



UTS

**SCHOOL OF
POSTGRADUATE STUDIES**

**PROPOSAL DEFENCE (PD) PREPARATION
GUIDELINES**

2024

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
1.0 PURPOSES OF PD EXAMINATION	3
2.0 TIMELINE FOR PD EXAM TO BE CONDUCTED	4
3.0 SUBMSSION OF PROPOSAL FOR DEFENCE	5
3.1 Abstract / Executive Summary	5
3.2 Project Proposal	6
3.3 Plagiarism Checking	8
4.0 DEFENCE OF THESIS / DISSERTATION PROPOSAL	9
4.1 Preparation of Presentation Slides	9
4.2 Before PD Examination	11
4.3 During PD Examination	12
4.4 Q & A Session	12
4.5 After PD Examination	13
4.6 Expectation of PD Examiners	14
5.0 PANEL OF EXAMINERS	15
5.1 Duties and Responsibilities	15
5.2 Decorum and Conduct	16
5.3 Post-Defence Requirements	17
6.0 APPENDICES	18

1.0 PURPOSES OF PD EXAMINATION

This guide aims to assist postgraduate students of University of Technology Sarawak (UTS) in the preparation of proposal defence (PD) for their postgraduate study. This guide also includes the decorum and conduct of PD by panel of examiners.

A project proposal is normally the first step in producing a thesis/dissertation. The proposal defence serves as an opportunity for the candidate to share with the examining panels and supervisory committee a complete first three chapters of the proposed study that is a comprehensive and well-defined plan for the dissertation.

The purpose of proposal defence is to assure that the candidate's research plan holds academic merit, the proposed research question(s) and / or research hypothesis is complete, and the proposed methodology (or experimental design) is sound. By understanding the research requirements, the student can gain approval to proceed to data collection for his/her experimental works.

As well as indicating the plan of action, a thesis proposal should show the theoretical positioning and relationship to past work in the candidate's research area. In brief, a candidate should be able to demonstrate a satisfactory mastery of the topic, of the methodology, and ownership of the thesis/dissertation.

Students are advised to adhere closely to the rules / recommendations / requirements of this guide during preparation of proposal for PD examination. Close attention should be paid by the student to the following criteria: (i) format and technical specification as stated in this Guide, and (ii) the text and all illustrative materials should be clear and error free. It is the responsibility of student to prepare all materials for the proposal and to ensure the pages of the proposal in correct order.

2.0 TIMELINE FOR PD EXAM

- Each candidate must register, present and defend his/her research proposal within the timeline of Proposal Defence (PD) as stated in Table 1.
- Please refer to **Clause 9.1.2 Proposal Defence** in **Postgraduate Academic Rules and Regulations** for the details.

Table 1: Timeline of PD

Programmes	Maximum Duration*
Master's by Research (Full-time)	within twelve (12) months
Master's by Research (Part-time)	within eighteen (18) months
PhD (Full-time)	within eighteen (18) months
PhD (Part-time)	within twenty-four (24) months

** from the date of first registration*

3.0 SUBMISSION OF PROPOSAL FOR DEFENCE

- The proposal should be prepared in accordance with **Proposal Defence (PD) Preparation Guidelines (UTS-SPS-P07-PD)** by using **Havard Referencing System: Guide and Examples (UTS-SPS-P08-HRS)** or **APA Style Referencing: Guide and Examples (UTS-SPS-P08-APA)**.
- The **formatting** of the proposal **should adhere strictly to the guidelines of the thesis**, as stated clearly in the **Thesis/Dissertation/Project Report Preparation Guidelines (UTS-SPS-P08-TG)**.
- The Proposal should include the first three chapters (Introduction, Literature Review, and Methodology) and their traditional elements, the References, and appropriate Appendices (surveys, assessments, measurement scales, if any). It should also include a Title page which replaces the word "Thesis / Dissertation / Project Report" with "Proposal."
- The student needs to submit "**Submission of Research Proposal for Defence**" via Oculus system.
- The main supervisor needs to fill the "**Supervisor Comment(s) on Originality Report Generated by Turnitin**" in the Oculus system after the student submits "**Submission of Research Proposal for Defence**"
- A complete proposal (in PDF format) must be submitted to School of Postgraduate Studies. The proposal should also include a **maximum one (1) page of abstract** of proposed project.
- In addition, the **Turnitin Originality Report Summary** (to be downloaded from *Turnitin* website) (in PDF format) is also mandatory to be submitted to School of Postgraduate Studies.
- **The PD submission must be submitted before the due date as stated in Postgraduate Academic Calendar.**

3.1 Abstract / Executive Summary

Some points to keep in mind while writing abstract / executive summary.

- While drafting the abstract / executive summary, look over the subject to see what disciplinary assumptions are challenged; question the significance of the ideas; emphasize the important of the expected results; and address limitations in a realistic manner.

- Avoid using the first person “I” or “we”. In addition, whenever possible, choose active verbs instead of passive ones, for example, use “the study tested” instead of “it was tested by the study” or “I tested in the study”.
- Avoid, if possible, using trade names, acronyms, abbreviations or symbols in the abstract / executive summary. Student would have to explain these names which would take up valuable room/words.

3.2 Project Proposal

Following are some guidelines for preparation of the contents of proposal. **Please refer to Appendix A Evaluation Rubric for Project Proposal for additional guidelines.**

(a) Title of Proposal

- Title should reflect clearly the proposed project and describe the content of the proposal accurately.

(b) Introduction

- Introduction should include the problem under study, its importance, validity and the research strategy. It sets forth the context, the hypotheses to be tested, the research objectives to be attained and the contribution to knowledge.

(c) Literature Review

- The problem statements and research strategies are derived and developed through critical review of literatures related to the topic of the thesis/dissertation.
- A literature review surveys scholarly articles, books and other sources (e.g. dissertations, conference proceedings) relevant to a particular issue, area of research, or theory, providing a description, summary, and critical evaluation of each work.
- It is meant to act as a base for the experimental or analytical section of the research proposal and is to offer an overview of significant literature published on the topic.
- Literature selected must be up to date, analysed and synthesized logically. However, a literature review is not a summary of works of different authors. Rather, it is a critical review of available literature on the topic.

(d) Problem Statement(s), Research Question(s) and Objective(s) of Research

- Research question(s) or problem statement(s) is the foundation and focus of your research work. It is a clear, stand-alone statement that makes explicit what it is you are aiming to discover or establish. The problem statement will outline the basic facts of the problem, explain why the problem matters, and pinpoint a solution as quickly and directly as possible.
- A good research question is clear and synthesizes from many credible sources. The research question refers to something that you are interested in or care about; defines what data you need to collect; and which methods you will use for data analysis.
- A research question can set the following boundaries to you in your research journey.
 - Define or measure a specific fact or gather facts about a specific phenomenon;
 - Match facts and theory;
 - Evaluate and compare two theories, models, or hypotheses;
 - Prove that a certain method is more effective than other methods.
- An objective is a clear statement of something that needs to be accomplished in order to answer the research questions.
- “S.M.A.R.T.” objectives are:
 - **Specific** → states exactly what the candidate needs to achieve
 - **Measureable** → includes a quality or quantity measure
 - **Agreed** → between the candidate and the examiner
 - **Realistic** → can be challenging but must be achievable
 - **Time-bound** → with a clear end date or timescale
- Objectives are usually headed by infinitive verbs such as to identify, establish, describe, determine, estimate, develop, compare, analyse, and collect.

(e) Material and Methods / Methodology

- It describes the methods and techniques used.
- In social science, a theoretical or conceptual framework is generally included. This can generally be organized as separate subheadings in a chapter which usually include descriptions of the participants or subjects, the apparatus (or materials), and the procedure.
- In engineering and sciences, this may include, but not limited to, chapter or chapters which describe the theoretical development, hypothesis description, methodology, experimental design and standard procedure description. This section may be written in one or two chapters.

(f) **Reference**

- The proposal should contain appropriate documentation – that is, references to original literature relevant to the research presented in the research abstract/summary.

3.3 Plagiarism Checking

- Candidate is required to provide softcopy of **full set of originality report** to School of Postgraduate Studies upon submission of proposal for PD examination.
- The main parameter of originality required and limits for proposal submitted for PD examination is with “**Overall similarity index of 20% and below**”.
- The quoted materials and bibliography/reference list shall be excluded in the parameter of originality.
- **Supervisor is required to review the originality report** and to ensure the limits as stated above are adhered to, and also to check the detailed *Turnitin* originality report. **Supervisor is required to endorse the originality report** by filling the “**Supervisor Comment(s) on Originality Report Generated by *Turnitin***” in the Oculus system.

4.0 DEFENCE OF THESIS / DISSERTATION PROPOSAL

Please refer to Appendix B Evaluation Rubric for PD Oral Presentation for additional guidelines.

4.1 Preparation of Presentation Slides

- The candidate may provide the **PowerPoint presentation slides** to panel of examiners during the defence.
- The Master's degree candidate should aim for a 20-minute presentation while 30-minute presentation for Doctoral degree candidate. This will be followed by a Q&A session.
- **Audience** are not only permitted but invited and are entitled to **ask reasonable questions after** the PD panel of examiners have **finished their questioning**.
- On the day of Proposal Defence, the candidate is encouraged to make a brief and succinct overview of the proposal, ensuring that the following major points are addressed in a thorough yet clear manner:
 - Significance of the proposed research
 - A summary of key points extracted from the literature on the topic
 - A description of the conceptual framework and how the problem will be measured or assessed
 - A proposal for analysis and interpretation of data or evidence
- The **proposed content** for PowerPoint presentation slides is as follows.

(i) First Slide

- Consists of title, students' name, supervisor(s) information, date and venue. The title must be sufficiently clear to reflect the nature and intention of the research.

(ii) Background of the Study *(you may combine the background of study with Literature Review or put under different title)*

- Overview of past and current status of existing research work.
- What are the problems that need to be addressed and why the problems need to be resolved?

- Provide a succinct outline of the reasons why the study should be undertaken and the general objectives of the study.

(iii) Literature Review

- Show why the research idea is interesting within the proposed research field by discussing what other scholars/writers have done and not done with the topic in the field.
- Here the candidate need to tell how the thesis/dissertation will build on existing studies and yet explore new territory.
- It provides a thorough and up-to-date literature review on the proposed research topic with focus on the problem statements.
- It indicates clearly where the candidate stand and how the candidate position himself with regards to proposed research topic as compare to other relevant/similar past or on-going researchers.
- It provides references to all major relevant publications including the applicant's own.

(iv) Define the Problems of the Research

- Research problem statement is the foundation and focus of the proposal. It is a clear, stand-alone statement that makes explicit what is it that the candidate is aiming to discover or establish.
- The problem statement outlines the basic facts of the problem, explain why the problem matters, and pinpoint a solution as quickly and directly as possible.

(v) Research Objectives and/or Research Question

- The objectives of the work must be clearly explained.
- An objective is a clear statement of something that needs to be accomplished over a period of time.
- The research objectives must be **"S.M.A.R.T."**.

(vi) Research Methodology (or Design) and Project Management

- Research Methodology is about how the candidate is going to achieve the project objectives.
- The research methodology clearly demonstrates how the candidate plan to tackle the research problem. It has details such as:
 - Explain the research design – how the candidate is going to collect and analyse the data?
 - Describe the limitations of the research – what are the challenges the candidate may face in data elicitation and how the candidate is going to alleviate the challenges? In other words, don't promise what the candidate can't possibly deliver.
 - Identify specialized equipment, facilities and infrastructure, whether new or existing that are required for the research
- The Gantt chart and milestones of the research need to be included in the proposal.
- Give enough detail to establish the feasibility of the research methodology, but not so much as to make the reader feel bored.

(vii) Significance / Applied Value of the Research

- What is/are the significance aspect of the proposal research?
- What is/are expected findings? Any specific or potential applications?
- Any impact on society, economy and nation?

4.2 Before PD Examination

- Know the research work well and go through the presentation slides.
- Should have practiced the defence presentation at least 3 times.
- Keep the number of slides within the allocated time for PD presentation: 20 minutes for Master's degree candidate and 30 minutes for Doctoral degree candidate.
- Anticipate the questions that the examiners and audience will ask and plan the answers carefully.
- Reach the venue at least 15 minutes before the PD time.

4.3 During PD Examination

- Master's degree candidate is given 20 minutes for the presentation while 30-minute presentation for Doctoral degree candidate. Please note that this is not a public lecture. **Examiners should have read the candidate's proposal and PowerPoint draft (if any).**
- Don't read the slides during presentation. Speak slowly and clearly.
- Postgraduate candidate should project confidence and enthusiasm.
- Present only the important facts; keep the presentation short and concise.

4.4 Q&A Session

- Following the candidate's presentation, each examining panel is given the opportunity to present questions to the candidate. This is intended to probe the candidate's understanding of the proposal and to clarify, to both the candidate and examining panels, information which has been presented.
- One of the main purposes of Q&A session with the examining panels is to identify possible problems with the proposed research and to examine ways to improve the candidate's dissertation. The panels are looking for the candidate to have a clear understanding of the proposed research methodology.
- Prepare your answers to the following questions ahead of time:
 - The purpose of your research; why you want to conduct this research; how you plan to perform your research; and when you intend to conduct the research.
 - Be prepared to describe the methods you propose for collecting and analysing data and be able to convince your examining panel that these methods are appropriate.
- Understand the examiners and audience's questions before giving the answers. Take time to reflect on the question and then answer.
- **Be honest if you don't not know the answer.** Don't panic, but make notes of them.
- You **may disagree** but **do not be defensive on your argument. Accept criticism and be open-minded.**
- **Avoid long discussions or debates.**

- Seize the opportunity to talk about the research and do not deviate from the scope of your research.
- Committee members may also suggest changes in any aspect of the proposal at this point.
- It is imperative to remember that opinions may differ; should differences arise, the Chairman of examining panel will provide guidance.

REMEMBER

The Proposal Defence requires demonstration of two elements:

- The candidate, examining panels and supervisory committee have given careful and deliberate consideration on the proposal, and that the "big picture" is defensible.
- The candidate should be able to weigh the suggestions of the examining panels and accept those that will strengthen the study.

4.5 After PD Examination

After all examining panels have had opportunities to ask questions and make suggestions or comments, the panels will deliberate and determine whether or not the proposal has been successfully defended and can be approved.

It is important to note that approval of a proposal does not ensure approval of Chapters One to Chapter Three when defending the Dissertation/Thesis during viva voce examination.

After careful deliberation, the examining panels shall suggest one of the following as the outcome of PD.

- (i) Proposal is accepted **without amendments**. Student can proceed with research works.
- (ii) Proposal is accepted **with amendments** with either one of the following decisions.
 - The student needs to amend the proposal based on the assessors' comments but is not required to resubmit the proposal. Student can proceed with research works.
 - Proposal with amendments as recommended by the examining panel must be submitted for verification by the Chairman of panel within one month from the date of PD examination. The corrections done must be listed in the '**Postgraduate Defence of Research Proposal: Confirmation of Corrective Action**' (UTS-SPS-P07-CCA) form (Appendix C) for verification purpose. Student can then proceed with research works.

- (iii) **Major amendments.** Student is required to resubmit the amended proposal and present again to the panel of assessors.
- (iv) **Proposal rejected.** The student fails the assessment of proposal defence with either one of the following decisions.
 - Student is required to prepare a new proposal and present again to the panel of assessors.
 - Student is recommended to be terminated his/her candidature (for 3rd attempt of proposal defence only).

4.6 Expectation of PD Examiners

- Does the research proposal provides an original contribution to knowledge and is deemed worthy to pursue?
- A good research proposal is not just about solving problems; it's also about solving problems that no one else sees. In analysing the relevant literature, it's not just 'describing' what had been done by past studies. It's about finding the literature gap(s) that no one else sees.
- Is your research proposal methodologically sound?
- In summary, the research proposal defence is concisely and clearly presented, well-argued, and supported by credible sources.

5.0 PANEL OF EXAMINERS

- Panel of examiners are appointed to evaluate the research proposal, discuss and challenge its merits with the student. The panels are expected to provide positive comments and suggestions to improve the research proposal.
- At the end of the allotted time for oral defence, panel member shall deliberate and decide on the assessment recommendation to be given to the students.
- The examining panel of PD is composed three experts recommended by respective School and one of them shall be appointed the Chairperson. The supervisory committee of the student shall be invited to attend the PD.
- The list of proposed examining panel shall be submitted to School Board of Examiners (SBX) **at least two weeks before** the scheduled PD for final approval.

5.1 Duties and Responsibilities

5.1.1 Chairperson

- The main roles of the Chairperson are to moderate the oral defence.
- Do commit to the appointment as Chairperson and avoid relinquishing this role at the last minute.
- When the PD date is confirmed, please adhere to the date as a change in the date will increase the level of anxiety, stress and apprehension to the student.
- After the proposal defence, the chairperson summarizes the panel's recommendations, comments and corrections needed (if any), and submits the report to programme coordinator for SBX recommendation.
- The chairperson votes together with the examiners during proposal defence. However, the chairperson only has one vote (i.e. the chairperson cannot vote twice).
- The chairperson cannot override (or overturn) the decision of the examiners without their agreement. The final decision shall be based on majority votes.

5.1.2 Examining Panel

During the oral defence:

- Panel members must read the research abstract/summary, before sitting on a defence panel.
- Suggest all possible improvements for the proposed research work.

5.2 Decorum and Conduct

5.2.1 Decorum of PD

- Decorum: The oral defence is a formal academic activity. As such, proper decorum should be maintained during and after the proceedings. This applies to both panel members and the student.
- The chairperson has to ensure the decorum is maintained at all times. In situation where it becomes necessary to interrupt the normal course of the PD for any reasons, the chairman may call a temporary intermission in the PD in order to re-establish the decorum.
- **DO's**
 - Adopt a friendly 'developmental' approach to questioning.
 - Restate questions if a candidate misunderstood the meaning.
 - Rephrase questions to ensure that the candidate understands.
 - Start with questions that the candidate can answer.
 - Questioning could include praise on achievements, such as: This is current topic of enormous interest to the scientific world. However, this section appears complex. Can you explain this part?
 - Allow student to take break if necessary.
 - Be willing to listen and consider new views.
 - Provide advice to enhance the proposal content.
 - Do not just pass judgement but also provide clear guidance to assist the candidate to achieve the standards you are expecting.
- **DON'Ts**
 - Do not be little or criticise the supervisors.
 - Do not engage in an argument with other examiners in front of the candidate.

5.2.2 Conduct of PD

- The chairperson introduces the panel of examiners to student and audience.

- The student presents the highlights of the research proposal.
- After the presentation, the chairperson opens the Q&A session to the panel of examiners and audience. The chairperson moderates the panel discussion and student's oral defence.
- The chairperson formally ends the PD and the panel of examiners evaluates, in private, the performance of the student.
- Chairperson concludes and records the final recommendations of the Panel of Examiners on the status of the proposal. This should be based on the examiners' reports, oral presentation by the candidate, responses by the candidate to questions posed by the examiners and other relevant matters.
- Chairperson invites the candidate back to the examination room and announces the result of the examination.
- After the PD, the panelists are required to complete all the relevant evaluation forms and submit the completed forms to the chairperson for compilation.
- PSC considers and recommends the endorsed panels' report to UPC.
- UPC approves the result of PD and endorses by Senate accordingly.
- School of Postgraduate Studies informs the student on the PD result. Each panelist's comments would be given to student for reference and improvement as well.

5.3 Post-Defence Requirements

The revised version of a proposal must first be vetted and rectified by the supervisors. In cases where verifications are needed from the panel, the corrective actions shall be submitted to the chairperson of the panel of examiner for endorsement. The candidate can then proceed/continue to conduct the research work.

Appendix A

EVALUATION RUBRIC FOR PROJECT PROPOSAL

Evaluation Criteria	Rubric	
	Points	Level
Introduction (15%) <i>(Clear and concise description of the overall hypotheses and background information; Clear description of the professional design practice context and why the hypothesis matters to the stakeholders within that context; Rationale for carrying out the project is explained clearly, etc)</i>	0 – 4	Unacceptable
	5 – 8	Marginal
	9 – 12	Acceptable
	13 – 15	Exceptional
Problem Statement (s) & Aims/Objectives (10%) <i>(Identification of problems; Aims/objectives are clearly and coherently stated)</i>	0 – 2	Unacceptable
	3 – 5	Marginal
	6 – 8	Acceptable
	9 – 10	Exceptional
Literature Review (25%) <i>(Comprehensive analysis and synthesis of critical points of knowledge, ideas and theories, resulting in themes that are concise, unbiased, and relevant to the project topic; Review of literature is presented in logical and coherent manner; The work of others is acknowledged and referenced accordingly; Source of material is up to date and comprehensive, etc)</i>	0 – 6	Unacceptable
	7 – 12	Marginal
	13 – 18	Acceptable
	19 – 25	Exceptional
Research Methodology (25%) <i>(Choice of data and methods of collection clearly described, including extent of data gathering; Methods are convincingly justified against the project aims and objectives; Experimental design clearly explained, etc.)</i>	0 – 6	Unacceptable
	7 – 12	Marginal
	13 – 18	Acceptable
	19 – 25	Exceptional
Feasibility of Study and Project Management (10%) <i>(Work scope is justifiable and workable; Awareness of time, resources and practicality; Identification of appropriate project milestone; Observation to date(if any) – statistical analysis, graphs, tables, etc)</i>	0 – 2	Unacceptable
	3 – 5	Marginal
	6 – 8	Acceptable
	9 – 10	Exceptional
Overall Presentation of Research Proposal (15%) <i>(Structure and style of proposal makes its flow easy to take in and follow; Clearly written and well-argued throughout; Proper English and grammar used; Fully and correctly referenced; Appropriate use of graphics and diagrams, etc.)</i>	0 – 4	Unacceptable
	5 – 8	Marginal
	9 – 12	Acceptable
	13 – 15	Exceptional

Appendix B

EVALUATION RUBRIC FOR PD ORAL PRESENTATION

Title of Research (5%)	Scale	Score (%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very clear reflection of research • Moderate reflection of research • Minimal reflection of research • No reflection of research 	⑤	
	③ ④	
	① ②	
	①	
Literature Review (20%) (which inclusive of hypothesis development, research flow chart or framework)	Scale	Score (%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive literature review, excellent critical analysis of related works; very clear research framework or flow chart or academic construct • Significant literature review with good critical analysis of related works; good evidence of well-organized bodies of knowledge; clear research framework or flow chart or academic construct • Satisfactory literature review with insufficient critical analysis of related works; moderately clear research framework or flow chart or academic construct • Insufficient and/or unrelated literature review; vague and/or unclear research framework or flow chart or academic construct 	⑨ ⑩	× 2 =
	⑥ ⑦ ⑧	
	③ ④ ⑤	
	① ② ③	
Problem Statement (5%)	Scale	Score (%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Problem statement is properly described with sufficient contextual details; very clear rationale and justification for research gap • Problem statement is clearly analysed with moderate rationale and justification for research gap • Problem statement is not properly stated or minimal analysis of problem with little rational and justification for research gap • Problem statement is vague and/or wrongly defined; no rationale and justification for research gap 	⑤	
	③ ④	
	① ②	
	①	

Appendix D (Continued)

Research Objectives and/or Research Questions (5%)	Scale	Score (%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research objectives and/or questions are described very clearly 	⑤	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research objectives and/or questions are clear but not quantifiable 	③ ④	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research objectives and/or questions or scope are not precise 	① ②	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research objectives and/or questions and scope are unclear and/or wrongly defined 	①	
Research Methodology (or Design) & Project Management (35%)	Scale	Score (%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very clear data collection method; highly accurate choice of sampling design; very clear procedures or techniques or experimental setup; the scope of work is justifiable, workable and explicitly described 	⑨ ⑩	× 3.5 =
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The research methodology is clear but with unrealistic approaches; some deliverables may not be measured; the scope of work is defined 	⑥ ⑦ ⑧	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The research methodology/procedures/techniques/experimental setup is not clear; unclear data collection method; inaccurate choice of sampling design; the scope of work are not precise 	③ ④ ⑤	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The research methodology is wrongly defined and planned; absence of data collection method; no procedures or techniques or experimental setup; the scope of work are unclear and/or wrongly defined 	① ②	
Significance / Applied Value of the Research (10%)	Scale	Score (%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed research work is significant to address contemporary problems; can be used to resolve lingering questions or gaps in knowledge in the field of study; may influence public policy 	⑨ ⑩	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Similar work exists but differences have been described clearly 	⑥ ⑦ ⑧	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing similar works have been attempted before; vague significance of study 	③ ④ ⑤	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identical works have been attempted before; no significance of study 	① ②	

Appendix D (Continued)

Communication Skills / Questions & Answers (20%)	Scale	Score (%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explanation/justification is clear and highly convincing; able to answer and respond correctly to questions and comments; keeps his/her countenance with good answering techniques 	⑧ ⑨ ⑩	× 2 =
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explanation/justification is understandable; able to answer the questions fairly well 	④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation is difficult to comprehend; questions are not answered properly or are often misunderstood 	① ② ③	

Appendix C

CONFIRMATION OF CORRECTIVE ACTION (PROPOSAL DEFENCE)

(UTS-SPS-P07-CCA)

 UTS	UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY SARAWAK
	POSTGRADUATE DEFENCE OF RESEARCH PROPOSAL: CONFIRMATION OF CORRECTIVE ACTION

Student Name	
Student ID	
Programme	
Title of Project	

Confirmation of Corrective Action Taken

(Attach additional sheets if necessary)

No.	Amendments / Changes Suggested by Examiners (candidate is required to list down the amendments / changes as contained in the Examiners' Report given to you)	Response/Action Taken by Candidates (Candidate to state the response / action taken with respect to the suggested amendment / change)
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		

I hereby certify that response/corrective action has been taken on the amendments/changes as suggested in the Examiner's Report given to me.

(Signature of Candidate)

Date: _____

Name:

I hereby confirm that the candidate had responded/taken corrective action on the amendments/ changes as suggested in the Panel's Reports given to him/her.

(Signature of Main Supervisor)

Date: _____

Name: