 Guidelines and Nomination Form

 Research Proposal Reviewer

|  |
| --- |
| **GUIDELINES** |
|  **Role of Review Panel** The role of a review panel of a research proposal 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; and
* If the research is matched to the candidate’s abilities and school’s resources.

 **Criteria for Selecting Panel Members**  Proposal reviewers should have academic qualifications equivalent to the level of degree they are assessing. If a  reviewer does not have the appropriate qualifications, a case needs be made for including them on the panel, based  on significant experience judged to be equivalent.  The use of at least one external reviewer is encouraged. However, it may be possible, in some cases of critical mass  of research expertise within the University, for a School to nominate a review panel internal to the University. Please  review the Conflict of Interest Guidelines when selecting a reviewer. The review panel should have a combination of expertise and experience required to provide appropriate feedback  and a detailed report to the research candidate. Reviewers are required to report on:* The clarity of statement of the research problem;
* The significance of the study;
* The rationale for conducting the study;
* The literature review and theoretical framework;
* The statement of the research question/s; and
* The proposed methodology and data analysis

 Each nominated proposal reviewer requires a statement addressing the suitability of the reviewer to fulfil the role.  The statement should include sufficient relevant information for the Associate Dean to determine suitability.  Examples may include the reviewer’s experience in publishing, supervision, examining theses, and research grants.  Other examples may include professional memberships and relevant industry experience. A brief CV should be  included (2-3 pages) for each nominated reviewer as evidence against claims in the suitability statement.  |

The following matrix should be used to determine whether a review panel has an appropriate mix of skills, experience and expertise:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Reviewer 1** | **Reviewer 2** |
| **Required for each panel member** |  |  |
| Discipline knowledge |  |  |
| Understanding of key aspects for Literature Review & Conceptual Framework  |  |  |
| Understanding of research methodology  |  |  |
| Understanding depth and breadth required for the study (assessing scope and timeframe) |  |  |
| Understanding of ethical and risk considerations  |  |  |
| **Desired for at least one panel member** |  |  |
| Publication record |  |  |
| Significant industry experience (judged to be equivalent of research track record) |  |  |
| Specific knowledge relevant to the thesis  |  |  |
| Supervisory experience  |  |  |

**APPLICATION FORM FOR NOMINATING PROPOSAL REVIEWERS**

|  |
| --- |
|  **CANDIDATE DETAILS (ECU Internal Use Only)** |
|  **Student Number:** |  |
|  **Candidate Given**  **Name(s):** |  |
|  **Family Name:**  |  |
|  **Principal Supervisor:** |  |
|  **School:** |  |
|  **Course:** |  |
|  **Thesis Title:** |  |
|  |
|  **REVIEWER INFORMATION**  |
|  |
|  **Reviewer 1** |
|  **Reviewer’s Title** |  Other: |
|  **Name:** |  |
| **Email Address:** |  |
|  **Institution:** |  |
|  **Citizenship:** **(list all countries)** |  |
|  **Academic**  **Qualifications:** |  |
|  **Present Position** |  |
|  **ORCID ID (if available):** |  |
|  **Staff Web Profile:** |  |
| **Please provide a brief fact paragraph outlining the suitability of the reviewer**: |

|  |
| --- |
| **Reviewer 2** |
|  **Reviewer’s Title** |  **Other:** |
|  **Name:** |  |
| **Email Address:** |  |
|  **Institution:** |  |
|  **Citizenship:** **(list all countries)** |  |
|  **Academic**  **Qualifications:** |  |
|  **Present Position** |  |
|  **ORCID ID (if available):** |  |
|  **Staff Web Profile:** |  |
| **Please provide a brief fact paragraph outlining the suitability of the reviewer:** |

|  |
| --- |
|  **Reviewers Nominated By:** |
|  **Principal Supervisor Name:** |  |
|  **Signature:** |  |
|  **Date:** |  |

|  |
| --- |
|  **School Approval** ***Forward this completed form to the Associate Dean Research for review and signature*** |
|  **Associate Dean Research Name:** |  |
|  **Signature:** |  |
|  **Date:** |  |

|  |
| --- |
|  **Disputes** |
|  Nominated reviewers are approved by the relevant Associate Dean Research, or nominee. Supervisors who are dissatisfied with  the decision of the Associate Dean Research are encouraged to make an appointment with their Dean of School. Disagreements  that cannot be resolved at school level may be referred to the Dean Graduate Research. |