FAKULTI : FAKULTI PENDIDIKAN

TAJUK : PERMOHONAN PELANJUTAN TEMPOH PEMBETULAN TESIS

BUTIRAN PELAJAR	KETERANGAN PELAJAR	ULASAN DAN TINDAKAN FAKULTI	KELULUSAN
NAMA : SYED KALEEM ULLAH SHAH BUKHARI **NO K/P @ ISID : 201007M10082** **NO MATRIK : PP103032** **PROGRAM : Doktor Falsafah (Pengurusan dan Pentadbiran)** **JENIS PENGAJIAN : Penyelidikan** **BENTUK PENDAFTARAN : Sepenuh Masa** **PENYELIA : Prof. Madya Dr. Hamdan bin Said** **BIL SEM: 12/16** **STATUS : Peperiksaan** **MUKASURAT : 3/3**	1.1 Pelajar telah menjalani peperiksaan lisan kali kedua *(reviva)* pada **18 Oktober 2015** dan keputusan adalah B2 (**6 bulan** untuk pembetulan). 1.2 Pelajar telah menghantar pembetulan tesis dalam tempoh yang diberi, tetapi pemeriksa berpendapat bahawa pelajar masih belum menepati kehendak pembetulan yang sepatutnya (rujuk laporan pemeriksa bertarikh 16 jun 2016). Pelajar telah diberi tempoh selama 2 (dua) bulan untuk membuat pembetulan semula sehingga **16 Ogos 2016.** 1.3 Walaubagaimanapun pelajar memerlukan masa untuk membuat pembetulan semula sebelum menghantar tesis kerana pelajar merasakan pemeriksa telah membuat penambahan kepada senarai pembetulan yang perlu dibuat. 1.4 Pihak Fakulti Pendidikan telah membuat semakan dan mendapati bahawa: - Pelajar telah membuat semua pembetulan berdasarkan laporan pengerusi tetapi setelah meneliti laporan pemeriksa yang bertarikh 12 Jun 2016, pemeriksa tidak berpuas hati dengan kualiti pembetulan yang telah dibuat. - Fakulti mendapati Laporan pengerusi setelah reviva adalah agak ringkas dan umum tanpa menyatakan aspek yang perlu dibaiki secara spesifik. Manakala, laporan pemeriksa selepas periksaan dilakukan kepada tesis yang telah dibetulkan pula telah menyatakan aspek yang perlu dibetulkan dengan lebih jelas dan pelajar kemungkinan salah faham dengan kehendak ini. - Berdasarkan perbincangan JKA pada 6 september 2016 bersama penyelia, fakulti berpendapat pelajar perlu membuat pembetulan sebagaimana yang diminta oleh pemeriksa, tetapi pelajar memerlukan lebih masa untuk membuat pembetulan berdasarkan komen-komen tersebut. 1.5 Pada masa yang sama, pelajar telah pulang ke Pakistan dan sedang membuat pembetulan di sana kerana isteri beliau sakit.	1.1 Pelajar memohon rayuan agar diberi lanjutan tempoh membuat pembetulan selama 4 bulan (15 Disember 2016). 1.2 Keterangan masalah pelajar seperti dilampiran. 1.3 Jawatankuasa Akademik Fakulti Pendidikan pada 6 september 2016 menyokong permohonan perlanjutan tempoh pembetulan sehingga 16 November 2016 (3 bulan) 1.4 Dokumen yang berkaitan dilampirkan.	Setuju / Tidak Setuju (Ulasan) --- --- --- **Dekan** **Sekolah Pengajian Siswazah** **(Cop Rasmi)** Tarikh : _____

UTM UNIVERSITI TEKNOLOGI MALAYSIA | Fakulti Pendidikan

Fakulti Pendidikan
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia
81310 Johor Bahru
Johor, Malaysia

Tel: +(6)07-5534280/34169/34026 Faks: +(6)07-5560542/5577351/5534884 educ.utm.my

RUJUKAN KAMI : UTM.J.31/14·14/1

RUJUKAN TUAN :

25 September 2016

Dekan
Sekolah Pengajian Siswazah
UTM, Johor Bahru

Saudara,

PERMOHONAN PERLANJUTAN TEMPOH PEMBETULAN TESIS
NAMA PELAJAR : SYED KALEEM ULLAH SHAH BUKHARI
PROGRAM : PPA
NO. MATRIK : PP103032

Sukacita saya merujuk kepada perkara di atas.

2. Dimaklumkan bahawa pelajar telah tamat tempoh bagi membuat pembetulan tesis pada 16 Ogos 2016 yang lalu dan juga telah membuat permohonan bagi perlanjutan tempoh pembetulan tesis.

3. Sehubungan itu, pihak Fakulti Pendidikan melalui keputusan **Mesyuarat Jawatankuasa Akademik Fakulti Pendidikan** yang diadakan pada **6 September 2016** adalah **menyokong** dan **tiada halangan** bagi permohonan pelajar tersebut selama tiga (3) bulan lagi.

Sekian untuk makluman dan tindakan pihak saudara selanjutnya.

Terima kasih.

"Berkhidmat untuk Negara kerana Allah"

Yang benar,

PROF. MADYA DR. MUHAMMAD SUKRI BIN SAUD
Timbalan Dekan (Akademik)
Fakulti Pendidikan
☏ 07-5534257
✉ p-sukri@utm.my

s.k - Pengurus Akademik (Pasca Siswazah)

- Prof. Madya Dr. Hamdan bin Said (Penyelia)

- Timbalan Pendaftar
Fakulti Pendidikan

Prof DrBaharuddinAris
Dean
Faculty of Education
UniversitiTeknologi Malaysia
81310 Johor Bahru, Johor, Malaysia.

Subject: Request for Time Extension for Completing Thesis Corrections

The above matter is referred.

With due respect, it is stated that I am a Ph.D. student at the faculty of education, UTM, Johor Bahru Campus. I did my viva voce on 18th October, 2015 and was awarded B2 with 6 months duration to complete corrections. I completed the corrections and submitted the corrected version of the thesis on 7th of April, 2016 to the SPS UTM. The corrected thesis was given back to me withother **new major corrections** on 16th of June, 2016. In examining this corrected version of the thesis, the internal examiner took more than 2 months to examine the thesis, more than 6 weeks allowed by SPS UTM.

The other new corrections given to me on 16th of June, 2016 **were not in agreement with the decision of the panel of examiners in the viva voce on 18th October, 2015**. See the attached result of the viva voce result signed by all parties involved (appendix A). There were many things not discussed during the viva voce of 18th October 2015, but in 16th of June report, the internal examiner directed me to do corrections beyond the agreed corrections needed to be done by the panel of examiners. The first thing that is required of meis to **re-analyze the data, chapter 4 and accordingly re-write chapter 5**. The second thing is to **align chapter 1 and chapter 2.**

The reports of viva voce session and latest report that is of 16th June, 2016 are attached with this letter.I was given two months to complete these corrections and on 16th of August, 2016 I am supposed to re-submit my thesis with new corrections. Though I have already started the corrections yet the time is insufficient to complete these new corrections. For that purpose, I request you to give me another 4 more months so that I can complete the corrections.

I shall be highly thankful to you for your support.

Sincerely Yours,

Syed KaleemUllah Shah Bukhari,
Ph. D. Student, Faculty of Education,
Matric Card #: PP103032,
Mobile #: 0149150504.
Supervisor: Assoc Prof DrHamdan Said

UTM School of Graduate Studies
UNIVERSITI TEKNOLOGI MALAYSIA

School of Graduate Studies
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia
81310 Johor Bahru
Johor, Malaysia

Tel: +(6)07-5537876 Fax: +(6)07-5537592/37800 http://www.sps.utm.my Email: graduate@utm.my

OUR REF.:

YOUR REF.:

UTM.J.10.01/14.14/1/6/3/10 Jld 4 (138) 16 June 2016

Syed Kaleem Ullah Shah Bukhari
KDOG Room 620,
XB 2,
UTM Johor Bahru

Dear Candidate,

THESIS CORRECTION

With reference to the above, we would like to inform you that the Panel of Examiners has checked the corrections done and found them to be unsatisfactory. You are advised to refer to the corrections stated in the thesis as well as the report attached.

2. You are required to redo the corrections as stated and submit the thesis within **two (2) months** from the date of this notice for further verification.

3. You are also reminded that failure to submit the corrected thesis the latest on the will result in **termination of your status as a student and no award of a degree**.

The University thanks you for your cooperation in this matter.

Thank you.

'Berkhidmat untuk Negara'

Yours sincerely,

ASSOC. PROF. DR. AMINAH MD. YUSOF
Deputy Dean (Program Development & Customer Relation)
School of Graduate Studies
for the Dean
☎: +607 553 7839
✉: aminahyusof@utm.my

cc - Chairman, Graduate Studies Committee
Faculty of Education
(Assoc. Prof. Dr. Muhammad Sukri bin Saud)

Supervisor:
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Hamdan bin Said
Faculty of Education

Checklist of Corrections

This checklist of corrections is arranged based on the sequence of the column one in the below table.

Thesis Sections	Corrections Required	Corrections Done
General comments	Proof read the thesis	Thesis has been proof read. ✓
Abstract	Put issue and problem statement in abstract, correct Malay abstract. Check the grammar.	Problem statement in abstracts, both in English and Malay version has been incorporated and checked (pg. v-vi).
Chapter 1 (Introduction)	Introduce campus sustainability, decision making, and relationship between them	Introduction on campus sustainability, decision making and the relationship on the campus sustainability and decision making has been revised (pg. 1-4).
Background	Put 3 sub-topics, related to important things and problem. Must relate issue with research question—rewrite.	Background has been revised under sub-topics of the campus sustainability, decision making and the relationship of the campus sustainability and the decision making and relation to the research questions (pg. 5-19).
1.3 (Statement of the problem)	Gap with previous research	Problem statement has been revised (pg. 19-22).
1.5 (Research Questions) Page 18	Rephrase research questions to qualitative research. Change the research questions to how and why.	Research questions have been rephrased and revised (pg. 23-24).
Theoretical Framework	Put system theory. Add theoretical model for sustainability and decision making	Campus sustainability theory has been incorporated (pg. 28-31)
1.7 (conceptual framework)	No independent and dependent variables can be used.	1.7 (conceptual framework) has been revised by eliminating the words, independent and dependent. (pg.26-27).
Page 28 (Variables)	No sub-titles for variables.	Sub-titles for variables have been removed (pg. 34-35).
Page 29	Specify term for campus sustainability	The term for campus sustainability has been specified (pg. 36).

ASSOC. PROF. DR. HAMDAN BIN SA
Supervisor
Faculty Of Education
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia
81300 UTM Johor Bahru

Chapter 2	Make sub-topic base on your research objective	Literature review has been revised (pg. 55-119)
Page 34, 70	Grammatical error and edit in English and references	The section has been revised (40-42)
Chapter 3	Put a report on pilot study	Report on pilot study has been incorporated (section 3.7.1, pg. 147-154)
	The arrange of interview question is not good	The arrangement of the research questions has been revised and refined (pg. 124).
	How the documents were analyzed	How the documents were analyzed has been stated and explained (section 3.6, pg. 143-147).
	Explain how to use comparative study and thematic analysis	How thematic analysis was used has been explained (section 3.6, pg. 143-147).
Chapter 4	Explain figure 4.26 come from data	Explanation has been incorporated (pg. 277-293).
	Each part must be explained section by section for example casual factors	Causal factors have been explained individually (pg. 282-291).
Chapter 5	Discuss the differences between this study (findings) and previous researches	The findings and discussion on these findings have been revised. Research Question 1 (pg. 298-311); Research Question 2 (pg. 311-321); Research Question 3 (pg. 322-329).
	*Limitations and implications of (findings)	Limitations and implications have been incorporated. (pg. 298-329) and (pg. 333-335).

*Limitations and implications of the findings have been incorporated in each research question's discussion in chapter five.

ASSOC. PROF. DR. HAMDAN BIN SA...
Supervisor
Faculty Of Education
Universiti Tekn... Malaysia
81300 UTM Joho... Skudai, Johor

DATELINE FOR SUBMIT SECOND CORRECTION: 16/08/2016

UTM(PS)-Pind. 05/02

UNIVERSITI TEKNOLOGI MALAYSIA

PENGESAHAN SEMAKAN PEMBETULAN TESIS
(CERTIFICATION ON THE CORRECTION OF THESIS)

Tarikh *(Date)*: 12/6/2016

Dekan
Sekolah Pengajian Siswazah
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia
81310 UTM Skudai
Johor

No. Faks: 07-5537800

Maklumat peperiksaan: (Diisi oleh SPS)

Tarikh viva (*Date of viva*):
22/06/2015
Tempoh pembetulan (*Duration for correction*):
C (REVIVA)

Tuan *(Dear Sir)*,

TAJUK TESIS *(Title of Thesis)* (Diisi oleh SPS): **Decision Making in Campus Sustainability at Pakistan Public University**

NAMA PELAJAR *(Name of Student)* (Diisi oleh SPS): **Syed Kaleem Ullah Shah Bukhari**

FAKULTI (Faculty) (Diisi oleh SPS): **Fakulti Pendidikan**

Semakan pembetulan: **Pertama/~~Kedua~~*** (*Correction verification: **First/~~Second~~***)(Diisi oleh SPS)

1. Dengan ini saya mengesahkan telah menyemak dan meneliti dan berpuas hati bahawa pelajar:
(I hereby certify that I have read and verified the thesis and satisfied that the candidate):

(Initial)

telah membuat segala pembetulan dan mencapai tahap sebagaimana yang dicadangkan oleh panel pemeriksa dan saya mengesyorkan pelajar di atas dianugerah Ijazah Sarjana/Doktor Falsafah *(has done all the neccessary corrections recommended by the Panel of Examiners and I recommend that the candidate be awarded Master/Phd* degree)* ☐

sedikit pembetulan yang hanya perlu disahkan oleh penyelia dan saya mengesyorkan pelajar di atas dianugerah Ijazah Sarjana/Doktor Falsafah (*minor corrections need to be verified by the supervisor and I recommend that the candidate be awarded Master/Phd* degree*) ☐

+-

2. ✓ Pelajar gagal membuat pembetulan sebagaimana yang dicadangkan oleh panel pemeriksa *(The candidate failed to carry out all the neccessary corrections recommended by the Panel of Examiners*

i. membuat pembetulan semula (*redo correction*) ☐

ii. Tempoh pembetulan (*Duration for correction*): 2 ~~hari~~/bulan*(~~days~~/*months**). ☑
Berikan perincian maklumat pembetulan yang dikehendaki (*Please provide details for the corrections needed*). p/s harap beri tempoh maksimum yg. ada bagi pembetulan banyak kesilapan / kelemahan tesis.

iii. tidak dianugerah Ijazah *(not be awarded)* ☐

3. Penyataan Lain *(Other Remarks - if any)*: ① Mohon tempoh pembetulan maksimum diberikan kerana banyak pembetulan (rujuk email: Jun 12, 2016)
② pelajar perlu datang berjumpa untuk perbincangan (pembetulan)

Pengesahan dibuat oleh *(Certified by)*: (dicadangkan sekali seminggu berjumpa penya)

Nama *(Name)*: M. Al-Muz. Zammil Yasin
Pemeriksa Luar/Pemeriksa Dalam*
*(External Examiner/Internal Examiner)**

Associate Prof. Dr. M. Al-Muz-Zammil Yasin
Ph.D. (Florida, USA), M.A (Ohio State, USA), B.Sc. Hons. (UTM)
Lecturer / Consultant
Leadership / Management
Faculty of Education
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia
81310 UTM Skudai, Malaysia
H/P : 019-743 7758
Tel : 07-553 4280 / 553 4290
E-mail: muzzutm@gmail.com

12/6/16

Perhatian *(Attention)*:

Boleh dihantar dengan faks (**07-5537800**) untuk kegunaan segera tetapi salinan asal **MESTI** dihantar kepada Sekolah Pengajian Siswazah. *(This verification may be faxed (07-5537800) for urgent usage but the original copy **MUST** be sent to the School of Graduate Studies).*

School of Graduate Studies
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia
17 JUN 2016
RECEIVED

* *Sila potong yang tidak berkenaan (*Delete where not applicable)*

Comments on Resubmission of Thesis

Syed Kaleemullah

(Post 2nd Viva)

No.	Problems in report/writing	Explanation	Action
1	Student did not respond to comments. Obviously, the abstract in the final version of the writing was taken from the previous 2nd viva. (No changes but only rearrangement of the sentences sequence).	How come the research questions were added (from 3 to 11) but the findings be the same? There were also typos and error in BM abstract.	Needs to redo the abstract accordingly.
2	The student did not refer to the examiners' comments for the amendments made post Viva 2 but only to the briefed chairman's report (see student's "Checklist of Corrections"— signed by Supervisor) This led to many concerns, which discussed in the viva session but were not taken care of by student.	Needs to response to all the examiners' comments (in the attachments along with the Chairmans' reports).	Needs to have copies of examiners' reports from the 1st and 2nd Viva Voce and acts upon all the comments: IMPORTANT
3	The introduction was still short (Pages 1-4) considering there were two important variables in the research.	Student needs to expand the writing. Address bot important variables and the links between those two variables. You don't have to discuss on the issue/problems yet (discuss issues in 1.2 Background of Problem)	Needs to redo the introduction Student should introduce the variables (Campus Sustainability Decision making, and the relationship between the two concepts.(4W1H) (not yet the issues/problems related to variables. Why What Where When How, etc.
4	The subtopics in 1.2 were not organized according to issues.	What I meant by issue is such as: a) Highly centralized decision making b) Curriculum is not revised c) Financial related issue	Please look at your main issues in 1.2 (p.5) and 1.2 (p.19) (I think you are not clear on this even though we talked a lot on this during the two Viva Voce sessions!!!)

Associate Prof. Dr. M. Al-Muzammil Yasin
Ph.D. (Florida, USA), M.A (Ohio State, USA), Bsc. Hons. (UTM)
Lecturer / Consultant
Leadership / Management
Faculty of Education
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia
81310 UTM Skudai, Malaysia
H/P : 019-743 7758
Tel : 07-553 4280 / 553 4290
E-mail: muzzutm@gmail.com

5	The research (problem) background was not in line with the Research Questions. Many gaps which were highlighted were not taken by researcher specifically to reveal related findings	Student is not clear on the relationship between the background and research questions	Needs to rewrite so that the issued background is in line with the research questions. Needs to discuss with me
6	What troubling me the most is the fact that student had changed the research questions after the first viva (and again after second viva!!!) As I remember we had only requested for additional question on the model/framework, as it was also discussed by researcher (see my comment no. 5 in the 1st Viva). First viva, there were about five research questions. During the second viva it was a shock to see the thesis had only three questions (all "whats questions)-(page 18) Final version, There were 11 research questions!!! (Too many) (page 23-24)	In 1st Viva, I requested for another research question to be inserted I informed student that the research questions were accepted but one additional question was needed for the model/framework In 2nd Viva, Examiners requested for questions which could address the "nature" of qualitative study as the "whats" questions are not suitable) 11 questions based on not rich data and not appropriate interview protocol	It is frustrated to see student's ignorance on this issue (did not come to discuss either) Needs to discuss with me on the research questions (IMPORTANT) as I see problem in your understanding.
7	Students did not respond to request to change the "Whats" research questions but adding too many research questions under each of the questions. Now there are 11 RQs!!! In the 2nd viva student only had 3 questions (page 18)	The way the questions were framed is not right. It is so illogical to have too many research questions as it is qualitative in nature.	Needs to discuss this with me
8	Students now have many additional concepts/variables in 11 research questions but did not add them in the operational definition list. (2nd viva page 28-30, final version p. 30-34)	The operational definitions should be in line with the research questions (include variables and important concepts involved in the study)	Needs to revisit the operational definition and redo accordingly (refer research questions)

Associate Prof. Dr. M. Al-Muz-Zammil Yasin
Ph.D. (Florida, USA), M.A (Ohio State, USA), Bsc. Hons. (UTM)
Lecturer / Consultant
Leadership / Management
Faculty of Education
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia
81310 UTM Skudai, Malaysia
H/P : 019-743 7758
Tel : 07-553 4280 / 553 4290
E-mail: muzzutm@gmail.com

9	Chapter II was not prepared from general to more detail aspects in research.	Looking at the arrangement in Chapter one (subtopic 1.1) , you should introduce campus sustainability before introducing decision making. The models of HEIs (p.57) was not supposedly under subtopic 2.4 (Past Researches on the Decision Making at the HEis) Discussion on HEIs spending was not supposedly under subtopic 2.5.8 The explanation on the Pakistan was not in appropriate order	Please reorganize your chapter II. Please discuss with me
10	Student did not dedicate individual subtopics to discuss on past researches done and to give your critical analysis and finally come with gaps in your research.	There should be subtopics to address research on sustainability, decision making, and research on these two aspect as an integration	Need to Include subtopics
11	Student deleted important explanation on sustainability in Chapter II (see 2nd viva p. 73-	Need to discuss in thorough on the sustainability as this is the number one variable.	Please look at the previous viva and redo this part
12	Chapter 3 still have reference to grounded theory!! (2nd Viva version p.102)	Student was told to remove the grounded theory idea as this study does not fit into that design	Needs to discuss with other lecturer on this (suggestion: refer Dr. Sarimah Ismail)
13	The pilot study done did not clearly mention on the changes to the protocol and questions	Must report on the changes or improvements made to the protocol, such as the arrangement of questions	Needs to redo
14	The interview protocol questions were not in appropriate order. It wasn't congruence with the research questions as well.	Compare the research questions with the interview protocol (p. 384-388), thus leading to question on the validity of your data and finding	You study is compromised in terms of quality due to this, and data collection is suggestable to rectify the problem (needs to discuss with me)
15	Your data was rich since the interviews were done "one shot" and there were no repetitions of interview to clarify and gather more rich data Also the way you triangulate with the document was sloppy.	The identified problem is the protocol of interview (pilot study failed to correct on this issue)	Needs to discuss with me: IMPORTANT

Associate Prof. Dr. M. Al-Muzammil Yasin
Ph.D. (Florida, USA), M.A (Ohio State, USA), Bsc. Hons. (UTM)
Lecturer / Consultant
Leadership / Management
Faculty of Education
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia
81310 UTM Skudai, Malaysia
H/P : 019-743 7758
Tel : 07-553 4280 / 553 4290
E-mail: muzzammil@gmail.com

3 of 4

16	Many questions in the protocol to integrate sustainability, as it was the main variable. So, when you interview the responses seemed to focus on the decision making with no vivid relation to sustainability.	The answers did not really focus on sustainable decision making but rather on "decision making" with no specific links or reference to the issues of sustainability.	Seriously there is a major problem with the instrument, thus data involved as well. Needs to discuss this with me.
17	Need to provide proof for the document used in triangulation	Need to include where necessary (Important).	Redo the reference/provide evidence.
18	Student did not do the thematic analysis clearly (steps by steps) following Braun and Clarke (2006, 2012) Thematic Analysis.	The analysis needs to be done according to the steps for each and every research questions	Needs to do this otherwise your findings are questionable. Please refer specifically to each and every steps involved
19	Student did not present the analyses based on the questions (each and every one of them)	Please prepare the analyses according to research questions	Needs to reanalyse and rewrite the entire Chapter II Analyses should also include data from the first viva
20	There was no detailed analyses shown before the framework in Ch 4 exist. Also students just quote analyses from other analyses parts, which is not adequate to support the model.	Student needs to show how the analyses was done before the model/framework was derived Should separate this analysis with other research questions	Framework should be represented in one of the research questions The analysis must be detailed. Needs to redo the writing on this
21	Student did not refer to other lecturer(s) to discuss on the qualitative analysis as your supervisor expertise is in quantitative approach.	Qualitative analyses were not done properly and did not follow the proposed reference steps (Braun and Clarke (2006)	Needs to discuss with other lecturer on this (suggestion Dr. Sarimah Ismail)
22	Chapter 5 needs to be discussed according to research questions	Please see other students' theses	Needs to redo the writing
23	**Student did not come to discuss to resolve problems pertaining to the research**	**Needs to see me once in a week after this**	**Needs to make appointment and discuss once in every week in order to fix the problems.**

Prepared by:

Assoc. Prof. Dr. M. Al-Muz-zammil Yasin
2nd June 2016 (Revised 15th 2016)

Associate Prof. Dr. M. Al-Muz-zammil Yasin
Ph.D. (Florida, USA), M.A (Ohio State, USA), Bsc. Hons. (UTM)
Lecturer / Consultant
Leadership / Management
Faculty of Education
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia
81310 UTM Skudai, Malaysia
H/P : 019-743 7758
Tel : 07-553 4280 / 553 4290
E-mail: [illegible]@gmail.com

CABUTAN MINIT MESYUARAT
JAWATANKUASA AKADEMIK FAKULTI PENDIDIKAN
BIL. 8/2016

TARIKH	:	**11 OGOS 2016 (KHAMIS)**
MASA	:	**10.00 PAGI**
TEMPAT	:	**BILIK MESYUARAT, FAKULTI PENDIDIKAN**

BIL. PERKARA

9.0 PERMOHONAN PERLANJUTAN TEMPOH PEMBETULAN TESIS

NAMA PELAJAR	:	**RAHMAT ADY PUTERA**
PROGRAM	:	**PPD**
NO. MATRIK	:	**PP113042**

Mesyuarat membincangkan permohonan perlanjutan tempoh pembetulan tesis bagi pelajar tersebut atas keterangan dan sebab seperti berikut :

i. Pelajar telah menjalani peperiksaan lisan pada 22 Februari 2016 dan diputuskan untuk melaksanakan pembetulan dalam tempoh selama enam (6) bulan.
ii. Walaubagaimanapun pelajar memerlukan masa untuk membuat pembetulan semula sebelum menghantar tesis tersebut.
iii. Tarikh akhir menghantar pembetulan tesis ialah pada 22 Ogos 2016.
iv. Pelajar menghadapi masalah kerana pihak *proofreader* hanya akan memberikan maklumbalas pada 3 September 2016.

Mesyuarat membincangkan permohonan perlanjutan pembetulan tesis ini **disokong** selama **tiga (3) bulan** lagi. Butiran maklumat pelajar adalah seperti **di Lampiran F.**

Tindakan : PA (PG)/Urusetia PG

10.0 PERMOHONAN PERLANJUTAN TEMPOH PEMBETULAN TESIS

NAMA PELAJAR	:	**SYED KALEEM ULLAH SHAH BUKHARI**
PROGRAM	:	**PPA**
NO. MATRIK	:	**PP103032**

Mesyuarat membincangkan permohonan perlanjutan tempoh pembetulan tesis bagi pelajar tersebut atas keterangan dan sebab seperti berikut :

i. Pelajar telah menjalani peperiksaan lisan kali kedua pada 18 Oktober 2015 dan keputusannya adalah (B2) dimana pelajar diberi tempoh selama enam (6) bulan untuk pembetulan.
ii. Pelajar diminta membuat pembetulan kedua dan diberi tempoh sehingga 16 Ogos 2016.