

EVALUATION CHECKLIST FOR RESEARCH PROPOSALS

(This checklist incorporates the items used by government funding bodies in their evaluation of research proposals.)

1. Problem identification:

- 1.1 Is the problem clearly defined?
- 1.2 Is the basic research problem well formulated, or is it poorly and vaguely structured?
- 1.3 Is it briefly and concisely stated?

2. Background to the research problem:

- 2.1 Has there been an adequate description of the background to the problem either under a separate heading or as part of the literature?
- 2.2 Has the area of concern regarding the problem been identified, i.e., has the need that exists to research the problem been clarified?
- 2.3 Have the basic terms and concepts been clarified, either under a separate heading, or as a suitable sub-heading?

3. Literature review:

- 3.1 Is there clear evidence of a thorough review of the literature?
- 3.2 Is there a theoretical engagement with the relevant literature?
- 3.3 Does the literature review provide an adequate theoretical framework for the study?
- 3.4 Has appropriate literature been examined in order to provide the background and rationale to the problem and its formulation?
- 3.5 Have relevant sources been used to identify the problem?
- 3.6 Does the literature review correspond with the aims of the research?
- 3.7 Are the cited references acceptable?
- 3.8 Are references and bibliographic citation correct?

4. Conceptual framework:

- 4.1 To what extent are the framework and theoretical assumptions clearly stated?
- 4.2 Has the study been clearly delineated under a separate heading or sub-heading, i.e., have the boundaries of the research been stated?
- 4.3 Has a suitable hypothesis (or hypotheses) been formulated, or has a suitable research question (or research questions) been stated?

5. Objectives:

- 5.1 Have the objectives been stated clearly?
- 5.2 If there are more than three objectives, have they been divided into main and subsidiary objectives?

6. Research design:

- 6.1 Is the project and research design well structured and outlined, or is it poorly articulated?
- 6.2 Has the research methodology been articulated clearly?
- 6.3 Is there a clear correspondence between the stated aims of the research and the chosen methodology?

- 6.4 If measuring instruments were designed in other contexts, have they been suitably evaluated in terms of relevance and appropriateness to the Egyptian context, or tested for their validity before use?
- 6.5 Have the sampling methodology and data collection been adequately clarified?
- 6.6 Is the analysis appropriate to the aims of the research?

7. Significance:

- 7.1 To what extent will the research make an original and creative contribution to knowledge?
- 7.2 Alternatively, to what extent will the research analyse and diagnose a particular problem, set it out logically, arrive at conclusions and make proposals for the solution of the problem?
- 7.3 Why is it important to undertake this research? Whom will it benefit or to whom will it be important?
- 7.4 Is the proposed research likely to promote further investigation within and/or across disciplines and fields?
- 7.5 Has the expected outcome (or outcomes) of the research been clearly identified?

8. Feasibility:

- 8.1 Is the problem researchable and is it feasible? Do the preliminary data and available resources support its feasibility?
- 8.2 Does the applications academic profile or potential support their ability to accomplish the project?

9. Other general comments:

Is the proposal well structured or poorly compiled? If the latter, what should be done to make it a well-structured proposal?

10. Language:

Has the research proposal been proofread and edited?

NB: This questions only to guideline applications to improve their proposal.

Best wishes

Grants Office:-

Tel: 241/3683

Fax: 2360606

Email: qaaunit@yahoo.com