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**Research Proposal Reviewers Report**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SECTION A: CANDIDATE DETAILS** | | | |
| Candidate Given Name(s): | Enter text here. | Family Name: | Enter text here. |
| Student Number: | Enter text here. | School: | Choose an item. |
| Course Level: | Choose an item. | | |
| Thesis Title: | Enter text here. | | |
| Principal Supervisor | Enter text here. | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SECTION B: REVIEWER DETAILS** | |
| Date Proposal Seminar Held | Click to select a date. |
| Reviewer’s Name | Enter text here. |
| Reviewer’s Institution | Enter text here. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SECTION C: REVIEWER EVALUATION**  Please assess each of the categories from excellent to inadequate and provide written feedback and comments as appropriate. Requested maximum of about three pages. Please also provide a final, overall assessment of the proposal. | | | | |
| **Role of Review Panel**  The role of the review panel is to determine:   * If the project is conceptually and methodologically sound; * If the project is of appropriate scope for the level of the award; * If the research is significant/able to make an original contribution to knowledge.   Reviewers are also expected to attend the proposal seminar and provide feedback to the candidate. | | | | |
| 1. **The proposal clearly states the academic impact of conducting the study, including the original contribution to knowledge.** | | | | |
| Excellent | Very Good | Good | Marginal | Inadequate |
| Comments | Enter text here. | | | |
| 1. **The proposal clearly indicates the possible impact (societal/economic impact and possible beneficiaries) of study.** | | | | |
| Excellent | Very Good | Good | Marginal | Inadequate |
| Comments | Enter text here. | | | |
| 1. **Clarity of statement of the research problem, research question/s or hypotheses.** | | | | |
| Excellent | Very Good | Good | Marginal | Inadequate |
| Comments | Enter text here. | | | |
| 1. **Review of literature and theoretical/conceptual framework.** | | | | |
| Excellent | Very Good | Good | Marginal | Inadequate |
| Comments | Enter text here. | | | |
| 1. **Proposed methodology and data analysis, and justification of choice.** | | | | |
| Excellent | Very Good | Good | Marginal | Inadequate |
| Comments | Enter text here. | | | |
| 1. ***For Creative Arts Research Only.* Clear indication of how the creative project will link to the exegesis through theoretical and/or reflexive discourse.** | | | | |
| Excellent | Very Good | Good | Marginal | Inadequate |
| Comments | Enter text here. | | | |
| 1. **Ethical issues and risk factors identified and addressed.** | | | | |
| Excellent | Very Good | Good | Marginal | Inadequate |
| Comments | Enter text here. | | | |
| 1. **The scope of the project is appropriate to the level of degree, with realistic timelines.** | | | | |
| Excellent | Very Good | Good | Marginal | Inadequate |
| Comments | Enter text here. | | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. **Overall recommendation:** | |
| Recommend to proceed, subject to any minor amendments to the approval of the Principal Supervisor  Recommend to proceed, subject to major amendments being made to the satisfaction of the Associate Dean (Research)  Recommend to revise and resubmit to reviewers, which will require the Candidate to undertake their oral proposal presentation again  Recommend not to proceed, noting this will result in the Candidate failing to meet the requirements of milestone 2 and being excluded from the course | |
| Comments | Enter text here. |