

Student Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Supervisor: \_\_\_\_\_

Criterion	Unacceptable	Standard	First Class
Background / Research Question:	<input type="checkbox"/> Fails to provide sufficient context to allow understanding of proposal content <input type="checkbox"/> Does not establish a clear research question, or gap; fails to identify a need for work in the area <input type="checkbox"/> Does not identify the potential significance of the work, either for specific field or society in general	<input type="checkbox"/> Establishes sufficient context to facilitate understanding of proposal content <input type="checkbox"/> Establishes a clear research gap and demonstrates that it needs to be addressed <input type="checkbox"/> Clearly establishes significance of the proposed research for specific field, or society in general	Standard, plus: <input type="checkbox"/> Enables a thorough understanding of proposal content in a concise manner <input type="checkbox"/> Defines research question precisely, via reference to current research in the field <input type="checkbox"/> Makes a convincing case for the potential significance of the proposed research work
Goals / Objectives:	<input type="checkbox"/> Incomplete or poorly thought out goals, either too ambitious or too limited in scope <input type="checkbox"/> Goals fail to address research question adequately	<input type="checkbox"/> Goals are clearly defined, appropriate for thesis scope, and achievable within the course constraints <input type="checkbox"/> Goals clearly address the research gap described above	Standard, plus: <input type="checkbox"/> Precise goals broken down into clear sub-objectives that demonstrate thorough understanding of the project
Approach and Methods	<input type="checkbox"/> Only vague references to experimental or theoretical approaches provided <input type="checkbox"/> Approach or methods incompatible with stated goals, demonstrate a lack of understanding of problem	<input type="checkbox"/> Clearly establishes experimental or theoretical approach, or possible approaches <input type="checkbox"/> Approach(es) identified compatible with goals <input type="checkbox"/> Specific method(s) identified, where possible	Standard, plus: <input type="checkbox"/> Clearly identifies how approach / methods address goals <input type="checkbox"/> Provides compelling rationale for choosing approach / methods
Overall Document Design:	<input type="checkbox"/> Does not adhere to document requirements <input type="checkbox"/> Poorly organized, with redundancies or inappropriately positioned information throughout, lacks clear structure <input type="checkbox"/> Grammatical problems and syntax create problems for understanding <input type="checkbox"/> Inconsistent attribution of ideas and poor / no documentation / references provided <input type="checkbox"/> Aimed at too high or too low of an audience	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets document requirements for length, format, etc. <input type="checkbox"/> Organized well, with content in discrete and appropriate positions in paper, structure clearly laid out <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates coherent prose with clear attempts at transitions between sections and paragraphs <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates grammatical correctness and clarity in sentence design <input type="checkbox"/> Clear attribution of ideas and referencing <input type="checkbox"/> Meets stated audience needs for background / depth	Standard, plus: <input type="checkbox"/> Evidence of thoughtful consideration of purpose, content, & the context in organization, writing & design of document <input type="checkbox"/> Transitions, paragraph design, etc. strengthen logical relationships between ideas, contributes to document flow <input type="checkbox"/> Easy to read prose that concisely and clearly communicates complex scientific concepts <input type="checkbox"/> Uses references effectively to frame problem or justify approach

Comments:

Grade: **/ 15.0**