

**GGM Research methods**  
**Evaluation: Research proposal**

Student name and number

turnitin similarity percentage:

	Hons Ethical form included	Y/N			Total Mark (%)	

Item (Weight)	Unsatisfactory (0-49)	Satisfactory (50-64)	Good (65-74)	Very good (75-84)	Excellent (85-100)	Mark
<b>Title (8%)</b> Provide a mark out of 8	The title is absent or not appropriate. The title does not include important variables/topics.	The title reflects the contents of the proposal. The title includes most of the important variables/topics.		The title clearly reflects the topic, style, and thrust of the research. The title includes all the important variables/topics.		
	<i>Comment:</i>					
<b>Introduction (8%)</b> Provide a mark out of total 8	The context for the problem to be addressed by the project is unclear. Poor justification for the topic with little or no reference to related work, a specific research gap and the importance of addressing this gap.	The context for the problem to be addressed by the project is mostly clear. Some justification is provided for the chosen topic, which may be based on related work, a specific research gap and the importance of addressing this gap.	Justification for the topic, based on related work, a specific research gap and the importance of addressing this gap, is presented but not completely convincing.	The context for the problem to be addressed by the project is very clear. There is a convincing justification for the chosen topic, based on related work, a specific research gap and the importance of addressing this gap.	There is very clear and convincing justification for the chosen topic, based on related work, a specific research gap and the importance of addressing this gap.	
	<i>Comment:</i>					
<b>Problem statement, research aim and objectives (15%)</b> Provide a mark out of 15	The problem statement is unclear; concepts relevant to the topic and field of study are lacking. The problem lacks scientific, theoretical and/or practical significance. The problem statement is inconsistent with the title. The research aim and objectives do not match the problem statement. Achieving the objectives will not achieve the research aim at all.	The problem statement is formulated clearly and understandably in terms of concepts relevant to the topic and field of study. The problem is of scientific, theoretical and/or practical significance, appropriate for an Honours project. The problem statement is mostly congruent with the title. The research aim and objectives mostly match the problem statement. Achieving the objectives will partially achieve the research aim.		The problem statement is succinct, formulated clearly and understandably in terms of concepts relevant to the topic and field of study. The problem is of scientific, theoretical and/or practical significance, above the normal expectations for an Honours project. The problem statement is congruent with the title. The research aim and objectives match the problem statement. Achieving the objectives will achieve the research aim.		
	<i>Comment:</i>					
<b>Literature review (20%)</b> Provide a mark out of 20	Some relevant topics are missing. Related work is insufficiently covered. There is little evidence of relevant and current literature. The review of the literature is fragmented and incoherent.	The review covers most relevant topics. Some related work is covered. There is evidence of literature having been reviewed, but it is limited or there is over reliance on secondary sources.	The review covers all relevant topics. Related work is adequately covered. There is good evidence of literature having been reviewed, but there is some over reliance on standard journals / sources.	The review comprehensively covers all relevant topics. Related work is covered comprehensively. The review of the literature is very good and is from a range of sources and journals.	There is an excellent coverage of relevant literature from a wide range of sources and journals.	
	<i>Comment:</i>					

**GGM Research methods**  
**Evaluation: Research proposal**

Item (Weight)	Unsatisfactory (0-49)	Satisfactory (50-64)	Good (65-74)	Very good (75-84)	Excellent (85-100)	Mark
	<p>The review does not refer to a research gap that is important to address.</p> <p>There is little or no critical appraisal of the literature.</p>	<p>The review provides superficial evidence of a research gap and may justify why it is important to address this gap.</p> <p>Critique of existing literature is superficial and not sufficiently related to the chosen topic.</p>	<p>The review confirms that there is a research gap that is important to address.</p> <p>There is a good attempt to critique existing literature, but the link to this project could be stronger.</p>	<p>The review provides very clear evidence of a research gap that is important to address.</p> <p>There is a developed critique of existing literature and it is clearly linked back to the relevance of the chosen topic.</p>	<p>There is a highly developed critique of existing literature and it is clearly linked back to the relevance of the chosen topic.</p>	
<i>Comment:</i>						
<i>Assess * and the points relevant to the student's field of study</i>						
<p><b>Research design (approach / method) and data (20%)</b> Provide a mark out of 20</p>	<p>* Choice of research type and method are unclear and/or not justified.</p> <p>* The analysis methods and/or tools are not described and there is no justification for selecting them.</p> <p>* Limitations of the research are not discussed or are incorrectly outlined.</p> <p>* Ethical considerations of the research are not discussed or are incorrectly outlined.</p>	<p>* Some justification for choice of research type and method exists but aspects of this may be questioned.</p> <p>* The description of the analysis methods and/or tools may be superficial and/or unclear, and/or justification for selecting them is not convincing.</p> <p>* Limitations of the research design are addressed but are superficial.</p> <p>* Ethical considerations of the study are addressed but are superficial.</p>	<p>* Research type and method are appropriate, with good justification provided for it.</p> <p>* Key aspects of the analysis methods and/or tools are described with good justification for selecting them, but with some minor omissions or lack of detail.</p> <p>* Limitations of the research design are addressed appropriately.</p> <p>* Ethical considerations of the study are addressed appropriately.</p>	<p>* Research type and method are appropriate, with very clear justification provided.</p> <p>* All aspects of the analysis methods and/or tools are described in detail with very clear justification for selecting them.</p> <p>* Limitations of the research design are addressed appropriately and in detail.</p> <p>* Ethical considerations of the study are addressed appropriately and in detail.</p>	<p>* Research type and method are appropriate, with excellent justification provided.</p> <p>* All aspects of the analysis methods and/or tools are described in detail with very clear justification for selecting them.</p> <p>* Limitations of the research design are addressed appropriately and in detail.</p> <p>* Ethical considerations of the study are addressed appropriately and in detail.</p>	
	<p>Flowchart and description of the research plan are unclear and inadequate.</p> <p>The study area is not described and/or no justification for the study area is provided.</p> <p>The data is not described and no justification of the use of data is provided</p> <p>Data permissions are not identified, their terms and conditions not specified, and adherence to them is not explained.</p>	<p>Key aspects of the research plan are included in the flowchart and described, but description may be superficial and/or unclear, or have omissions.</p> <p>The study area is described but justification for choosing the study area is not convincing.</p> <p>The data is described but justification for the use of data is not provided</p> <p>For some datasets, data permissions are identified, their terms and conditions specified, and adherence to them explained. Some of the information is superficial.</p>	<p>Key aspects of the research plan are included in the flowchart and described but with some minor omissions or lack of detail.</p> <p>The study area is described with good justification for choosing it.</p> <p>The data is described with good justification for choosing it.</p> <p>Relevant data permissions are identified, their terms and conditions specified, and adherence to them explained, but with some minor omissions or lack of detail.</p>	<p>All aspects of the research plan are included in the flowchart and described well with no obvious omissions.</p> <p>The study area is described in detail with very clear justification for choosing it.</p> <p>The data is described in detail with very clear justification for choosing it.</p> <p>Relevant data permissions are identified, their terms and conditions specified, and adherence to them explained in detail.</p>	<p>All aspects of the research plan are included in the flowchart and described in excellent detail, including internal and external validity threats.</p>	
<i>Comment:</i>						

**GGM Research methods**  
**Evaluation: Research proposal**

Item (Weight)	Unsatisfactory (0-49)	Satisfactory (50-64)	Good (65-74)	Very good (75-84)	Excellent (85-100)	Mark
<b>Overall organization and unity (8%)</b> Provide a mark out of 8	The proposal significantly lacks coherence and development. There is no clear flow of information and ideas from introduction to research design.	The proposal lacks elements of coherence and development. There is a poor linking of ideas throughout the proposal.	The proposal is a fairly cohesive piece of writing but with some lack of flow and linking of ideas.	The proposal is a very good piece of writing with a very high level of coherence and internal consistency.	The proposal is an exceptional piece of writing that has coherence, originality, and creativity.	
<i>Comment:</i>						
<b>Presentation and referencing (8%)</b> Provide a mark out of 8	Formatting is frequently erroneous or inconsistent.  Word count is significantly inappropriate (either too long or too short).  A non-standard or non-approved referencing system was used and/or there are major errors in referencing both in the text and within the reference list.	There are some errors and inconsistencies in formatting.  Word count is slightly outside of the approved range (5,000 – 7,500).  A recommended referencing system is used but with a number of errors either in the text or in the reference list.	Formatting is consistent, error free, and impressive.  Word count is within the approved range (5,000 – 7,500).  A recommended referencing system is used correctly and consistently throughout the proposal. All references cited in the text are included in the reference list.			
<i>Comment:</i>						
<b>Language (8%)</b> Provide a mark out of 8	There are frequent and major errors regarding language, grammar, and spelling.	There are some errors regarding language, grammar, and spelling.	Language, grammar, and spelling are correct and appropriate throughout the proposal.			
<i>Comment:</i>						
<b>Impression (5%)</b> A mark out of 5	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Good	Very good	Excellent	
<i>Comment:</i>						

**Acknowledgements**

This rubric is based on an evaluation scheme in Welman et al. (2005) and a marking schedule used in the School of Community Health at the Charles Stuart University.