 *Full Research Evaluation Proposal*

 **Comments**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  **Commendations**  |  **Affirmations**  |  **Does Not Meet Requirements**  |
| **Writing**  | 1. Writing style and overall presentation of review is clear, convincing and concise. 2. Contains no or very few grammatical, punctuation or spelling errors. 3. Writing is well structured with good organization of information.  | 1. Standard of writing and overall presentation of review is adequate, but could be improved in terms of clarity and precision. 2. Attention to detail is lacking (i.e. some grammatical, punctuation or spelling mistakes detected). 3. The structure and organization could be improved.  | 1. There are serious deficiencies in the standard of writing that detract from the overall presentation of the review. 2. Frequent grammatical, punctuation or spelling mistakes. 3. Poor structure and organization of information.  |
| **Review of Literature**  | 1. Appropriate and relevant literature is cited in the review. 2. Review reflects a very good understanding of the literature on the selected research area. 3. Review reflects a very good understanding of the available literature on the selected intervention. 4. The literature presented is analysed critically.  | 1. The appropriateness and relevance of literature included could be improved. 2. The review reflects a fair understanding of the literature on the selected research area. 3. The review reflects a fair understanding of the available literature on the selected intervention. 4. The critical analysis of the literature presented could be improved.  | 1. Inappropriate use of irrelevant literature. 2. The review reflects a poor understanding of the literature on the selected research area. 3. The review reflects a poor understanding of the available literature on the selected intervention. 4. The literature is not critically analysed.  |
| **Research Question**  | . 1. Importance and relevance of research question(s) has been well justified. 2. Research question(s) is well defined and narrowly focused. 3. The research question(s) presented are comprehensive and researchable.  | 1. Justification of the importance and relevance of the research question could be improved. 2. The research question could be more focused. 3. The research question could be better articulated and more appropriately defined for research purposes.  | 1. Inadequate justification of the importance and relevance of the research question. 2. The research question lacks any clear focus. 3. The research question is not researchable and is incomprehensive.  |
| **Evaluation Design & Sample**  | 1. Appropriate and relevant design chosen to address the research question/ intervention. 2. Selected design is comprehensively explained. 3. Selected design is well justified in terms of appropriateness for research question/ intervention. 4. Population of interest and sample clearly identified. 5. Limitations of design and sampling clearly identified.  | 1. Appropriateness and relevance of chosen design chosen could be improved. 2. Selected design could be explained more comprehensively. 3. Justification of design could be improved. 4. Population of interest and sample could be identified more clearly. 5. Identification of the limitations of design and sampling could be improved.  | 5. Appropriateness and relevance of chosen design is inadequate. 6. Study design is inadequately explained. 7. Justification of design is inadequate. 8. Population of interest and sample not identified. 9. Limitations of design and sampling inadequately identified.  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Data & Methods**  | . 1. Variables of interest clearly identified and conceptualized. 2. Variables of interest clearly operationalized for measurement. 3. Appropriate methods clearly identified for data collection. 4. Chosen methods for data collection clearly explained. 5. Limitations of data sources and measurement methods clearly identified.  | 1. Identification and conceptualization of variables of interest could be improved. 2. Operationalization of variables for measurement could be improved. 3. Appropriateness of selected data collection methods could be improved. 4. Chosen methods for data collection could be explained more clearly. 5. Identification of the limitations of data sources and measurement methods could be improved.  | 1. Identification and conceptualization of variables of interest is inadequate. 2. Operationalization of variables for measurement is inadequate. 3. Selected data collection methods are inadequate. 4. Data collection methods are inadequately explained. 5. Limitations of data sources and measurement methods inadequately identified.  |
| **Overall Research Plan & Project Organisation**  | 1. The proposal has been convincingly presented and the research plan is very well thought through. 2. The proposal presents convincing justification for the funding of the project. 3. Ethical considerations for this project have been clearly identified. 4. Project organisation and management plans were practical and clearly outlined.  | 1. The presentation of the proposal and plan for research could be improved. 2. The justification for funding for the project could be improved. 3. The ethical considerations for the project could be more thorough. 4. Project organisation and management could be improved.  | 1. The research plan has been inadequately presented 2. The justification for funding for the project is not convincing/is very weak 3. The ethical considerations for the project have been inadequately discussed 4. Project organisation and management plans are inadequate.  |

**Comments:**