**MNU Research Grant Evaluation Form**

**Information and Instruction**

*Criteria No. 1 and 2 are to be completed by reviewers. If a mandatory criterion is absent from the proposal, marks shall not be awarded for that criterion. For instance, if Criterion 1.3 requires clearly defined goals and objectives, and these are not provided in the proposal, no marks will be allocated. Reviewers are expected to refer to the detailed proposal and exercise their professional judgment in evaluating each section.*

*Criteria No.* ***3 and 4 are to be completed by the MNU Research Grant Committee ONLY.*** *Committee members are expected to review the principal and co-investigators' backgrounds attached with the proposal.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| GRANT APPLICATION NUMBER: | | |  | | | | Date Submitted: | / / |
| Title of the Project: | | |  | | | | | |
| 1 | **Academic Staff** | **Yes**  **No** | **a** | **Amount Requested:**  Total:  Kick-off: | **b** | **Grant Applying for:**  Small Medium Large  (≤10K) (≤100K) (≤1 million) | | |
| **Higher Degree Student** | **Yes**  **No** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria for evaluation** | **Indicators for evaluation of the application** | **Rating of grant** | **Comments** |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Significance of the project** | 1.1 The study addresses an important issue that closely relates to MNU/National Research Priorities. | 5 |  |  |
| 1.2 The research problem is well formulated. | 5 |  |  |
| 1.3 The goals and objectives are clearly stated. | 5 |  |  |
| 1.4. The literature review sufficiently contributes to establishing the background and rationale for the study | 5 |  |  |
| 1.5. The proposal describes an original and innovative study | 5 |  |  |
| 1.6 The project’s contribution to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) is clearly articulated and demonstrable potential for positive, measurable impact at community, national, or global levels. | 5 |  |  |
|  |  | **30%** |  |  |
| 1. **Soundness of the proposed plan and budget** | 2.1 The research design has been well structured and clearly articulated. | 5 |  |  |
| 2.2 The data collection has been well structured and clearly articulated. | 5 |  |  |
| 2.3 The sampling has been well structured and clearly articulated. | 5 |  |  |
| 24 The data analysis procedure has been well structured and clearly articulated. | 5 |  |  |
| 2.5 The research question(s) and the proposed methodology are feasible. | 5 |  |  |
| 2.6 There is a clear correspondence between the stated aims of the research and the proposed methodology. | 5 |  |  |
| 2.7 The timeline proposed for the project is realistic and adequate. | 5 |  |  |
| 2.8 The budget proposed for the project includes all major costs, is realistic and has been justified. | 5 |  |  |
| 2.9 Risk management is adequately addressed. | 5 |  |  |
| 2.10 The proposal includes a clear dissemination plan. | 5 |  |  |
|  |  | **50%** |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Competence of the applicant** | 3.1 The CV of the PI demonstrates that s/he has the necessary knowledge and experience to lead the project and achieve its objectives. | 5 |  |  |
| 3.2 The team’s research track record and the combination of team members is strong across all areas needed to accomplish the proposed research. | 5 |  |  |
|  |  | **10%** |  |  |
| 1. **Significance of the proposed work to the career development and intellectual growth of the applicant.** | * 1. The project includes activities that will contribute to directly enhance the intellectual capacity, professional development and career progression of individual researchers. | 5 |  |  |
| 4.2 Potential opportunities to attend seminars/conferences and networking opportunities have been identified. | 5 |  |  |
|  |  | **10%** |  |  |
| **Total marks awarded:** (Minimum marks required for granting an award is set at 75%) | | **100%** |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Overall Recommendation:**  Recommend to fund the proposed research project  To be re-evaluated for funding after suggested revisions  Do not recommend to fund  **Comments:** |
| **DATE: / /** |

**-End of the Document-**