MA & PhD Research Proposal Evaluation Form

***INSTRUCTIONS TO THE READER:***

***Rate the proposal on each criterion as indicated below***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **For the requirement, the proposal has:** | **Conditions for rating** |
| Severe problem/s(S P) | Does not meet minimum standards of the particular requirement OR the proposal omits addressing this requirement. To adequately satisfy this criterion *complete revision* is required. Poor quality overall on this requirement. |
| Major problem/s(Ma P) | Criterion is substantially compromised. *Comprehensive revisions* are required to address the criterion. Proposal does not reveal understanding or application of this requirement.  |
| Minor problem/s(Mi P) | Meets requirements that will enable implementation of the proposed research. Could benefit from *minor improvements* but these are not necessary for implementation of the study. Improvements may enhance the proposal and the research.  |
| No problem/s(No P) | Impressive. Exceeds standards on the particular requirement. Outstanding grasp and execution of relevant requirement. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of student: |  |
| Name of supervisor: |  |
| Name of reader: |  |
| Date of assessment: |  |
| Proposed title: |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SECTION IN PROPOSAL** | **CRITERION** | **S****P** | **Ma****P** | **Mi****P** | **No****P** |
| *TITLE*  | 1.The title is a concise statement of the main topic  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2. The title identifies the variables or theoretical issues under investigation and the relationship between them.  |  |  |  |  |
| Comments (including clear directives for revisions): |
| Student Corrections: |
| Reader responses to student corrections: |
| *INTRODUCTION* | 1.The study problem is brief and clear |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2. The rationale includes clear statements of the questions that the study aims to answer. |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3. The value of the research is presented and argued.  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 4. The contexts that contribute to the conceptualization of the research problem are clearly identified and coherently addressed. |  |  |  |  |
|  | 5. The boundaries of the study have been clearly demarcated. |  |  |  |  |
| Reader Comments (including clear directives for revisions): |
| Student Corrections: |
| Reader responses to student corrections: |
| *LITERATURE REVIEW* |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1. Sources have been selected on their relevance to the research problem and research aims, that is, the material reviewed helps argue how the research will either build on previous ideas, findings, and explanations, or help generate and construct new concepts and descriptions. |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2. The discussion of relevant literature demonstrates an awareness of key texts and central concepts for the proposed study. |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3. The literature survey substantiates the research question. |  |  |  |  |
| Reader Comments (including clear directives for revisions): |
| Student Corrections: |
| Reader responses to student corrections: |
| *METHOD* | 1.The research is feasible, focused, and manageable with academic value to a subdiscipline in the psychological sciences. |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2. A specific research design and/or approach is identified and/or described.  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3. Details of recruitment or sampling procedures are unambiguous and clear. |  |  |  |  |
|  | 4. The data collection procedures are a suitable fit for addressing the research problem. |  |  |  |  |
|  | 5. Materials, apparatus, and/or data gathering receive attention. |  |  |  |  |
|  | 6. The data analysis procedures are a suitable fit for addressing the research problem. |  |  |  |  |
|  | 7. The method of data analysis is appropriate for the type of data. |  |  |  |  |
|  | 8. Ethical considerations get the required and appropriate attention.  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 9. Appropriate statistical, analytic, or interpretive procedures are clearly identified and explained.  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 10. Alignment: Is there an alignment between the title, research methods and research questions? |  |  |  |  |
| Reader Comments (including clear directives for revisions): |
| Student Corrections: |
| Reader responses to student corrections: |
| *STYLE* | 1.Ways of ensuring validity, reliability, and/or quality are addressed.  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2. For PhD: A rigorous motivation has been given regarding how this study will make an *original contribution* to the knowledge base of the discipline/topic.  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3. Arguments are convincing and make academic or scholarly sense. The proposal shows adequate integration, coherence, and reasoning.  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 4. Grammar, spelling, and punctuation are correct. |  |  |  |  |
|  | 5. A suitable and paradigmatically-consistent academic writing style is maintained throughout the proposal. |  |  |  |  |
|  | 6. In-text citations are adequate and follow all rules in a consistent manner.  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 7. The reference list adheres to conventions of the most recent APA publishing manual. |  |  |  |  |
|  | 8. The student has used bias-free and non-discriminatory language. |  |  |  |  |
|  | 9. Is the proposal in line with the required style of presentation such as font, font size, length (10 pages), headings, spacing ? |  |  |  |  |
| Reviewer Comments (including clear directives for revisions): |
| Student Comments: |
| Reader responses to student corrections: |

***FIRST ROUND OVERALL EVALUATION***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Unconditional Acceptance*** | ***Accepted with Minor Revisions*** | ***Referred back for Major Revisions*** | ***Not accepted*** |
|  |  |  |  |

***FINAL ROUND OVERALL EVALUATION***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Unconditional Acceptance*** | ***Accepted with Minor Revisions*** | ***Referred back for Major Revisions*** | ***Not accepted*** |
|  |  |  |  |