**Research Proposal Assessment Form**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Student number: |  |
| Title of Research Proposal: |  |
| Evaluator name: |  |
| Date: |  |

|  | **Very poor** | **Poor** | **Meet expectations** | **Exceed expectations** | **Mark** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1. Title** |  |  |  |  | 5/5 |
| **2. Problem Statement &**  **Purpose of the Study** |  |  |  |  | 15/15 |
| **3. Research Questions** |  |  |  |  | 15/15 |
| **4. Assumptions,**  **delineations & limitations** |  |  |  |  | 10/10 |
| **5. Preliminary Literature Review** |  |  |  |  | 15/15 |
| **6. Research Design & methodology** |  |  |  |  | 10/10 |
| **7. Structure and technical layout** |  |  |  |  | 10/10 |
| **8. Referencing style** |  |  |  |  | 10/10 |
| **9. English Composition** |  |  |  |  | 10/10 |

**Total mark awarded: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_%**

**Comments: \***

**Rubric Evaluation for Research Proposal**

|  | **Very poor** | **Poor** | **Meet expectations** | **Exceed expectations** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1.Title** | Title was omitted or inappropriate given the problem, purpose and research questions. | Title lacks relevance or fails to offer appropriate details about the educational issue, context, or contribution of the proposed study. | Title is relevant, offering details about the proposed research study. | Title is informative, succinct, and offer sufficiently specific details about the educational issue, context, and contribution of the study. |
| **2. Problem Statement &**  **Purpose of the Study** | Statement of the problem,  significance or purpose was omitted or inappropriate. | Although a research issue is identified, the statement is too broad or the description fails to  establish the importance of the problem area. Connections to the literature are unclear, debatable, or insignificant. | Identifies a relevant research issue. Connections established with the literature.  Suitable for an MSc/MTech study. | Articulates a specific, significant problem by connecting that problem to the literature. Statements of purpose flows logically from the introduction. The research problem and the statement of significance clearly establish relevance and suitability for an MSc/MTech study. |
| **3. Research Questions** | Research questions were omitted or inappropriate given the context, purpose, or methods of the study. | Research questions are poorly formed, ambiguous, or not logically connected to the description of the problem, purpose, or research methods. | Research questions are stated, connected to the research issue, and supported by the literature. | Articulates clear, reasonable, and succinct research questions and definitions given the purpose, design,  and methods of the proposed study. |
| **4. Assumptions, delineations & limitations** | Assumptions, delineations  and limitations were omitted  or inappropriate given the  context, purpose, or  methods of the study. | Assumptions, delineations  and limitations are poorly formed, ambiguous, or not logically connected to the description of the problem, purpose, or research methods. | Assumptions, delineations  and limitations are stated, connected to the research issue, and supported by the literature. | Articulates clear, reasonable, and succinct assumptions, delineations and limitations given the purpose, design,  and methods of the proposed study. |
| **5 Preliminary Literature Review** | The review of literature was  missing or consisted of non research based articles.  Propositions were  irrelevant, inaccurate, or  inappropriate. | Selected literature was from unreliable sources. Literary supports were vague or  ambiguous. | Key constructs were connected to relevant, reliable theoretical and research literature.  Narrative integrates critical and logical details from the peer-reviewed theoretical and research literature. | Reliable theoretical and research literature has been consulted. Attention is given to different perspectives, conditionalities, threats to validity, and opinion vs. evidence. |
| **6 Research Design & methodology** | The research design and methodology are  inappropriate or have not  been identified and or  described using standard  terminology. | The research design and methodology are confusing or incomplete given the research questions. | The research design and methodology have been identified and described in sufficiently detailed terms. | The research design and methodology are mutually supportive and coherent.  Attention has been given to eliminating alternative explanations. Sufficiently specific details about the design and methodology are offered. |
| **7. Structure and technical layout** | Structure not logical. Failure to consistently apply attention to correct headings, table of  contents, page numbers, and running headers. Figures unclear and untidy. | Weak structure. Many inconsistencies regarding headings, table of contents, page numbers, and running headers. Figures untidy. | Good structure. Consistency regarding correct headings, table of  contents, page numbers, and running headers. Figures clear and tidy. | Excellent structure and very neat figures. Extremely consistent regarding headings, table of  contents, page numbers, and running headers. |
| **8. Referencing style** | Failure to apply acceptable referencing style. Non-scientific references used. | Weak, incomplete, ambiguous, or inconsistent application of referencing style. Some non-scientific references used. | Conforms to acceptable reference style. References are scientific and appropriate to study. | Consistently applied referencing style. Good scientific sources have been used. |
| **9. English Composition** | Failure to apply standard  rules for English  composition.  Many language and grammar errors. | Weak, incomplete, ambiguous, or inconsistent application of rules of English composition. | Delivery was good.  Manuscript conformed to most standards of English. Few language and grammar errors. | Delivery was excellent. Consistently applied English composition. Almost no language and grammar errors. |