

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

<i>Not Appropriate at all</i>					<i>Most Appropriate</i>
1	2	3	4	5	

1. Abstract (PLO1)

<i>Comments</i>					
1	2	3	4	5	

2. Introduction (PLO1)

<i>Comments</i>					
1	2	3	4	5	

3. Literature Review (**PLO1**)

<i>Comments</i>				
1	2	3	4	5

4. Methodology (**PLO6**)

<i>Comments</i>				
1	2	3	4	5

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

<i>Comments</i>				
1	2	3	4	5

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

<i>Comments</i>				
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:

Items Assessed	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Good	Very good	Excellent
Abstract (PLO1)	Missed two or more of the following items and badly written: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction • Methodology • Results • Discussion 	Missed one of the following items and badly written: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction • Methodology • Results • Discussion 	Has all the following items but written badly: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction • Methodology • Results • Discussion 	Has all the following items but points are not connected properly: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction • Methodology • Results • Discussion • Potential use • Fairly written 	Has all the following items excellently written: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background • Motivation (current issue and potential solution) • Objective and scope But <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unclear problem statement • Objective and scope is not clear • Writing is bad • Points are not connected properly 	Has the following items: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background • Motivation (current issue and potential solution) • Problem statement well defined • Objective and scope But <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective and scope are not clear • Writing is bad • Points are not connected properly 	Has the following items but points are not connected properly: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background • Motivation (current issue and potential solution) • Problem statement well defined • Objective and scope are well defined <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing is acceptable 	Has the following items: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing is bad • Points are not connected properly 	Has the following items: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing is bad • Points are not connected properly 	Has the following items: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acceptable writing But <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Points are not connected properly 	Has the following items: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Materials/method description • Method/model/theory description with citation But <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Badly written • Procedures are difficult to follow • Methods are confusing and lacking many details. 	Has the following items: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Materials description • Complete method/model description with explanation and citation • Justification to use the method/model • Procedure is well written But contain <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some confusing sentences 	Has the following items: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Materials/model/theory description • Complete method description with explanation and citation • Justification to use the method/model • Procedures are well written But contain <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some confusing sentences 	Has the following items: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.

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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Badly written • Discussion is difficult to follow • Confusing and lacking many details 	Has the following items: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Badly written • Confusing and lacking some details 	Has the following items: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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
	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
	PLO1	PLO2	PLO3	PLO4	PLO5	PLO6	PLO7