OUTCOMES**						
520, 540	**PO1, PO3**	**PO7**	**PO5**	**PO4**	**PO4, PO5**	**PO2, PO3**	**PO6**
220, 310	**PO1**	**PO2**	**PO3**	**PO4**	**PO5**	**PO6**	**PO7**
340	**PO2**	**PO3**	**PO1**	**PO4**	**PO7**	**PO6**	**PO5**
481	**PO1, PO2**	**PO3**	**PO4**	**PO7**	**PO5, PO8**	**PO6**	**PO5**
440, 461, 462, 850, 862	**PO1**	**PO2**	**PO3**	**PO4**	**PO5**	**PO6**	**PO7**
545	**PO1**	**PO4**	**PO2**	**PO6**	**PO7, PO8**	**PO3**	**PO5**
[redacted]	**PLO1**	**PLO2**	**PLO3**	**PLO4**	**PLO5**	**PLO6**	**PLO7**

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY							
NEC	**PROGRAMME OUTCOMES**						
520, 540	**PO1, PO3**	**PO7**	**PO5**	**PO4**	**PO4, PO5**	**PO2, PO3**	**PO6**
220, 310	**PO1**	**PO2**	**PO3**	**PO4**	**PO5**	**PO6**	**PO7**
340	**PO2**	**PO3**	**PO1**	**PO4**	**PO7**	**PO6**	**PO5**
481	**PO1, PO2**	**PO3**	**PO4**	**PO7**	**PO5, PO8**	**PO6**	**PO5**
440, 461, 462, 850, 862	**PO1**	**PO2**	**PO3**	**PO4**	**PO5**	**PO6**	**PO7**
545	**PO1**	**PO4**	**PO2**	**PO6**	**PO7, PO8**	**PO3**	**PO5**
[redacted]	**PLO1**	**PLO2**	**PLO3**	**PLO4**	**PLO5**	**PLO6**	**PLO7**