

Why Planning Matters: Assessment Rubric

Rubric



| Criteria | Excellent | Very good | Good | Satisfactory | Unsatisfactory |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| Criteria 1: Does the research matter? PLO 1: Identify why research matters. | The proposal demonstrates novel and significant benefits to the community. The outcomes will advance knowledge significantly to warrant publication. | The proposal justifies potential benefits the research is likely to make to the community. The outcomes may advance knowledge significantly enough to warrant publication. | The proposal describes some potential outcomes of the project and how they will benefit the community and/or advance knowledge. | The proposal lists limited potential outcomes of the project that may have some benefit to the community and/or advance knowledge. | The proposal does not identify any benefit to the community and/or it will not advance knowledge. |
| Criteria 2: Is the proposed research justified and supported by relevant literature? | The proposal synthesizes openly accessible literature relevant to the research problem. It demonstrates the role of literature review in generating the proposed approach. | The literature review compares and contrasts potential approaches to the research problem. It provides a sound justification for the approach chosen. | The literature review enumerates the relevant potential approaches to the research problem, and supports the approach chosen. | The literature review identifies some information that is applicable to the research problem and suggests research approaches. | The proposal does not include a literature review, or the review does not add any justification to the proposed research approach. |
| Criteria 3: Is the problem researchable? PLO 3: define a researchable problem. | The proposal generates a clear, logical and consistent line of sight between the research problem all the way through to anticipated research outcomes. The proposed research elegantly synthesises complex problems, questions, methods and outcomes. | The research problem, aims, research question, method and anticipated outcomes are logically and coherently sequenced and outlined. | The research problem, aims, research question, method and anticipated outcomes are defined, and the relationship between them is clear. | The research problem, aims, research question, method and anticipated outcomes are identified. Relationships between them are inferred. | The research problem, aims, research question, method and anticipated outcomes are poorly described and/or incoherent. |

| Criteria | Excellent | Very good | Good | Satisfactory | Unsatisfactory |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|
| Criteria 4: Have you created a feasible research plan? PLO 5: create a research plan. | <p>The proposal provides comprehensive frameworks demonstrating how the project will be supported by the resources required to make it successful.</p> <p>It demonstrates all the necessary steps to ensure access to skills and resources required.</p> | <p>All required skills and resources are justified and accounted for.</p> <p>The proposal demonstrates that steps have been taken to ensure access to crucial skills and resources.</p> | <p>The proposal lists the skills and resources required to undertake the project, and describes a pathway to ensure timely access to them.</p> | <p>The proposal identifies the necessary skills resources to undertake the research but lacks the detailed steps in acquiring them.</p> | <p>The project as described is not feasible, and/or the proposal does not identify the resources necessary to undertake the research.</p> |
| Criteria 5: Will you be able to develop a strong research method? PLO2: Evaluate the roles of qualitative and quantitative methodologies and theoretical frameworks in research. | <p>(in addition to very good)</p> <p>The proposed path to developing a research methodology is almost certain to generate a well-developed, rigorous and defensible set of methods for comprehensively responding to the research question.</p> | <p>(in addition to good)</p> <p>The proposed path to developing a research method will ensure the learner is familiar with a wide range of strategies, approaches and methodologies that relate to the research question.</p> | <p>(in addition to satisfactory)</p> <p>The proposed path to developing a research method will ensure that the learner will be aware of standard disciplinary practices and methods in relation to the research question.</p> | <p>The proposed path to developing a research methodology may result in the identification of a valid research methodology.</p> | <p>The proposed path to developing a research methodology will not result in the identification of a valid research methodology.</p> |
| Criteria 6: Is your research ethical? PLO 4: Apply ethics to research. | <p>The proposal includes a well-developed framework to comprehensively address all potential ethical issues.</p> <p>The ethical framework reflects best practices in governance and oversight of ethical issues.</p> | <p>The proposal justifies a reasonable and ethical approach to all relevant foreseeable issues.</p> <p>It provides a sound basis for the practical governance and oversight of ethical issues.</p> | <p>The proposal describes and addresses foreseeable ethical issues.</p> <p>It describes a strategy for ensuring ethical issues.</p> | <p>The proposal identifies potential ethical issues and how they will be addressed.</p> | <p>The proposed research is unethical or does not include any ethical considerations.</p> |

Why Planning Matters: Assessment Rubric



Rubric

| Criteria | Excellent | Very good | Good | Satisfactory | Unsatisfactory |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|
| Criteria 7: Is your proposal readable? | <p>The expression is clear, coherent, concise and free of error.</p> <p>Ideas are expressed in a manner that both a specialist and non-specialist audience can readily understand.</p> <p>There are no errors of referencing</p> | <p>The research proposal is coherent and concise, with very few errors of expression.</p> <p>An attempt has been made to ensure that ideas could be understood by a non-specialist audience.</p> <p>Referencing is comprehensive and predominantly correct.</p> | <p>The research proposal is coherent and readable.</p> <p>Some errors of expression are present.</p> <p>Some errors of referencing are found.</p> | <p>It is possible to make sense of the research proposal with effort on the part of the reader, despite several errors of expression.</p> <p>Most of referencing is done incorrectly.</p> | <p>The expression is difficult or impossible to make sense of, and/or is full of errors.</p> <p>Referencing has not occurred or referencing is done incorrectly throughout.</p> |