



Research Review Committee (RRC) Orientation Notes

WHAT IS A RESEARCH STUDY?

It is an investigative inquiry that seeks to answer a particular problem, address an issue, or explain a phenomenon. It must be systematic, evidence-based, data-driven and organized in such a way as to reach a credible conclusion.

Which research studies require URO support? For a research project to be funded by the university, it must meet these criteria:

1. It requires ample time apart from proponent's usual teaching or office hours,
2. It necessitates the usage of ADZU facilities, materials, resources and/or the services of mentors, coaches, statisticians, enumerators, data analysts, etc.
3. The outcome of the research project benefits the school, its students, the city, or country.

WHAT A RESEARCH STUDY IS NOT

It is not the same as a thesis or dissertation meant to earn a diploma or degree. Research proposals and papers are not obliged to have a hypothesis or a theoretical framework. For this reason, these papers need not be scored. Instead, the papers are either approved or asked to be revised by the RRC.

A research study need not be complex. Simple studies can be accepted as long as the information needed in the study are not readily available as such research is needed. A simple research is defined as

1. having one or two research questions
2. involving two or three variables, and/ or
3. A study that can be completed within 4 to 5 months or 1 sem.



INSIDE THIS ISSUE

Role of RRC.....	2
Composition.....	2
Responsibilities.....	2
Benefits	2
Criteria for Rating	
Proposals.....	3
Criteria for Rating Terminal	
Reports.....	4



ROLE OF THE RRC

The Research Review Committee reviews the technical merits of proposals and terminal reports of research studies applied to URO through the Research Chair Program.

What the RRC is NOT

It is not the co-author of the proponents. Its recommendations serve as suggestions to improve the research study.

The RRC is not merely to pin-point errors but to help the proponent/s succeed in completing a research study.

Benefits and Remuneration of RRC Members

1. Each RRC member shall receive Php 1,200 as honorarium for participating in the proposal evaluation.
2. Another Php 1,200 shall also be granted for attending the deliberation of the terminal report of an implemented study.
3. Members of the Research Review Committee shall also receive certificates of appreciation to be signed by the URO Director.

Composition of the RRC

1. It shall have 3 to 5 members. A Committee Chairperson will be elected from among the RRC members by themselves.
2. The Chairperson is responsible for facilitating the a) review discussion and b) communicating the deliberation results to the proponent/s.
3. Observers may be invited during RRC evaluations such as the URO Director, mentors, consultants and college/ unit/ office administrators.
4. The URO Director may determine if there is need a to invite members from outside of AdZU, such persons may be afforded the same responsibilities and benefits provided to their AdZU- affiliated counterparts

Responsibilities of the RRC members

1. Ensure the contents of the papers being reviewed meets the standards expected of a technically sound and properly written paper. It must observe proper acknowledgement of sources.
2. Assist proponents by providing constructive feedback and recommend appropriate actions to be taken.
3. Check whether the feedback and recommendations given to the proponent/s have been complied with.
4. Participate in the panel deliberations such as, but not limited to,
 - i. fair quantity of research loads (in units) that are to be awarded to proponents of proposals/protocols
 - ii. viability of the research project being proposed
 - iii. appropriateness of the budget, activities, work plan, and project duration being proposed. and whether a research proposal may be recommended for implementation and for the URPC's final approval.

The criteria for the RRC to consider in evaluating the technical merits of a research proposal are as follows.

Criteria for Proposal Evaluation	Response	Comments/ Recommendations
I. Viability of The Proposal 1) Is the study doable? Can it be completed on time?	◇ YES ◇ NO	
2) Are the research design (Qualitative/ Quantitative) and method (Data Gathering, Analysis, Sampling) appropriate?	◇ YES ◇ NO	
II. Relevance of The Proposal Should this study be done at this time? Is it needed at this time?	◇ YES ◇ NO	
III. Proponent's Capability Do they have the knowledge and skill (e.g., writing, analytical) to complete the study?	◇ YES ◇ NO	
Others, Specify:		
Verdict: Approved with Minor Revisions (One NO response in the above Criteria) Approved with Major Revisions (2 NO responses in the above Criteria) Rejected (3 or more NO responses)		Remarks
Name and Signature of Evaluator: _____ Date: _____		

Criteria for Final Paper Evaluation	Response	Comments/ Recommendations
I. Language and Organization Is the paper understandable? Does it make sense? Is the paper well-organized?	◇ YES ◇ NO ◇ YES ◇ NO	
II. Methodology Did the paper comply with the approved research design and methodology? Was the data gathering procedure properly followed?	◇ YES ◇ NO ◇ YES ◇ NO	
III. Data Presentation and Analysis Are the data presented easy to understand? Do these make sense? Are the data analyzed correctly?	◇ YES ◇ NO ◇ YES ◇ NO	
IV. Compliance on Content Did the paper meet your expectations of what the study should contain? Did the study contain the RRC's recommendations during the proposal presentation?	◇ YES ◇ NO ◇ YES ◇ NO	
V. Conclusions and Recommendations Did the study arrive at the right conclusion/s and gave appropriate recommendations?	◇ YES ◇ NO	
Other matters, please specify:		
Verdict: Approved w/ minor Revisions (1-2 NO responses) Approved w/ Major Revisions (3-4 NO responses) Rejected (5 or more NO responses)		Remarks
Name and Signature of Evaluator: _____ Date: _____		