

Scorecard for the selection of Masters Candidates for 2018 Funding

Five Point Rating Scale, Weight and Descriptor

Review Criteria/ Weight	Description	5 = Excellent	4 = Very good	3= Good	2 = Fair	1 = Poor
1. Academic merit (15%)	Ave. % from previous degree	80 % and above	70-79%	60-69% / Pass	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 Review (25%)	Description of research rationale (i.e., motivation for the research) including a literature review with in text references	The research rationale 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. The Literature is 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.	The research rationale provides fair arguments on the importance of the research AND fairly outlines how the research will close the gap identified in the problem statement. The literature review is relevant and is adequately aligned with the problem statement and supports the proposed research. In text citations are in place	The research rationale 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. The literature review is partly aligned with the problem statement but has minor gaps that could be refined. The literature supports the proposed research. In text citations are in place.	The research rationale vaguely describes the importance of the research OR fails to outline how the research will close the gap identified in the problem statement. The literature review is included but is not aligned with the problem statement and thus does not support the proposed research. Citations are missing, thus making the research rationale questionable.	The research rationale does not describe the importance of the research and there is inadequate information to make a fair assessment. The literature review is scant/ almost non-existent; not aligned with the problem statement; does not support the proposed research.

Scorecard for the selection of Masters Candidates for 2018 Funding

Five Point Rating Scale, Weight and Descriptor

Review Criteria/ Weight	Description	5 = Excellent	4 = Very good	3= Good	2 = Fair	1 = Poor
4. Aims and Objectives (5%)	Description of the aims and objectives of the study.	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.	The research aims and objectives are sound but have inconsistencies that can be refined to appropriately aligned with the problem statement	The research aims and objectives are appropriate but only partly align with the problem statement	The research aims OR the objectives are not aligned with the problem statement	The research aims AND the objectives are not aligned with the problem statement
5. Methodology and Proposed Research Plan (25%)	Research methodology, work plan and project organization (activities and timelines).	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. The research work-plan implicitly lists project activities that are linked to realistic and feasible timelines.	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 The research work-plan lists project activities with realistic and feasible timelines. But there are some minor issues to be considered for improvement.	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 The research work-plan lists project activities with realistic and feasible timelines. But there are some minor issues to be considered for improvement. The	The proposed methodology vaguely articulated and is thus questionable in terms of meeting the proposed research aims and objectives. The work-plan merely lists broad activities without timelines, or with unrealistic timelines that require major revision. OR the missing timelines makes it difficult to assess the feasibility of the project. The reviewer may suggest revisions required.	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. The work-plan, activities and timelines are not included, making it difficult to assess the feasibility of the project. The reviewer may suggest revisions required.

Scorecard for the selection of Masters Candidates for 2018 Funding

Five Point Rating Scale, Weight and Descriptor

Review Criteria/ Weight	Description	5 = Excellent	4 = Very good	3= Good	2 = Fair	1 = Poor
			Reviewer to specify revisions required. NB Improvements required are either on approach OR on workplan.	reviewer may suggest revisions required. <u>NB Improvements required are on both the approach AND on workplan.</u>		
6. Anticipated Outputs (10%)	Anticipated realistic outputs of the research such as publications, poster and/or oral conference presentation	One research article/ book chapter or any respective output for the specific discipline will be produced. In case of an article publication, the anticipated title and target journal are mentioned. For other outputs, information dissemination/ technology transfer are explicitly articulated. <u>In addition,</u> 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 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. <u>OR,</u> 1 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	One research article/ book chapter or any respective output for the specific discipline will be produced. The anticipated titles and target journal are <u>NOT</u> 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 and/or achievable	No information is provided in the proposal for the reviewers to assess.

Scorecard for the selection of Masters Candidates for 2018 Funding

Five Point Rating Scale, Weight and Descriptor

Review Criteria/ Weight	Description	5 = Excellent	4 = Very good	3= Good	2 = Fair	1 = Poor
			outputs are realistic and achievable.			
7. Potential Impact (5%)	Potential for socio-economic impact of the research in South Africa	The candidate has clearly defined how this research will have socio economic/ environmental impact AND how the project will contribute to knowledge generation/ commercial application /societal benefits nationally and internationally . The stated impact is very high ; feasible and relevant both in the national and international context.	The candidate has 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 .	The candidate has 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 moderate ; feasible and relevant only in the national context .	The candidate has vaguely 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 .	The candidate has not defined the significance and the merits of the research for reviewers to assess the potential impact of the research.
8. Alignment with National Research Strategies (10%)	Alignment with one or more National Research Strategies	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	The candidate has listed one national priority and has explained how the proposed research either fits AND/OR contributes or is adequately aligned to the stated strategy/s	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	The candidate has vaguely mentioned how the proposed research is linked or aligned to national priorities	No information is provided in the application to enable a fair assessment