



**RESEARCH PROPOSAL REVIEWER
EVALUATION FORM**

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:	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					



ASPECT EVALUATED (* Denotes critical points)	Excellent 3	Acceptable 2	Not acceptable 1	Not covered 0	Not applicable
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	<input type="text"/>
7-9	Extensive and/or methodological revisions required	<input type="text"/>
3-6	Reconceptualise the study and resubmit	<input type="text"/>
2 and below:	Rejected	<input type="text"/>

2.6 Decision and recommendations
