



UNIVERSITI SAINS MALAYSIA

SCHOOL OF EDUCATIONAL STUDIES

**EVALUATION FORM**  
**EXPLORATORY RESEARCH GRANT SCHEME (ERGS) IPT APPLICATION**  
*Borang Penilaian Permohonan Skim Geran Penyelidikan Eksploratori (ERGS) IPT*

**A PROJECT LEADER :**  
*Ketua Projek*

**RESEARCH TITLE:**  
*Tajuk Penyelidikan*

**REVEIWER'S NAME:**  
*Nama penilai*

**SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT (Please tick appropriate box)/ Ringkasan Penilaian**

B		Likert Rating (L)					Weightage (W)	Marks (L X W)
		Poor	Inadequate	Acceptable	Good	Very Good		
		1	2	3	4	5		
	<b>1. Completeness of project background</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>2</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments		
1.	Is the title appropriate?	
2.	Are the statement of issues relevant?	
3.	Is the concept of study robust?	
4.	Is the literature current?	
5.	Is the literature relevant?	

<b>2. Research Approach and Technical Objectives</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>2</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	----------	--------------------------

Comments		
1.	Are the objectives of study appropriate?	
2.	Are the research questions or hypothesis consistent?	
3.	Is the research design appropriate and relevant?	

**Likert Rating (L)**

Poor	Inadequate	Acceptable	Good	Very Good	<b>Weightage (W)</b>	<b>Marks (L X W)</b>
1	2	3	4	5	<b>2</b>	<input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="checkbox"/>	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="checkbox"/>	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="checkbox"/>	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="checkbox"/>	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="checkbox"/>		

**3. Viability of Research**

Comments	
1.	Are the issues to be addressed realistic for 12-36 months study?
2.	Is the method of data gathering suitable?
3.	Is the method of data analysis suitable?

**4. The experience, qualifications and availability of research team**

1	2	3	4	5	<b>1</b>	<input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="checkbox"/>	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="checkbox"/>	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="checkbox"/>	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="checkbox"/>	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="checkbox"/>		

Comments	
1.	Does the project leader have suitable research qualification?
2.	Has the project leader conducted and completed other researches?
3.	Is the research team suitably qualified?
4.	Have they conducted and completed other related research projects?

**5. Utilisation of existing/available infrastructure**

1	2	3	4	5	<b>1</b>	<input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="checkbox"/>	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="checkbox"/>	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="checkbox"/>	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="checkbox"/>	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="checkbox"/>		

Comments	
1.	Will the researchers be using available resources and infrastructure?
2.	Have they attempted to reduce cost by using sites nearest to the place of work?

**6. Time Planning**

1	2	3	4	5	<b>1</b>	<input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="checkbox"/>	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="checkbox"/>	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="checkbox"/>	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="checkbox"/>	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="checkbox"/>		

Comments	
1.	Does the researcher provide a reasonable timeline to complete the study?
2.	Is the milestone thoroughly thought out?

**Likert Rating (L)**

Poor	Inadequate	Acceptable	Good	Very Good	Weightage (W)	Marks (L X W)
1	2	3	4	5	<b>1</b>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="text"/>

**7. Overall Assessment**

Comments	
1.	How complete is the project background?
2.	Are the approach, objectives and technical robust?
3.	How valid is this project?
4.	How qualified and experience is the team?
5.	How well does the team utilize existing and available infrastructure?
6.	Is the time planning reasonable?

**FOR DEPUTY DEAN (RESEARCH) USE ONLY**

**Merit of the proposal**

	Poor	Inadequate	Acceptable	Good	Very Good	Marks
	1	2	3	4	5	
i. Technical aspects	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>
ii. Validity aspects	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>
iii. Experience and qualification of team	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>
iv. Utilisation of existing infrastructure	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>
v. Timelines	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>
vi. Overall assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>
<b>TOTAL MARKS</b>						<input type="text"/>

$$\text{Merit} = \frac{\text{Criteria [ ( } \overset{1}{\square} + \overset{2}{\square} + \overset{3}{\square} + \overset{4}{\square} + \overset{5}{\square} + \overset{6}{\square} ) + \overset{7}{\square} ]}{50} \times 100 = \square \%$$

**RECOMMENDED FUNDING/ Cadangan Peruntukan**

**C** Poor Inadequate Acceptable Good Very Good

1. Appropriateness of cost estimates ..... 1 2 3 4 5

COST CATEGORY	RECOMMENDED FUNDING (RM)
Vot 11000 - Salary and Wages	
Vot 21000 - Travelling and Transportation	
Vot 24000 - Rental	
Vot 27000 - Research Materials and Supplies	
Vot 28000 - Maintenance and Minor Repair Services	
Vot 29000 - Professional Services	
Vot 35000 - Accessories and Equipment	
<b>TOTAL</b>	

**Comments:**

*Ulasan:*

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

**Name:**

*Nama:*

**Deputy Dean of Research**

*Tarikh:*

**Signature:**

*Tandatangan:*

## **SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT**

### **1. Completeness of project background**

Is the literature review that gives the background adequate, current and relevant to the proposal? Is the statement of the issues and problems to be addressed sufficiently clear to the committee? Is the title an accurate one for the proposal?

### **2. Research Approach and Technical Objectives**

The research approach should be consistent with the objectives and the scientific and practical aspects of the research methodology. Consider the approach to data collection, data analysis and applicability of the proposed equipment.

### **3. Viability of Research**

Are the issues to be addressed realistic and narrow for 12-36 months study? Is the methodology (the procedure and the methods to be applied in the study) current, reasonable, adequate and appropriate? The Evaluation Committee should assess this by taking into consideration the risks of support equipment failure, inadequate technical support, etc.

### **4. The Experience, Qualifications and Availability of Research Team**

The reviewer should consider the relevant experience and background of the key projects individuals and co-researcher. Have they successfully completed related projects? The reviewers' evaluation should be based on the evidence contained in the proposal pertaining to their experience, availability and the indicated amount of effort by the principal investigator and team.

### **5. Capability of project leader**

Has the applicant conducted relevant research in the area/field of specializations? Has the applicant published within the proposed area? Are his/her previous works relevant to the current proposal? If the applicant is a beginner, please indicate so as special consideration is always given to new staff to start them into research.

### **6. Capability, appropriateness and availability of research team**

Are the co-researchers in the relevant area? Are there sufficient grounds given to justify recruitment of more than one project assistants?

### **7. Appropriateness of cost estimates**

Is the budget reasonable and acceptable?

### **8. Utilization of existing/available infrastructure**

The Evaluation Committee should ensure that the applicant reduces to a minimum any call upon outside facilities and as far as possible and within the context of the research that the applicant intends this must mean confining the research to the closest available sites to their campus.