

Scorecard for the selection of Doctoral Candidates for 2018 Funding

Review Criteria /Weight	Description	Five Point Rating Scale, Weight and Descriptor				
		5 = Excellent	4 = Above average	3 = Average	2 = Below average	1= Poor
1. Academic Merit. Ave. % for previous degree) – 15 %	Average cumulative %percentage mark from previous degree	80 % and above	70-79%	60-69%	50-59%	Below 50%
2. Problem Statement – 5%	Description of the problem statement informing the proposal.	The problem statement is clearly articulated. Gaps in the existing literature are identified and supported by relevant literature. The literature is cited in text.	The problem statement well described and supported by relevant literature. The identified research gap could be refined.	The problem statement is adequately described but has no citations in text. The research gap is vaguely articulated.	Both the problem statement and the research gap are vaguely described without in text citations.	The problem statement and the research gaps are not defined in the proposal.
3. Rationale and Literature – 20%	Description of rationale including a literature review with references.	<p>The research rationale is well advocated, it provides strong and valid arguments on the importance of the research and explicitly outlines how the research will eliminate the gap identified in the problem statement.</p> <p>The study is well conceptualized; The Literature is thoroughly reviewed; relevant and is fully aligned with the problem statement and fully supports the proposed research. Citations in text are included and the list of references is attached.</p>	<p>The research rationale is clear. The applicant provides fair arguments on the importance of the research AND fairly outlines how the research will close the gap identified in the problem statement.</p> <p>The study is reasonably conceptualized; The literature review is relevant and is adequately aligned with the problem statement and supports the proposed research. In text citations are in place</p>	<p>The research rationale could be refined. The applicant only provides fair arguments on the importance of the research OR fairly outlines how the research will close the gap identified in the problem statement.</p> <p>The conceptualization could be strengthened; The literature review is partly aligned with the problem statement with minor gaps that could be refined. It is unclear which gaps in the extant literature are being addressed. In text citations are in place.</p>	<p>The research rationale of the study is not clear. The applicant vaguely describes the importance of the research OR fails to outline how the research will close the gap identified in the problem statement.</p> <p>The conceptualization is weak; The literature review is included but is not aligned with the problem statement and thus does not support the proposed research. It is unclear which gaps in the extant literature are being addressed. Citations are missing, thus making the research rationale questionable.</p>	<p>The research rationale does not describe the importance of the research and there is inadequate information to make a fair assessment.</p> <p>The conceptualization is weak; The literature review is scant/ almost non-existent; not relevant, outdated and not aligned with the problem statement; does not support the proposed research.</p>

4. Aims and Objectives 5%	<p>Description of the aims and objectives of the study.</p>	<p>The research aim unambiguously indicates the overarching goal of the project and the objectives concisely indicate the key issues that the research will focus on. Both the aims and objectives are aligned with the problem statement.</p>	<p>The research aims and objectives are sound but have inconsistencies that can be refined to appropriately aligned with the problem statement</p>	<p>The research aims and objectives are appropriate but only partially align with the problem statement</p>	<p>The research aims OR the objectives are not aligned with the problem statement</p>	<p>The research aims AND the objectives are not aligned with the problem statement</p>
5. Methodology and proposed research plan 25%	<p>Research methodology, work plan and project organisation. Doctoral Abroad applicants must in addition, provide a motivation explaining the benefits of undertaking the doctoral studies abroad and reasons why the doctoral studies cannot be undertaken in South Africa.</p>	<p>The proposed methodology systematically details the approach that will be taken to resolve the research problem. Information on data collection, measurement and analysis is clearly outlined. The detail provided is aligned with the aims and research questions /objectives.</p> <p>The research work-plan is thoroughly formulated, the applicant implicitly lists project activities that are linked to realistic and feasible timelines. The role of the candidate in the project is clearly defined and the infrastructure at the institution/ in the research group is adequate to ensure successful project completion.</p>	<p>The methodology provides the approach to be taken in resolving the research problem. Information on data collection/ measurement, analysis could be refined. The detail provided is aligned with the aims/ research questions /objectives. OR</p> <p>The research work-plan is reasonable. The applicant lists project activities with realistic and feasible timelines. But there are some minor issues to be considered for improvement. The role of the candidate in the project is clearly defined. The infrastructure at the institution/ in the research group is could be strengthened to ensure successful project completion, but the</p>	<p>The methodology provides the approach to be taken in resolving the research problem. Information on data collection/ measurement/ analysis could be refined. The detail provided is aligned with the aims/ research questions /objectives. AND</p> <p>The research work-plan can best be described as average; The applicant lists project activities but some of the project timelines are problematic and there are some minor issues to be considered for improvement. The role of the candidate in the project is defined. The infrastructure at the institution could be strengthened to ensure</p>	<p>The proposed methodology vaguely articulated and is thus questionable in terms of meeting the proposed research aims and objectives.</p> <p>The work-plan is poorly formulated. The applicant merely lists broad activities without specific / realistic timelines. Major revisions of the workplan are required. OR the missing timelines make it difficult to assess the feasibility of the project. The role of the candidate in the project is vaguely defined. The infrastructure to support the project is lacking but the proposal does not indicate how the gaps will be addressed. The</p>	<p>The proposed methodology is poorly stated, lacks detail on e.g., data collection, measurement and/or analysis. There is no alignment with aims and objectives.</p> <p>The work-plan, activities and timelines are not included, making it difficult to assess the feasibility of the project. The role of the candidate in the project is not defined. The reviewer may suggest revisions required.</p>

			proposal indicates how the gaps will be addressed. Reviewer to specify revisions required. NB Improvements required are either on approach OR on workplan.	successful project completion but the proposal does not indicate how the gaps will be addressed. The reviewer may suggest revisions required. <u>NB Improvements required are on both the approach AND on workplan.</u>	reviewer may suggest revisions required.	
6. Anticipated outputs 10%	Anticipated realistic outputs of the research such as publications, poster and/or oral conference presentation.	One research article/ booked chapter or any respective output for the specific discipline will be produced in a credible international peer reviewed journal. In case of an article publication, the anticipated title and targeted international journal are mentioned. For other outputs (e.g., art exhibitions), information dissemination / technology transfer are explicitly articulated. In addition, 1 conference to be attended has been identified and the work will be presented in a public forum/ workshop (as a poster/ oral presentation). The stated expected outputs are realistic and achievable.	One research article/ book chapter or any respective output for the specific discipline will be produced in a credible national peer reviewed journal. In case of an article publication, the anticipated title and target journal are mentioned. For other outputs, information dissemination/ technology transfer are mentioned with limited detail. OR, 1 national conference that will be attended, but has not been identified. The work will be presented in a public forum/ workshop (as a poster/ oral presentation). The stated expected outputs are realistic and achievable.	One research article/ book chapter or any respective output for the specific discipline will be produced. The anticipated titles and target journal are NOT mentioned. For other outputs, no detail on information dissemination /technology transfer is provided. Conference attendance or public presentation of work is not mentioned. The stated expected outputs are somewhat realistic.	Anticipated outputs are poorly presented and not realistic /or achievable	No information provided to make a fair assessment.
7. Potential impact 10%	Potential for socio-economic impact of the research in South Africa. In addition, applicants must	The project idea is novel and will contribute to the generation of both new methodologies and new knowledge in the field. The	The project idea will generate new knowledge with the application of existing knowledge and methodologies in the field. The candidate has	The study involves unique application of existing knowledge and methodologies in the field. The candidate has defined	The study will mainly utilise the application of existing knowledge and methodologies in the field. The candidate has vaguely	The candidate has not defined the significance and the merits of the research for

	demonstrate the novelty and scientific contribution to new knowledge. Where applicable multi-disciplinary aspect of the project must be described.	candidate has clearly defined how this research will have socio economic/ environmental impact AND how the project will contribute commercial application /societal benefits nationally and internationally. The stated impact is very high; feasible and relevant both in the national and international context.	clearly defined how this research will have socio economic/ environmental impact OR how the project will contribute to knowledge generation/ commercial application /societal benefits nationally. The stated impact is high; feasible and relevant only in the national context.	how this research will have socio economic/ environmental impact OR how the project will contribute to knowledge generation/ commercial application /societal benefits nationally. The stated impact is moderate; feasible and relevant only in the national context.	defined how this research will have socio economic/ environmental impact OR how the project will contribute to knowledge generation/ commercial application /societal benefits nationally. The stated impact is low based on the information provided.	reviewers to assess the potential impact of the research.
8. Alignment to National Research Strategies 10%	Alignment with one or more National Research Strategies.	<p>The candidate has clearly defined the significance and the merits of the research. The candidate has listed more than one national priorities and has explained how the proposed research fits AND contributes and is fully aligned to the stated strategy/s.</p> <p>The envisaged impact is feasible and relevant both in the national and international context. Therefore, the potential impact of the study is high based on the information provided.</p>	<p>The candidate has defined the significance and the merits of the research and has listed one national priority and explained how the proposed research either fits AND/OR contributes or is adequately aligned to the stated strategy/s</p> <p>The envisaged impact is feasible and relevant in the national context. Therefore, the potential impact of the study is high based on the information provided.</p>	<p>The candidate has defined the significance and the merits of the research. The candidate has listed one national priority that the proposed research fits BUT has not explained how the proposed research either fits OR contributes to the stated strategy/s</p> <p>The envisaged impact is feasible and relevant in the national context. However, the potential impact of the study is moderate based on the information provided.</p>	<p>The candidate has vaguely defined the significance and the merits of the research and; has vaguely mentioned how the proposed research is linked or aligned to national priorities</p>	<p>The candidate has not defined the significance and the merits of the research, OR No information is provided in the application to enable a fair assessment</p>