

Pre VIVA Evaluation Form
Faculty of Engineering, Universiti Malaysia Sarawak



Candidate's Name:	
Thesis Title:	
Level of Study/Area of Study:	
Guidelines to Evaluator, Supervisor and Student: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Duration of evaluation is strictly 2 weeks from the date of thesis received.2) Evaluator appointment letter will be produced by the Dean's office.3) Student is to ensure that he or she understands the comments made by the Evaluator and ensure corrections made communicated to the Evaluator.4) All corrections, wherever applicable, must be made known to the Dean's / Deputy Dean's office via a signed memo by the supervisor.5) It is responsibility of the student and supervisor to ensure formatting is according to university's requirement – as stated in the student guidelines.	Date of thesis received: Stamp Date:
Please provide your comments (with attachment if necessary) and please rate the thesis according to the rating criteria below. Fill in column "Rating" for each criteria with 1/2/3/4/5	
Comments	Rating <i>(refer to pg. 3)</i>
Hypothesis:	
Research Gap:	
Methodology:	
Research Outcomes and Conclusions:	

General Comments:

Reported by:

Official Stamp:

~~✗~~

Date

Day	Month	Year

Guidelines on Rating Criteria

<p>Hypothesis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is clearly stated (expected relationship between variables) and related to the objectives of the study. • Stating clearly testable prediction (empirical) on a specified set of conditions. • Is supported by relevant theories and empirical background (problem, observation)? • Is relatively new and untested. 	<p>1 – Poor 2 – Fair 3 – Average 4 – Good 5 - Excellent</p>
<p>Research Gap</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research gap and problem statement are clearly indicated in the thesis. • Research gap has been identified from in depth study of the literature. • The gap may be conflict in theoretical approach, conflict in empirical methods, arbitrage between literatures, mixed previous empirical results and are clearly identified. 	
<p>Methodology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project approaches/methods/ parameters were clearly outlined and justified. • Methodology suits to the needs to respond to the hypothesis. • Objectives are met with the prescribed methodology. 	
<p>Research Outcomes and Conclusions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research outcomes were consistent with the research objectives and were clearly justified • Research outcomes were clearly presented and discussed. • Research outcomes were supported with relevant and convincing data • Discussion on research outcomes demonstrate understanding of results, and supported by relevant literature review • Conclusions were clearly explained, meet the specified aim and objectives and suggested appropriate recommendations for future work. 	