

Semakan Pejabat Timb Dekan Penyelidikan _____

Lengkap Tidak Lengkap (Dikembalikan Kepada Penilai)

Disemak: _____ Disahkan: _____

Tarikh: _____ Tarikh: _____

RESEARCH UNIVERSITY GRANT (CLUSTER)

FORMATIVE FEEDBACK FORM

INSTRUCTION

- This form is to be completed by the Evaluators and endorsed by the Chairperson of the University Evaluation Committee
- Please use one form for each grant
- Please tick ✓ in the appropriate box
- Please attach quotation(s) for Vote 35 / special services
- Please attach appendix if the space is not enough

A. Research Details

Project Title : _____

Project Leader : _____

Reviewer : _____

B. Summary of Evaluation

Criteria	RUI		Weightage (W)	Marks			
	C	NC		Min		Max	
				Likert Rating (L)	Total (W*L)	Likert Rating (L)	Total (W*L)
1. Completeness of Application	✓		2	3	6	5	10
2. Capability of Project Leader	✓		2	3	6	5	10
3. Capability of Co-researchers	✓		1	3	3	5	5
4. Merit of Research	✓		2	3	6	5	10
5. Viability of Research	✓		1	3	3	5	5
6. Fairness of Cost estimates	✓		1	3	3	5	5
7. Utilisation of existing/ available infrastructure		✓	1	0	0	5	5
GRAND TOTAL				18	27	35	50

Key:

C = Compulsory: Grant proposal must satisfy criteria. Grant is rejected if likert rating is ≤ 2

NC = Non-Compulsory: Grant proposal need NOT satisfy criteria. Grant is NOT rejected if likert rating is ≤ 2

Marks = Likert Rating (L) x Weightage (W)

If assessment made in the compulsory section showed a rating of 2 (inadequate), the grant should be rejected. Please tick (✓) in the appropriate box and provide additional comments in the last column.

Criteria	Likert Rating (L)					Weightage (W)	Marks (L)x(W)	Remarks and/or items requiring additional information
	1	2	3	4	5			
	Seriously Inadequate	Inadequate	Acceptable	Good	Very Good			
1. Completeness of Application <i>[Guide for evaluation: 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 evaluator? Is the title appropriate for the proposal?]</i>						2		
2. Capability of Project Leader <i>[Guide for evaluation: Has the researcher conducted relevant research in the area/field of specialization? Has the researcher published within the proposed area? Are researcher's previous works relevant to the current proposal? If the researcher is a beginner, please indicate so. Special consideration is always given to new staffs to facilitate them to do research?]</i>						2		
3. Capability of Co-researchers <i>[Guide for evaluation: Are the co-researchers in the relevant area? Is the role of co-researcher adequate? Are there sufficient grounds given to justify recruitment of more than one co-researcher? Is the role of each co-researcher identified?]</i>						1		
4. Merit of Research <i>[Guide for evaluation: Does the research show merit according to the discipline addressed? Is the research method current, appropriate and rigorous?]</i>						2		
5. Viability of Research <i>[Guide for evaluation: Are the issues to be addressed realistic and manageable within the propose duration of study?]</i>						1		
6. Fairness of cost estimates Please attach quotation for vote 35 / special services <i>[Guide for evaluation: Is the budget reasonable and acceptable]</i>						1		

Criteria	Likert Rating (L)					Weightage (W)	Marks (L)x(W)	Remarks and/or items requiring additional information
	1	2	3	4	5			
	Seriously Inadequate	Inadequate	Acceptable	Good	Very Good			
7. Utilisation of existing/available infrastructure <i>[Guide for evaluation: The Evaluation Committee should ensure that the researcher reduces the usage of outside facilities as minimum as possible unless stated otherwise with justification. If possible, the researcher shows utilization of the closest available sites in the campus]</i>						1		
8. Multidisciplinary <i>[Guide for evaluation : Are the objectives, literature review, research methodology addressing multidisciplinary research approach? Are the team members multidisciplinary?]</i>						1		
9. Networking & Linkages <i>[Guide for evaluation : Does the team or cluster have strong national and international networking and linkages?]</i>						1		
10. Sustainability of Cohort (Age profile) <i>[Guide for evaluation : Does the team or cluster shows sustainability of cohorts : less than 10 years, 10-20 years, greater than 20 years?]</i>						1		
11. Contribution to Social Aspects <i>[Guide for evaluation : Did the team or cluster show attempts at community engagement?]</i>						1		
12. Contribution to Cultural Aspects <i>[Guide for evaluation : Did the team or cluster show contributions to cultural aspects?]</i>						1		
13. Contribution to Innovation Aspects <i>[Guide for evaluation : Are there products with potential for commercialisation and/or technology transfer with generation of intellectual property?]</i>						1		

Criteria	Likert Rating (L)					Weightage (W)	Marks (L)x(W)	Remarks and/or items requiring additional information
	1	2	3	4	5			
	Seriously Inadequate	Inadequate	Acceptable	Good	Very Good			
14. Providing people-oriented solutions to sustainability issues and/or bottom billion and/or well being agenda <i>[Guide for evaluation : Are the reasons given sufficient to justify the claim? Are these relevant with the proposal?]</i>						1		
GRAND TOTAL						/85		

Merit

Criteria (¹ + ² + ³ + ⁴ + ⁵ + ⁶ + ⁷ + ⁸ + ⁹ + ¹⁰ + ¹¹ + ¹² + ¹³ + ¹⁴) X 100= %

85

■ Compulsory ■ Non-Compulsory

D. Recommended Funding

If the allocation requested is acceptable, please attach a copy of the budget requested from the application form.

Vote	Budget Details	Requested (RM)	Recommended (RM)
11000	Salary and Wages		
14000	Overtime		
21000	Travelling Expenses and Subsistence		
22000	Transportation of Goods		
23000	Communication and Utilities (Phone, Fax, Postage etc.)		
24000	Rental		
26000	Supply of Raw Materials and Materials for Repair and Maintenance		
27000	Research Materials and Supplies (including Animals, Disposables, etc.)		
28000	Maintenance and Minor Repair Services		
29000	Professional Services and other Services including printing and hospitality, honorarium for subjects		
35000	Capital expenditure/Hardware purchases including equipment costing >RM500.00 must include justifications, specifications and quotations		
TOTAL			
GRAND TOTAL			

E. Action to be Taken

Application is recommended to Dean of School of Educational Studies with or without minor correction

Advise to make ammendments / corrections based on the given comments

F. Comments Regarding Assessment

[Please state reasons for rejection and provide positive criticisms and suggestions for improvement for any assessment made in **Section C** which shows a rating below 'acceptable' and provide details of the specific information being requested from the Project Leader as identified in the last column of **Section C**.]

G. Comments of Deputy Dean (Research)

Comments:

Signature: _____ **Date:** _____