



KRISHNA UNIVERSITY
CENTRE FOR RESEARCH STUDIES (CRS)
MACHILIPATNAM, ANDHRA PRADESH-521001
crskru@gmail.com, Ph: 08672-225962

ANNUAL RESEARCH REVIEW MEETING (ARRM) – Feb 08, 2015

RESEARCH SCHOLAR'S PROGRESS/PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT FORM

Introduction: The purpose of this review is to provide an opportunity for Ph.D. /M. Phil. scholars to reflect on, discuss and document the work that has been undertaken in the period under review and to set objectives for the next period. The three main aims of the progress review are: a) to monitor progress, identify problems and set goals for research, and highlight achievements, b) to encourage discussion between the scholar, and his/her supervisor(s) and Departmental Research Committee Members, and c) to enable the timely completion of thesis/dissertation.

Section 1: Scholar's Details

- a) Name:
- b) Regd. No.:
- c) Degree Regd.: Ph.D./M. Phil. Full Time / Part Time
(Please tick mark one)
- d) Date of Enrolment:
- e) Field of Research:
- f) Thesis Title:
- g) Faculty/Dept.:
- h) Name of the Supervisor:
- i) Name of the Co-Supervisor (if any):
- j) Is there any CHANGE OF TITLE YES /NO
 Or CHANGE OF TOPIC YES /NO
 Or CHANGE OF SUPERVISOR (s)? YES /NO
- k) Has the scholar passed Pre-Ph D/M.Phil. Examination YES /NO

Section 2: Assessing Progress

2.1 Please list key issues arising out of the scholar's presentation and/or written report and summarise outcome of discussion at the meeting. Responses may include advice on aspects that the scholar could improve, or highlight areas where the scholar has performed well.

Sl. No.	Issue (s)	Departmental Research Committee (DRC) Response
1	The topic of study is researchable one	
2	Understanding of topic and of discipline areas required to do research	

3	Research aim is well defined and achievable	
4	Research questions/objectives appropriate to Ph. D and understanding of what is required in Ph. D thesis.	
5	Scholar is familiar with relevant literature (Quality of literature review and/or appropriate use of relevant sources)	
6	Understanding of appropriate research methods to be used and/or conceptual framework or will they need to be developed (further)?	
7	Applied intellectual rigor and critical analysis of data	
8	Implications/suggestions based on findings of the study	
9	Presentation skills	
10	Collaborations (if relevant)	
11	Conference/Seminar presentations/Publication of research	
12.	Any other issue related to progress of research (e.g., ethical, environmental, and intellectual property or commercial in confidence issues)	

Section 3: Assessing Performance

3.1 Has the scholar (please circle)	Strongly Disagree			Strongly Agree	
a). met the agreed research objectives set at the commencement of his/her research ?	1	2	3	4	5
b). diligently and effectively applied himself/herself to research?	1	2	3	4	5
c). shown initiative and intellectual engagement consistent with the requirements of the research programme and level of study?	1	2	3	4	5
d). conducted his/her research responsibly and ethically?	1	2	3	4	5
e). complied with all policies on the conduct of research?	1	2	3	4	5

3.2 Does the subject of the research appeal to the interests of the society and/or industry? Yes No

3.3 Does the research compare and weigh the material against the work of others? Yes No

3.4 Does the research bridge the gap between theory and practice? Yes No

3.5 Does the research present credible and accurate information? Yes No

3.6. Does the research use sound and appropriate method(s)? Yes No

3.7 Does the research add new findings, insights, or knowledge to the body of literature? Yes No

3.8 Are the managerial relevance and implications of the decision problem demonstrated? Yes No

3.9 Is the timeline for completion provided by the scholar in his written report reasonable? Yes No

3.10 If no to any of the above, or if a rating of between 1 and 3 has been circled for any of the items at 3.1, please indicate further steps to be taken. (Please attach a separate page if more space required.)

Section 4: Departmental Research Committee Recommendation

Please indicate the Committee's recommendation:

1. **Scholar is making satisfactory progress**

OR

2. **Progress is not complexly satisfactory and another formal review is required**

Revised formal review due date: -----

Please note: *The maximum extension that may be requested is one month only.*

OR

3. **Progress is completely unsatisfactory**

(This option should be chosen if the outcome of the formal review meeting is to recommend termination of candidature)

Please provide reasons for recommending the termination of the candidature:

Departmental Research Committee Members to sign:

DESIGNATION	NAME OF THE MEMEBER	SIGN & DATE
Chair person, DRC		
HoD, Member		
Internal Senior Research Faculty Member		
External Senior Research Faculty Member		
Supervisor/Co-supervisor of research scholar concerned Member		