|  |
| --- |
| **RESEARCH PROPOSAL REVIEWER** **EVALUATION FORM** |
| **PRINCIPAL INVISTIGATOR:**   | **DATE RECEIVED:** | **DATE PROCESSED:**  |
| **REFERENCE NUMBER** : |
| **TITLE OF RESEARCH PROPOSAL:**  |

| **ASPECT EVALUATED****(\*\* Denotes critical points)** | **Excellent****3** | **Acceptable****2** | **Not acceptable****1** | **Not covered****0** | **Not applicable** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SCIENTIFIC WRITING** |  |  |
| Scientific language  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Logical flow of the contents |  |  |  |  |  |
| Internal consistency |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grammar and spelling |  |  |  |  |  |
| **TECHNICAL ASPECTS** |  |  |
| Technical presentation |  |  |  |  |  |
| Text references |  |  |  |  |  |
| List of references |  |  |  |  |  |
| **SOURCES** |  |  |
| Use of primary sources |  |  |  |  |  |
| Use of recent sources |  |  |  |  |  |
| Use of sources relevant to the topic |  |  |  |  |  |
| Use of research methodology sources  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **TIME SCHEDULE**  |  |  |
| Realistic planning in terms of programme requirements  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Time schedule feasible in terms of the research topic |  |  |  |  |  |
| **RESEARCH PROCESS** |  |  |
| Title:  |  |  |
| Relevance to the topic |  |  |  |  |  |
| Appropriately formulated |  |  |  |  |  |
| Research problem:  |  |  |
| Consistency with the title |  |  |  |  |  |
| Clarity of the problem  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contextualisation of the problem (background information clarifying the problem) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Appropriateness of the problem statement |  |  |  |  |  |
| Clarity of the significance |  |  |  |  |  |
| Research purpose: |  |  |
| Consistency with the title / research problem / problem statement |  |  |  |  |  |
| Correctly formulated |  |  |  |  |  |
| Objectives/specific research questions/ hypothesis: |  |  |
| Consistency with the problem statement / research purpose |  |  |  |  |  |
| Correctly formulated |  |  |  |  |  |
| Concepts: |  |  |
| Adequately defined (conceptually and/or operationally) |  |  |  |  |  |
| **METHODOLOGY** |  |  |
| Approach (quantitative/qualitative): |  |  |
| Appropriateness for the research problem |  |  |  |  |  |
| Adequately motivated |  |  |  |  |  |
| Design:  |  |  |
| **\*\*Appropriateness for the research problem** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Appropriately described |  |  |  |  |  |
| Population: |  |  |
| Clarity of description |  |  |  |  |  |
| **\*\*Relevancy to research problem** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sampling technique: |  |  |
| Appropriateness for the research problem and design |  |  |  |  |  |
| Appropriately described |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data collection: |  |  |
| **\*\*Appropriateness of the method for the research problem and design** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Method appropriately described |  |  |  |  |  |
| **\*\*Appropriateness of the instrument**  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reliability and validity are evident |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data analysis: |  |  |
| Appropriateness of the statistical tests for the design and research objectives / questions |  |  |  |  |  |
| Congruency between the instrument and data analysis plan |  |  |  |  |  |
| Design validity: |  |  |
| Design validity (internal/external validity or trustworthiness) is evident |  |  |  |  |  |
| Theoretical framework: |  |  |
| Relevance to study |  |  |  |  |  |
| Application in the study (e.g. instrument development) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ethical considerations: |  |  |
| Protection of participants |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protection of the institution |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maintenance of scientific integrity |  |  |  |  |  |

**Score:**

Adjudication of the research proposal based on the above criteria:

**Research potential**

**Grid 1:**

|  |
| --- |
| **GRID 1: Rating scale and descriptors** |
| **Excellent****4** | **Very good****3** | **Good****2** | **Fair****1** | **Poor****0** |
| Very high research potential and likely to make an important contribution to research | High research potential but minor revisions are required to increase its researchability | Has potential but needs further development to increase its researchability | Has potential but needs extensive development or needs to be reconceptualised | Researchability is questionable |

**Comments:**

**Significance of research**

**Grid 2:**

|  |
| --- |
| **GRID 2: Rating scale and descriptors** |
| **Excellent****4** | **Very good****3** | **Good****2** | **Fair****1** | **Poor****0** |
| Of very high scientific merit and likely to have an important impact on research in the field | Of high scientific merit, compelling, interesting and sound – will contribute towards research in the field | Good, but lacks an inspiring, exciting element in some respect/s | Has potential, but needs further development to increase its significance for the field | Characterised by one or more fatal flaws – significance is not apparent |

**Comments:**

**Scientific standard (Extent to which the proposal meets the criteria set out in the above table)**

**Grid 3:**

|  |
| --- |
| **GRID 1: Rating scale and descriptors** |
| **Excellent****4** | **Very good****3** | **Good****2** | **Fair****1** | **Poor****0** |
| Met 80-100% of the research proposal criteria | Met 60-79% of the research proposal criteria | Met 40-59% of the research proposal criteria | Met 20-39% of the research proposal criteria **OR** methodological issues need to be resolved | Met 0-19% of the research proposal criteria |

**Comments:**

**2.4 Summative score**

The scores obtained:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Grid** | **Applicant’s score** |
| 1 |  |
| 2 |  |
| 3 |  |
| **Total** |  |

**2.5 Interpretation**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 10 and above | Accepted with or without minor revisions |  |
| 7-9 | Extensive **and/or** methodological revisions required |  |
| 3-6 | Reconceptualise the study and resubmit |  |
| 2 and below:  | Rejected |  |

**2.6 Decision and recommendations**