



**FACULTY OF HOTEL AND TOURISM MANAGEMENT  
UNIVERSITI TEKNOLOGI MARA**

**RESEARCH PROPOSAL EVALUATION**

Student Name : .....

Student ID : .....

Program Code : .....

Topic : .....

.....

.....

Date : .....

**Examiners' Information**

Name <b>(Chairman)</b>	:	
Signature	:	
Name <b>(Examiner 1)</b>	:	
Signature	:	
Name <b>(Examiner 2)</b>	:	
Signature	:	

## RESEARCH PROPOSAL RUBRICS PART A

No of items	Component	CRITERIA					POINTS
		Excellent (4)	Competent (3)	Needs Improvement (2)	Incomplete (1)	Absent (0)	
1	<b>Introduction/ Background of Study</b>	An intriguing introduction based on facts leads clearly into the research proposal. Information presented displays expanded scope and relevance and is organized to enhance response to the problem/question presented. Shows evidence of a critique of prior work on the problem.	A fairly well formulated introduction with some evidence to support the topic leads into the research proposal. The information presented is related to problem/question and displays extended scope and relevance.	Introduction is not well constructed, uninteresting, or does not lead into the research proposal. Inappropriate information related to problem/question is presented with insufficient citations.	Lacks a proper introduction. Weak or inappropriate information related to problem / question is presented; lack of appropriate citations.	Missing	
	<b>Comment</b>						
2	<b>Problem Statement</b>	Stated the research problem clearly, and provided motivation for undertaking the research.	Fairly well posed statement of the problem that provides evidence but the evidence is not as strong as it could be.	Statement of the problem is not clearly stated and/or lacks quality evidence to support the problem.	Lacks a proper statement of the problem. Evidence presented does not support the thesis or problem statement.	Missing	
	<b>Comment</b>						
3	<b>Purpose of Study</b>	Very clearly stated purpose of the study and demonstrated its potential value.	Fairly well stated purpose of the study but did not demonstrate its potential value.	Purpose of the study is not clearly stated and/or the value is not stated.	Lacks a purpose of the study statement.	Missing	
	<b>Comment</b>						

	Component	CRITERIA					POINTS
		Excellent (4)	Competent (3)	Needs Improvement (2)	Incomplete (1)	Absent (0)	
4	<b>Research Design</b>	All elements of a good research designs are excellently displayed.	All elements of a good research design are adequately displayed.	Research design needs some improvement as some vital elements are missing or not properly displayed.	Very sloppy research design.	Missing	
	<b>Comment</b>						
5	<b>Research Scope</b>	Well stated research scope based on the proposed study.	Fairly well stated research scope based on the purpose of the study.	Stated research scope is unclear based on the purpose of the study.	Incomprehensible research scope.	Missing	
	<b>Comment</b>						
6	<b>Significance of study</b>	The proposed study is very important and nicely builds on existing research. The study is highly significant and innovative.	The proposed study is important and there is a good attempt to build on existing research. There are some innovative elements in the study.	The proposed study is relatively important and there is an attempt to build on existing research. However there are only a small number of innovative elements in the proposed study.	The proposed study significance is missing. The proposed study does not tackle an important issue and there is no attempt to build on previous research. There are no innovative elements in the proposed study.	Missing	
	<b>Comment</b>						

	Component	CRITERIA					POINTS
		Excellent (4)	Competent (3)	Needs Improvement (2)	Incomplete (1)	Absent (0)	
7	<b>Literature Review</b>	Demonstrated adequate basic knowledge of literature in the area, and of prior work on the specific research problem. The literature review is very comprehensive and describes relevant material. The purpose of the study is clearly described and there is an excellent connection between the material reviewed and the purpose of the study.	Demonstrated basic knowledge of literature or previous research in the area. The literature review is relatively comprehensive and describes most relevant material, although significant gaps still exist. The purpose of the study is described and there is a good attempt to connect the material reviewed with the purpose of the study.	Unclearly mentioned some previous work in the area. The literature review is not as comprehensive with some relevant materials deemed missing. The purpose of the study is described, but not as clearly as it might be. There is only some attempt to connect the material reviewed with the purpose of the study.	Very minimal mention of any previous research, literature, or theories. The literature review lacks comprehensive coverage of relevant material. The purpose of the study is not clearly described and there is no connection between the material reviewed and the purpose of the study.	Missing	
	<b>Comment</b>						
8	<b>Methodology</b>	A methods section is present, it is written clearly, and the section is missing none of the key elements of the methods.	A methods section is present, and only a few elements of the methods are absent or described insufficiently.	A methods section is present, but numerous elements of the methods are absent or described insufficiently.	A very sloppy method section is included in the proposal, many key elements of the methods are absent.	Missing	
	<b>Comment</b>						

	Component	CRITERIA					POINTS
		Excellent (4)	Competent (3)	Needs Improvement (2)	Incomplete (1)	Absent (0)	
9	<b>Analysis</b>	The proposed analysis is appropriate, theoretically sound and complete given the propose research.	The proposed analysis is appropriate, theoretically sound but incomplete given the propose research.	The proposed analysis is vague.	The proposed analysis is inaccurate.	Missing	
	<b>Comment</b>						
10	<b>Organization and Writing Mechanics</b>	The organization of the proposal is excellent. All sections of the proposal is present. Adheres to all the proposal writing format requirements as presented in the guidelines. The flow of the writing is excellent across sections and within sections with very minor grammatical errors.	The proposal is relatively organized. Most sections of the proposal are present and are presented in the right order. Adheres to most of the proposal writing format requirements as presented in the guidelines. The writing flows relatively well across sections and within sections with few grammatical errors.	Fairly written proposal that lacks clarity; has poor transition sentences. There are several grammatical errors. Almost adheres to most of the proposal writing format requirements as presented in the guidelines.	Poorly written paper that lacks organization. There are multiple grammatical errors. Fails to adhere to the proposal writing format requirements as presented in the guidelines.	Missing	
	<b>Comment</b>						
<b>TOTAL PART A MARKS ( _____ OUT OF 40)</b>							

## PART B

In conclusion, this proposal (circle the column which best describes the dissertation):

<b>GENERAL</b>				
<b>PASS AND CAN PROCEED TO THE NEXT STAGE</b>				<b>NEED TO RE-DEFENSE</b>
Deserves a distinction (cum laude). In the top 20% of all master's degree proposals.	The proposal is a very acceptable piece of work, but needs that extra spark to turn it into an above-average proposal.	Seen as a whole, the proposal is of an acceptable academic standard and deserves an average mark. Less serious revision/editing is required.	The academic standard of the proposal is sufficient to merit a pass mark. The work, however, is in need of serious editing.	The proposal does not meet the minimum academic requirements, and it is unlikely that even large scale revision/editing would bring the proposal up to scratch. Additional research may be required
<b>NO CORRECTION</b>	<b>CORRECTION WITHIN 2 WEEKS</b>			<b>CORRECTION WITHIN 1 MONTH</b>