

No.693 /OP/KITS/2019

Date: 18/11/2019

Faculty Research Support Scheme (FRSS)

FRSS - EVALUATION RUBRICS / GUIDELINES :

- Ref: 1. FRSS Guidelines issued vide circular No. 13/DeanR&D/2019/245, dated 1.2.2019
2. FRSS call for proposal submission vide circular No. 14/ DeanR&D / 2019/245, dated 1.2.2019
3. AAC meeting held on 21.11.2019 to finalize the evaluation rubrics for FRSS proposals

1. PI has any on-going funded projects : YES / NO
2. Proposed total budget of the project : Rs.
3. Proposed duration of the project :
4. Multidisciplinary project : YES / NO

1. Criteria and Weightage

S. No.	Criteria	Weightage (%)
A	Problem Identification	25
B	Scope and Objectives of Research	15
C	Research Methodology	20
D	Quality of Proposal	15
E	Budget & Justification	10
F	Credibility of PI	10
G	Presentation	05
Total		100

2. Rating Scale

2.1 For criteria 'A' to 'E'

Indicators	Score
Complete, accurate and exceeds minimum level of detail, clarity and logic. Demonstrates clarity, well organized, logical, sufficient details are provided to support statements	3
Complete, accurate and meets minimum acceptable level of detail, clarity and logic. Minor instances of lack of clarity, disorganized, insufficient details provided to support statements	2
Complete, but below minimal acceptable level of detail, clarity and logic. Major instances of lack of clarity, disorganized, inaccurate statements, insufficient details provided to support statements	1
Missing or incomplete information provided	0

2.2 For criterion 'F'

Indicators	Points
Highest Degree : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Post Doc • Ph.D. • M.Tech. • B.Tech. 	5 3 1 0 (max. 5 points)
Journal papers in SCI (previous 5 years) : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As First Author / Main Supervisor • Others • Paid journals not allowed 	5 2 (max. 15 points)
Journal papers in Scopus (previous 5 years) : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As First Author / Main Supervisor • Others • Paid journals not allowed 	2 1 (max. 15 points)
Sponsored Research projects completed (previous 5 years) : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principal Investigator • Others 	2 1 (max. 10 points)
Consultancy projects completed (previous 5 years) : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual project costing Rs. 5 lakh of consultancy 	2 (max. 10 points)
Patents: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Granted 	2 per patent (max. 10 points)
Ph.D. guided (including thesis submitted)	2 per student (max. 10 points)

2.3 For criterion 'G'

Indicators	Scores		
	3	2	1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contents of Presentation 	Appropriate and Well organized	Appropriate but Not well organized	Contents of presentation are not appropriate
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eye contact with audience, voice and spoken language 	Proper eye contact, clear voice with good spoken language	Eye contact is not proper, clear voice with good spoken language	Presentation not satisfactory Eye contact with few people and unclear voice

3. Rubric Based Evaluation:

S. No.	Criteria		Normalized Score (NS)				Weighted Score (WS)
A	PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION						Weightage 25% WS = NSx25 = x 25 =
	A1 (3.2)	State of the art literature survey presented	3	2	1	0	
	A2 (3.3)	Patents in the project area are presented	3	2	1	0	
	A3 (3.2 & 3.3)	References are complete and cited	3	2	1	0	
	A4 (3.4.1)	Gaps Identified	3	2	1	0	
	A5 (3.4.2)	The proposal clearly addresses the gaps	3	2	1	0	
	Scores :						
	Sum :						
Normalized Score (NS) : Sum / 15 = /15 =							
B	SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES OF RESEARCH						Weightage 15% WS = NSx15 = x 15 =
	B1 (3.5)	Stated objectives are sufficiently clear and very specific	3	2	1	0	
	B2 (3.5)	Objectives are realistic and feasible given proposed time frame and requested budget	3	2	1	0	
	Scores :						
	Sum :						
	Normalized Score (NS) : Sum / 6 = /6 =						
C	RESEARCH METHODOLOGY						Weightage 20% WS = NSx20 = x 20 =
	C1 (3.6)	Proposed research methodology is appropriate	3	2	1	0	
	C2 (3.6)	Sampling method is adequately described	3	2	1	0	
	C3 (3.6)	Design & experimentation is described	3	2	1	0	
	C4 (3.7)	Measurable & verifiable indicators are described	3	2	1	0	
	C5 (3.7)	Data analysis methods described	3	2	1	0	
	Scores :						
	Sum :						
Normalized Score (NS) : Sum / 15 = /15 =							
D	QUALITY OF PROPOSAL						Weightage 15% WS = NSx15 = x 15 =
	D1 (3.8)	Practical relevance / utility of project is stated	3	2	1	0	
	D2 (3.9)	Expected outcomes (deliverables) are described	3	2	1	0	
	D3 (3.10)	Agencies which utilize the results are justifiable (the project has industry-academia collaborative research)	3	2	1	0	
	D4 (3.11)	Proposal addresses protection of human / animal subjects and environmental concerns	3	2	1	0	
	D5 (3.11)	Societal Benefits (project outcome(s) have societal benefits / develop alternate solutions)	3	2	1	0	
	D6 (3.12)	Techno-commercial feasibility is discussed	3	2	1	0	
	D7 (3.3.1)	Potential of the proposal for IPR generation	3	2	1	0	
	D8	Proposal is well written, formatted, clear with logical flow	3	2	1	0	
	Scores :						
	Sum :						
Normalized Score (NS) : Sum / 24 = /24 =							

E	BUDGET & JUSTIFICATION						Weightage 10% WS = NSx10 = x 10 =
	E1 (4.2)	Budget estimates include all the details / cost	3	2	1	0	
	E2 (4.3)	Component wise justification is clear with sufficient details / specifications	3	2	1	0	
	E3 (4.4)	Budget requested for carrying out the project are clearly presented	3	2	1	0	
	Scores :						
	Sum :						
	Normalized Score (NS) : Sum / 9 = / 9 =						
F	CREDIBILITY OF PI						Weightage 10% WS = NSx10 = x 10 =
	F1	Highest Degree (max. 5 points)					
	F2	Journal papers in SCI (max. 15 points)					
	F3	Journal papers in Scopus (max. 15 points)					
	F4	Sponsored Research projects completed (max. 10 points)					
	F5	Consultancy projects completed(max. 10 points)					
	F6	Patents granted (max. 10 points)					
	F7	Ph.Ds guided (max. 15 points)					
	Scores :						
Sum =							
Normalized Score (NS) : Sum/ 80 = / 80 =							
G	PRESENTATION						Weightage 5% WS = NSx5 = x 5 =
	G1	Contents of presentation	3	2	1	0	
	G2	Eye contact with audience, voice and spoken language	3	2	1	0	
	Scores :						
	Sum :						
	Normalized Score (NS) : Sum / 6 = / 6 =						

4. Total Score:

S. No.	Item	Weighted Score	
		Max. Score	Evaluated score
A	Problem Identification	25	
B	Scope and Objectives of Research	15	
C	Research Methodology	20	
D	Quality of Proposal	15	
E	Budget & Justification	10	
F	Credibility of PI	10	
G	Presentation	05	
Total Score :		100	

Signatures of the Evaluators :

Date :

Guidelines for constitution of committee for evaluation of FRSS applications :

- | | | |
|---------------------------|-----|----------|
| 1. Principal | ... | Chairman |
| 2. Dean, R&D | ... | Convener |
| 3. Head of the Department | ... | Member |
| 4. External Expert | ... | Member |

(expert from NITs / IITs / research scientists of defense labs / industries having R&D labs)


PRINCIPAL

Copy to:

HoDs for circulation and department meeting to apprise the faculty on evaluation rubrics for FRSS proposals
