

The Grants contd.

2.3 REVIEW PROCESS (Refer to Page 19 - Introduction to University Research Grants)

Project Evaluation Form

CONFIDENTIAL

Evaluation of University Research Grants - 2017

Date submitted for evaluation: Date returned after evaluation:

Name of Evaluator:

Project Title:

Please tick relevant cage. Any specific comments to the applicant and/or suggestion for modification can be made relevant cages.

1. Applicants knowledge, training and research experience:

Adequate	
Inadequate	

2. Rationale for doing the research and analysis of the problems (background and justification):

Good	
Needs improvements	

3. Relevance of objectives and hypothesis to be tested:

Relevant and clear	
Not relevant	

4. Experimental designs:

Acceptable	
Needs modification	
Revise	

*(*If modification is proposed please give reasons and your proposed designs)*

5. Statistical analysis:

Adequate	
Inadequate	
Not suitable	

(If inadequate / not suitable please give reasons and proposed statistical design)

6. Relevance of location and methodologies for experimentation/ collection of data:

I. Location:

Suitable	
Not suitable	

(If not suitable please give reasons and suggest suitable locations)

II. Methodologies:

Adequate	
Inadequate	
Need modification	

(If inadequate or need modification please give reasons to time and suggest methodologies)

7. Feasibility of the proposal in relation to time and resources requested:

Feasible within given time period	
Require more time	
Can be done within a shorter time period	
Resources adequate	
Resources inadequate	

(If inadequate please give reasons and suggest additional resources)

8. Ethical consideration:

Ethically acceptable	
Ethical clearance obtained	
Application submitted for ethical clearance	
Ethically not acceptable	

9. Considerations to environmental safety (if applicable only)

Environmentally safe	
Environmentally not safe	
Need modification	
Not applicable	

10. Relevance / Justification of requested budget items: (Very Important)

i. Personnel

Adequate	
Inadequate	
Need further justification	

ii. Equipment - Not mentioned

Adequate	
Inadequate	
Need further justification	
Over estimated	

iii. Consumables

Adequate	
Inadequate	
Need further justification	
Over estimated	

The Grants contd.

vi. Travel/ Subsistence

Adequate	
Inadequate	
Need further justification	
Over estimated	

v. Miscellaneous

Adequate	
Inadequate	
Need further justification	
Over estimated	

11. Additional Comments, Suggestions and Responses

Kindly include the item number to which you provide a comment/suggestion or response.

Kindly evaluate the project according to the following marking scheme.

Factor	Maximum Limit of Points	Total
Scientific merit of the study	50	
The relevance of the study to national development	50	
Its contribution to strengthening the capacity of science and technology in the country	50	
Potential of the research findings to foster research & development relations between the University and the relevant Industry	50	
Possibility of research findings being published in international journals	50	
Total Score		

12. Recommendation:

<input type="checkbox"/>	Proposal RECOMMENDED for support
<input type="checkbox"/>	Proposal RECOMMENDED subject to minor modifications as stated
<input type="checkbox"/>	Proposal RECOMMENDED resubmission with modifications
<input type="checkbox"/>	Proposal NOT RECOMMENDED for support

Please provide justification if the project is not recommended for support.

For the Research Committee Use only

Evaluation of the Project

	Marks/Comment
Scientific Merit*	
Ethical considerations**	
Budget***	

* *Scientific Merit - Average of total marks given by the 2 reviewers as a percentage*

** *Needs ethics committee approval / Does not need ethics committee approval / Ethics approval is already granted*

*** *Budgets is justifiable / Needed revision / Revised budget approved / Cannot be approved*