**Section I: Student Particulars** *(to be filled up by School of Postgraduate Studies)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Candidate’s Name** |  | **Student ID** |  |
| **School** |  |
| **Programme** |  |
| **Thesis Tittle** |  |

**\* Note: Scale of Rating**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Scale** | **Marks Allocated** |
| upon 10 marks | upon 5 marks |
| **Exceptional / Outstanding** | ➈ ➉ | ➄ |
| **Strong / Very Good** | ➅ ➆ ➇ | ➂ ➃ |
| **Marginal / Fair** | ➂ ➃ ➄ | ➀ ➁ |
| **Poor / Unacceptable** | 🄋 ➀ ➁ | 🄋 |

**Section II: Please tick (🗸) the appropriate mark for each section. Please comment for each category.** *Please use additional sheets if necessary*.

|  |
| --- |
| **Thesis / Dissertation Report** |
| **Background Information** | **Score (%)** |
| * Consistently applies fundamental and advanced concepts to topics in subject area
 | ➈ ➉ |  |
| * Frequently applies fundamental and some advanced concepts to topics in subject area
 | ➅ ➆ ➇ |
| * Somewhat applies fundamental concepts to topics in subject area
 | ➂ ➃ ➄ |
| * Does not apply fundamental concepts in subject area
 | 🄋 ➀ ➁ |
| **Literature Review** | **Score (%)** |
| * Comprehensive literature review; Excellent critical analysis of related works; Use the latest and relevant references
 | ➈ ➉ |  |
| * Very clear literature review with good critical analysis of related works; Good evidence of well-organised bodies of knowledge; Demonstrate clear understanding of previous research
 | ➅ ➆ ➇ |
| * Satisfactory literature review with sufficient analysis of related works; Some awareness of the latest and use some relevant references; Demonstrate some understanding of previous research
 | ➂ ➃ ➄ |
| * Unrelated / Insufficient literature review; Little or no awareness of the latest and relevant reference; Demonstrate very little or implicit understanding of previous research
 | 🄋 ➀ ➁ |
| **Research Objectives / Problem Statements / Hypothesis** | **Score (%)** |
| * Demonstrate excellent grasp and understanding of the research problem and its relation to the surrounding issues; Questions addressed may provide significant new understanding; Objective and significance of the problem are stated clearly; Testing of multiple predictions/hypothesis has potential to provide especially conclusive results
 | ➈ ➉ |  |
| * Show sound grasp of the research problem; Questions addressed provide interesting insights into study system; Objectives are clear and related to the research problem; Several linked questions addressed or predictions from multiple hypotheses tested
 | ➅ ➆ ➇ |
| * Identify the main research problem; Show adequate understanding of the issue; Attempt to summarise and address the research problem but objectives are not within the parameter of, or deviate from the research problem; One or more hypotheses with testable predictions proposed
 | ➂ ➃ ➄ |
| * Failure to focus on a specific questions or hypothesis or objectives; Does not identify research problem appropriately; Objectives stated do no relate to the research problem; Ideas are impractical
 | 🄋 ➀ ➁ |
| **Design of Study; Research Framework** | **Score (%)** |
| * Demonstrate excellent understanding of the design; Design shows ingenuity and insight into system; Highly accurate choice of sampling design and biases effectively dealt with; Very clear research framework or academic construct or procedures or techniques or experimental setup; The scope of work is justifiable, workable and explicitly described
 | ➈ ➉ |   |
| * Use many correct methodology; Design of experiment provides maximum information and biases efficiently controlled or eliminated; Demonstrate good understanding of the design and able to justify the selection of methodology and materials; Clear research framework and the scope of work is defined
 | ➅ ➆ ➇ |
| * The research methodology/procedures/techniques/experimental setup is not clear; Unclear data collection method and some deliverables may not be measured; Show little grasp of the methodology adopted; Moderately clear research framework or academic construct and the scope of work are not precise
 | ➂ ➃ ➄ |
| * Use incorrect methodology; Does not adequately justify the selection of materials and methodology; Replication or controls inadequate; No or vague research framework or academic construct; The scope of work are unclear and/or wrongly defined
 | 🄋 ➀ ➁ |
| **Analysis, Interpretation and Discussion of Results** | **Score (%)** |
| * Results clearly presented; discussion hits major points and nuanced interpretation; Discussion is superior, accurate and engaging; Appropriate statistical analysis tool is used and reproducibility of results is possible; Findings are discussed with the most up-to-date references
 | ➈ ➉ |  |
| * Well thought out and clearly presented data summary as tables and graphs; Analysis and interpretation are sound and insightful and with appropriate statistical tools; Discussion sufficient and with few errors; Findings are discussed with relevant references
 | ➅ ➆ ➇ |  |
| * Data interpretation is appropriate but with some inconsistencies; Major topics or concepts inaccurately described; Considerable relevant discussion missing; Some inappropriate statistical tests were used; Most of the findings are without proper references or discussion
 | ➂ ➃ ➄ |  |
| * Data interpretation is inappropriate and data not summarized quantitatively; Results presented but possibly with inappropriate choice of tables and graphs; Failure to support results with statistics; Little discussion of project findings/outcomes; Displayed poor grasp of material
 | 🄋 ➀ ➁ |  |
| **Conclusions** | **Score (%)** |
| * Reach intelligent conclusions and makes excellent recommendations; Suggest new perspective or questions relevant to the central argument, and brings closure
 | ➈ ➉ |  |
| * Conclusions/summary based on outcomes and appropriate, included some recommendations; Clear take-home message
 | ➅ ➆ ➇ |  |
| * Conclusions/summary not entirely supported by findings/outcomes; Show some attempt to relate back to hypothesis/research questions/objectives
 | ➂ ➃ ➄ |  |
| * Conclusions unclear or not fully developed or not supported by findings/outcomes
 | 🄋 ➀ ➁ |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Clarity of Explanations** | **Score (%)** |
| * Sophisticated use of language maximizes interest, enjoyment and comprehension; Explanations very clear, factually correct
 | ➄ |  |
| * All explanations clear and easy to understand, factually correct
 | ➂ ➃ |
| * Overall meaning and explanations are understandable; Possibly some areas of slight confusion or minor factual errors
 | ➀ ➁ |
| * Serious difficulty explaining ideas; Major factual errors; Lack of comprehensibility
 | 🄋 |
| **Writing Style** | **Score (%)** |
| * Sophisticated, elegant style, complex yet lucid sentence structure, flawless grammar
 | ➄ |  |
| * Error-free, easy to read writing style, well-practiced and polished use of language
 | ➂ ➃ |
| * Basic writing style; Easy to read, few errors; Almost entirely in author's own words; Little paraphrasing or unnecessary quotation
 | ➀ ➁ |
| * Serious errors and awkwardness; Excessive use of quotation in place of author's own words; Excessive paraphrasing
 | 🄋 |
| **Total Marks** |  |

**Section III: Examiner Comments**

|  |
| --- |
| **Thesis Title** |
| Comments (Please comment the appropriateness of the title) :  |
| **Background Information** |
| Comments :  |
| **Problem Statement** |
| Comments : |
| **Research Question** |
| Comments : |
| **Research Objectives** |
| Comments : |
| **Literature Review**  |
| Comments:  |
| **Hypothesis** |
| Comments: |
| **Research Framework**  |
| Comments: |
| **Research Methodology**  |
| Comments : |
| **Subject Analysis & Interpretation** |
| Comments : |
| **Discussion & Conclusions** |
| Comments:  |
| **Thesis Format**  |
| Comments:  |
| **References** |
| Comments:  |
| **Additional Comments** |
| Comments : |

**SECTION IV: CANDIDATURE RECOMMENDATION**

Please indicate your summary recommendation by placing a tick (√) against the appropriate paragraph:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Results Scale** | **Recommendations upon Examination of Thesis** |  |
| **SCALE 1** | **Pass**The candidate is awarded a Doctor of Philosophy/Master’s Degree |  |
| **SCALE 2** | **PASS with Minor Corrections** The candidate is awarded a Doctor of Philosophy/Master’s Degree subject to changes/corrections to the thesis as listed in the Panel of Examiners Report. |  |
| **SCALE 3** | **CONDITIONAL PASS with Major Corrections** The candidate is awarded a Doctor of Philosophy/Master’s Degree subject to changes/corrections to the thesis as listed in the Panel of Examiners Report.The thesis **MUST** be revised and verified by the \*Panel of Examiners after the candidate has made the changes/corrections.\*Panel of Examiners:External Examiner Internal Examiner Both  |  |
| **SCALE 4** | **RESUBMISSION of Thesis for Re-examination** The candidate is allowed to re-submit the thesis for re-examination after the candidate has made changes/corrections to the thesis as required in the Panel of Examiners Report. The thesis **MUST** be re-examined and the candidate **MUST** attend another viva voce. |  |
| **SCALE 5** | **FAIL**The candidate is not eligible to be awarded a Doctor of Philosophy/Master’s Degree and is not allowed to re-submit the thesis for examination. |  |
| **SCALE 6:** (for PhD candidates only) | **RECOMMENDATION FOR MASTER’S DEGREE** The candidate has failed to attain sufficient academic standard for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy and recommended for a Master’s degree to be awarded in the field of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. |  |

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Signature Date**

**Name:**

**SECTION V: EXAMINER DETAILS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Examiner’s Name** |  |
| **IC No. / Passport No.** |  |
| **Position** |  |
| **University / Institute** |  |
| **Phone Number** |  |
| **Email** |  |
| **For Honorarium Purposes:**  |
| **Bank’s Name** |  |
| **Bank’s Account No.***(Please enclosed together statement of Bank Account)* |  |