|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Eastern Mediterranean University** **Type C (BAP-C) Scientific Research Project PEG Evaluation Form**  |
| 1. This form has been prepared for the purpose of providing support for the objective evaluation of the originality value, method, feasibility and impact value of project proposals. At the end of the form, informative/explanatory questions assisting the evaluation have been provided.
2. In line with the said criteria, the proposal is expected to be evaluated though the assignment of a score between “0” and “10” and relevant justification has to be provided in detail. While “0” indicates that the project has no special qualities or significance, “10” is assigned to projects having the said quality in full. If the space provided for explanation/justification is not enough, it may be further extended as needed.
3. Confidentiality is a fundamental issue in the evaluation process of the project; protection of documents relevant to the project is essential.
 |

|  |
| --- |
| **0. INFORMATION ON THE PROJECT**  |
| **Faculty/School** |  |
| **Project Registration No.** |  |
| **Project Title** |  |
| **Project Manager**  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1. ORIGINALITY VALUE**  | **Score:** |  | **(Out of 10)** |
| **Justification / Explanation** |
|  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2. METHOD** | **Score:** |  | **(Out of 10)** |
| **Justification / Explanation** |
|  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **3. FEASIBILITY** | **Score:** |  | **(Out of 10)** |
| **Justification / Explanation** |
|  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4. IMPACT** | **Score:** |  | **(Out of 10)** |
| **Justification / Explanation** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **5. OTHER FACTORS** |
| **Views and recommendations on the appropriateness of the project duration.** |
|  |
| **Views and recommendations on the appropriateness of the project budget and justification**  |
|  |
| **Other views and recommendations on the project proposal**  |
|  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **6. PROJECT PROPOSAL AVERAGE SCORE**  | **Score:** |  | **(Out of 10)** |

|  |
| --- |
| **7. OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT**  |
| **[ ]  Not appropriate (0.0-1.9)** | **[ ]  Weak (2.0-3.9)** | **[ ]  Average (4.0-5.9)** | **[ ]  Good (6.0-7.9)** | **[ ]  Very good (8.0-10)** |

|  |
| --- |
| **8. APPROVAL OF THE PROJECT EVALUATION GROUP (PEG)**  |
| **Names-Surnames of the PEG Members** | **Signature** | **Date** |
| **1.** |  |  |  |
| **2.** |  |  |  |
| **3.** |  |  |  |
| **4.** |  |  |  |
| **5.** |  |  |  |
| **6.** |  |  |  |
| **7.** |  |  |  |
| **8.** |  |  |  |
| **9.** |  |  |  |
| **10.** |  |  |  |

**INFORMATION ON THE EVALUATION CRITERIA**

The following table provides definitions on the degrees of fulfilling the criteria requirements.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Level** | **Point Value**  | **Description**  |
| Very Good  | 8.0-10 | The project proposal meets the relevant criteria in all aspects. There are hardly any deficiencies. The project may, however, contain a few flaws at an acceptable level.  |
| Good | 6.0-7.9 | The project proposal meets the relevant criteria at a good level. Along with this, there are some points in the proposal that have a room for improvement. |
| Average | 4.0-5.9 | The project proposal meets the relevant criteria at an average level. The proposal needs improvements.  |
| Poor | 2.0-3.9 | The project proposal does not sufficiently meet the relevant criteria. The proposal has missing points which may be completed.  |
| Not Suitable | 0.0-1.9 | The project proposal does not meet the relevant criteria. The project proposal contains serious missing points/weaknesses.  |

Below are some informative scripts providing assistance on each criteria item to be used during the evaluation.

**1. ORIGINALITY VALUE**

To what extent does the project proposal address the existing problems and/or deficiencies in science/technology; present original and creative/innovative recommendations towards overcoming the deficiencies or the solution of problems; and/or provide original methodological/conceptual/theoretical support and contributions in the relevant field/s of science/technology?

Does the project provide a scientific solution for a national or international problem?

Does it put forward any scientific or technological novelty in terms of method, theory or information outcome?

Does the project address a scientific complementary question presenting a new/different view?

**2. METHOD**

To what extent have the method/s and research techniques to be employed in the project been specificly and accurately explained with attributions to the relevant literature? What is their level of suitability in reaching the envisaged aims and targets?

In the event of not achieving any progress in the project through the proposed methods, to what extent do the alternative methods (Plan B) correspond with the envisaged project aims and targets?

Are the methods of data collection, tools (if any, their process of development) and data analysis techniques suitable for reaching the targets?

**3. FEASIBILITY**

Does the project team have project experience?

Does the project team have publications relevant to the topic of the project?

To what extent can the envisaged work-time planning, work packages, the importance level and success criteria of each work package be applied, measured and monitored?

How realistic and feasible have the project team’s (teams, in projects which contain more than one discipline) cooperation and coordination been planned taking into consideration work packages?

How realistic and feasible are the envisaged measures (Plan B) regarding the risks that may negatively affect the success of the project?

Considering the activities taking place within the framework of the project as well as the disciplines included, how suitable or sufficient is the project team in terms of qualifications as well as the number of members? How accurately have the job and duty distribution been planned considering the persons’ qualities and work packages?

Is the necessary infrastructure and equipment (laboratory, tools, machinery-equipment) available for the running of the project?

**4. IMPACT VALUE**

If the project has been carried out successfully, what is the potential of achieving outcomes or results such as bringing up individuals carrying out research on science/academics/economics/trade/social issues or forming new projects?

What is the potential of the envisaged outcomes and results of the project in terms of providing solutions to communal problems, being commercialised, and reducing the country’s dependency or increasing its level of competence at the international level?

To what extent are the envisaged activities appropriate and sufficient in the conveyance and dissemination of project outcomes and results to relevant stakeholders?