



**THE RESEARCH MANAGEMENT CENTRE OF ALFA UNIVERISTY COLLEGE
(RMCAUC)**

FORM 5.1 RESEARCH PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORM

Information						
A	Proposal Title	:				
	Principal Investigator (PI)	:				
	Faculty/Department	:				
	Reviewer Name	:				
	Date of Review	:				
Summary of Assessment (Please tick '✓' in the appropriate box)						
B		Poor 1	Inadequate 2	Acceptable 3	Good 4	Very Good 5
	1 Research Idea and Originality					
	i. Novelty and originality of the research	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	ii. Addressing gaps in existing knowledge	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	iii. Alignment with FRGS objectives	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Comments :	<hr style="border: 0; border-top: 1px solid #00aaff; margin-bottom: 5px;"/> <hr style="border: 0; border-top: 1px solid #00aaff; margin-bottom: 5px;"/>				
	2 Research Objectives and Scope					
	i. Clear, specific, and measurable objectives	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	ii. Well-defined and achievable research scope	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	iii. Soundness of Methodology	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Comments :	<hr style="border: 0; border-top: 1px solid #00aaff; margin-bottom: 5px;"/> <hr style="border: 0; border-top: 1px solid #00aaff; margin-bottom: 5px;"/>				
	3 Methodology					
	i. Appropriate and well-structured methodology	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	ii. Detailed research design	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	iii. Valid and reliable data collection and analysis methods	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Comments :	<hr style="border: 0; border-top: 1px solid #00aaff; margin-bottom: 5px;"/> <hr style="border: 0; border-top: 1px solid #00aaff; margin-bottom: 5px;"/>				

4 Feasibility

- i. Realism of the research timeline
- ii. Adequacy of resources and facilities
- iii. Capability of the PI and research team to execute the project

Comments :

5 Expected Contribution and Impact

- i. Advancing knowledge in the field
- ii. Highlighting academic or societal contributions

Comments :

6 Overall Evaluation

- i. Overall Assessment

Strengths of the Proposal:

Weaknesses of the Proposal:

C

RECOMMENDED FUNDING

- 1 Appropriateness of cost estimates

D **RECOMMENDATIONS BY EVALUATION COMMITTEE**

Please tick (√)

Recommended:

A. Recommended

B. Not Recommended (Please specify reason)

Name:

Date:

Signature :



GUIDELINES FOR ASSESSMENT

- Please assess the proposal according to the specified criteria.
- Provide constructive feedback and comments for each section.
- Submit the completed evaluation form to the RMCAUC by the specified deadline.

1. Project Background Completeness

Is the literature review thorough, current, and relevant to the proposal? Does the description of the issues and problems to be addressed clearly outline the research focus for the committee? Does the project title accurately reflect the content of the proposal?

2. Research Approach and Technical Objectives

The research methodology should be in line with the objectives and address both the scientific and practical dimensions of the chosen approach. Consider how the data will be gathered, analyzed, and whether the proposed equipment is appropriate for the study.

3. Research Feasibility

Are the research objectives achievable within the proposed 24-36 month timeframe? Is the methodology (including procedures and methods) modern, sound, and appropriate? The Evaluation Committee should consider any risks, such as equipment downtime or lack of technical support, when evaluating feasibility.

4. Research Team's Experience, Qualifications, and Availability

Reviewers should assess the qualifications and relevant experience of the principal investigator and key collaborators. Have they successfully completed similar projects? The evaluation should be based on the proposal's evidence regarding their experience, availability, and the expected contributions of the team.

i. Project Leader's Capability

Has the applicant conducted relevant research in the proposed area? Do they have publications in this field? Are their past works applicable to the current proposal? Special consideration should be given to new researchers to help them establish their research careers.

ii. Research Team's Capability, Appropriateness, and Availability

Do the co-researchers have relevant experience for the project? Is there a clear justification for hiring multiple project assistants?

iii. Multidisciplinary Nature

Does the project team bring a diverse range of expertise, ensuring a sufficiently multidisciplinary approach?

5. Collaboration

Does the project involve cooperation between institutions? Is the collaboration well-structured, justified, and feasible?

6. Utilization of Existing/Available Infrastructure

The Evaluation Committee should verify that the applicant minimizes dependence on external facilities and, when possible, conducts research at locations nearest to the campus.