



UNIVERSITI
MALAYSIA
KELANTAN

UMK/A1/10/2024

Tarikh Kuatkuasa: 14 Oktober 2024

**BORANG PENILAIAN PRA PEPERIKSAAN LISAN
PRE-VIVA VOCE EVALUATION FORM**

FAKULTI KEUSAHAWANAN DAN PERNIAGAAN

Nama Panel :

Nama Pelajar :

No. Matrik :

Tajuk :

ASSESSMENT RUBRICS FOR PRESENTATION (Weight 20%)

NO.	CRITERIA	PERFORMANCE LEVEL				Weight	TOTAL
		POOR (1 MARK)	FAIR (2 MARKS)	GOOD (3 MARKS)	EXCELLENT (4 MARKS)		
1.	Non-verbal Communication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exhibits very poor body language. Does not have any eye contact with the audience and appears to avoid the audience. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Makes eye contact with the audience at times. But the behavior is not consistent. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Makes good eye contact with the audience. The body language is good. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Makes excellent eye contact with the audience. The body language is pleasing. 	$\frac{\quad}{1.25} \times$ (Max: 5)	
2.	Appropriate use of visual aid	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uses visual aids very poorly and the use interferes with the presentation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uses visual aids but not very effectively in aiding the presentation. The usage distorts the presentation at times. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uses visual aids effectively. The usage of technology flows with the presentation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uses visual aids very effectively. The usage enhances the quality of presentation. 	$\frac{\quad}{1.25} \times$ (Max: 5)	
3.	Appearance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has a very poor sense of attire and appearance does not reflect a "business appearance". 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is well groomed and the appearance is acceptable for research report presentations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is well groomed and has a good "business appearance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is very well groomed and has a very pleasing and professional appearance. 	$\frac{\quad}{1.25} \times$ (Max: 5)	
4.	Confidence and Ability to Answer Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exhibits a very low level of confidence and appears visibly 'shaky'. Finds it difficult to answer questions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exhibits low level of confidence at times. Does not appear to be confident in answering questions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exhibits a high-level confidence. Does a good job in answering questions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exhibits a very high level of confidence. Is perfectly at ease while answering questions. 	$\frac{\quad}{1.25} \times$ (Max: 5)	
TOTAL						/20	

ASSESSMENT RUBRICS FOR THESIS CONTENT (Weight 60%)

NO.	CRITERIA	PERFORMANCE LEVEL				WEIGHT	TOTAL
		POOR (1 MARK)	FAIR (2 MARKS)	GOOD (3 MARKS)	EXCELLENT (4 MARKS)		
1.	Title	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lacks clarity and precision, failing to convey the field of study. Poorly chosen or absent, misaligning with the field and research objectives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Somewhat unclear or broad, lacking precise focus. Partially relevant but do not fully reflect the research objectives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mostly clear, effectively reflecting the field of study. Relevant and generally align with the field and research objectives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear and concise, accurately reflecting the field of study. Highly relevant and align with the field, problem statement and research questions/ objectives. 	$\frac{\quad}{0.5} \times$ (Max: 2)	
2.	Abstract	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The abstract fails to include most key elements, lacking clarity or detail. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The abstract includes some key elements, but two or more are missing or inadequately addressed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The abstract includes most key elements, but one may be less detailed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The abstract clearly includes all five key elements: problem statement, objective, methodology, findings, and implications. 	$\frac{\quad}{0.75} \times$ (Max: 3)	
3.	Introduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Missing or inadequate introduction section. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited background information, weak problem statement and unclear or generic research objectives / questions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mostly clear information, may lack some detail or focus on problem statement or research objectives / questions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comprehensive background, clear problem statement and well-defined research objectives and questions, 	$\frac{\quad}{2.5} \times$ (Max: 10)	
4.	Literature Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lacks recent and relevant literature, failing to provide insights or a comprehensive framework Without critical analysis or identification of gaps and theories. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited literature, with gaps in recentness and relevance, lacking depth. Partially analyzed literature, focusing more on summary than on identifying gaps and theories. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequate literature with some recent sources, offering good insights and coverage. Mostly critically analyzed literature, with some identification of gaps, theories, and relationships. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Includes recent and relevant literature, providing deep insights and comprehensive coverage. Critically analyzed literature, highlighting gaps, theories, and relationships, and proposing a strong theoretical framework. 	$\frac{\quad}{3.75} \times$ (Max: 10)	
5.	Research Methodology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Missing or inadequate methodology section. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unclear or incomplete description of methodology, questionable justification for chosen methods or analysis techniques. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Description of methodology present, some details might be missing, or justification for choices could be stronger. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed description of research design, data collection methods, and data analysis procedures. Clearly justified choices align with the research question. 	$\frac{\quad}{2.5} \times$ (Max: 10)	
6.	Findings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Findings do not clearly align with objectives and are poorly presented or unsupported by tables/figures. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Findings partially align with objectives, with presentation of support needing improvement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Findings mostly align with objectives, are generally well-presented, and supported by appropriate tables/figures. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Findings are clearly aligned with research objectives, well-presented, and effectively supported by tables/figures. 	$\frac{\quad}{2.5} \times$ (Max: 10)	

NO.	CRITERIA	PERFORMANCE LEVEL				WEIGHT	TOTAL
		POOR (1 MARK)	FAIR (2 MARKS)	GOOD (3 MARKS)	EXCELLENT (4 MARKS)		
7.	Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussions lack depth, with inadequate analysis and no new insights beyond existing knowledge. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussions provide limited analysis, with few new insights and minimal connection to current literature. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussions are adequate, with good analysis and some insights beyond current literature. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussions are thorough, providing deep analysis and new insights in light of current literature. 	$\frac{\quad}{2.5} \times$ (Max: 10)	
8.	Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lacks rigor and does not clearly align with research objectives. Implications and contributions are unclear or inadequately addressed, offering little insight or relevance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Somewhat rigorous but may not fully align with all research objectives. Implications and contributions are partially clear, with limited insights and relevance to the field and stakeholders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mostly rigorous and aligns well with research objectives. Implications and contributions are generally clear, with meaningful insights and relevance to the field and stakeholders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rigorous and aligns precisely with research objectives. Implications and contributions are clearly articulated, offering significant insights and relevance to the body of knowledge, policy, and stakeholders. 	$\frac{\quad}{1.25} \times$ (Max: 5)	
TOTAL						/60	

ASSESSMENT RUBRICS FOR STRUCTURE AND FORMAT (Weight 20%)

NO.	CRITERIA	PERFORMANCE LEVEL				Weight	TOTAL
		POOR (1 MARK)	FAIR (2 MARKS)	GOOD (3 MARKS)	EXCELLENT (4 MARKS)		
1.	Writing style (clarity, expression of ideas and coherence)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal is poorly written and difficult to read. Many points are not explained well. Flow of ideas is incoherent. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal is adequately written; Some points lack clarity. Flow of ideas is less coherent. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal is well written and easy to read; Majority of the points are well explained, and flow of ideas is coherent. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal is written in an excellent manner and easy to read. All the points made are crystal clear with coherent argument. 	___ x 1 (Max: 4)	
2.	Format organizing (cover page, spacing, alignment, format structure, etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing is disorganized and underdeveloped with no transitions or closure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing is confused and loosely organized. Transitions are weak and closure is ineffective. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uses correct writing format. Incorporates a coherent closure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing includes a strong, beginning, middle, and end with clear transitions and a focused closure. 	___ x 1 (Max: 4)	
3.	Technicality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The thesis/report contains numerous errors, with significant issues in phrases and terms, frequent grammar mistakes, spelling errors, incorrect numbering, and poor punctuation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The thesis/report has several errors, with occasional issues in phrases and terms, noticeable grammar mistakes, spelling errors, inconsistent numbering, and frequent punctuation mistakes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The thesis/report contains few minor errors, with generally accurate phrases and terms, good grammar, correct spelling, consistent numbering, and mostly correct punctuation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The thesis/report is free of errors, with accurate use of phrases and terms, impeccable grammar, correct spelling, precise numbering, and flawless punctuation. 	___ x 1 (Max: 4)	
4.	References and Citation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Missing or inadequate citations and references. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inconsistent or inaccurate citations and references, or missing elements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Citations and references mostly present, but some inconsistencies or minor errors might be present. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistent and accurate citations and reference list, adheres to APA format. 	___ x 1 (Max: 4)	
5.	Originality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plagiarism present (significant portions copied without attribution). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of originality, excessive reliance on borrowed ideas without proper attribution. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mostly original ideas, but some overuse of direct quotes or unclear paraphrasing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Well-researched and original content, minimal use of direct quotes, proper paraphrasing and citations. 	___ x 1 (Max: 4)	
TOTAL						/20	

1) Adakah pelajar bersedia untuk Viva?

Ya Tidak

2) Ulasan:

PERAKUAN PANEL

.....
(Tandatangan/ Signature)

Nama/ Name:

Tarikh/ Date: