

YOUR UNIVERSITY
Independent Research Project Evaluation Report
(Written Project Rubric)

<i>Candidate Details:</i>
<i>Title of Independent Research Report:</i>
<i>Submission Date:</i>
<i>Examiner Details:</i>

<i>Learning outcome</i>	<i>Performance Indicator</i>			
	<i>Unacceptable Level</i>	<i>Acceptable Level</i>	<i>High Performance level</i>	<i>Exceptional Performance Level</i>
Problem identification and definition (10%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student does not establish the need for the research. • Introduction is fragmented, background and aim not clear. • Research question Research stated but is not explicit. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A reasonable attempt is made by the student to establish the need for the research. • A clear Introduction, but background and aim could be clearer. • Research question articulated; but complicated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A good attempt is made by the student to establish the need for the research. • A good Introduction, clear background and aim. • Research question is clearly articulated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An excellent attempt is made by the student to establish the need for the research. • An excellent Introduction, clear background and aim. • Research question is evidently articulated.
Adequacy of the literature review (10%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An inadequate range of journal articles selected. • Some articles are irrelevant to the topic. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A reasonable range of journal articles selected. • Articles are relevant to the topic. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A good range of high quality journal articles selected. • Articles are relevant to the topic. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An excellent range of high quality journal articles selected. • Articles are relevant and extend the topic.
Organise information in a logical and coherent way (5%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some headings not provided and/or inappropriate. • Some information provided relates to the topic, but is incomplete. • Discussion lacks flow and is somewhat disjointed and fragmented. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Headings and sub-headings are appropriate. • Information provided relates to the topic but is cursory. • Discussion flows well, but is disjointed or fragmented in some places. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Headings and sub-headings are informative. • Information clearly covers the breadth and depth of the topic. • Discussion has a logical flow and coherent line of argument. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Headings and sub-headings are informative. • Information extends the breadth and depth of the topic. • Discussion has a logical flow and coherent line of argument.

<i>Learning outcome</i>	<i>Performance Indicator</i>			
	<i>Unacceptable Level</i>	<i>Acceptable Level</i>	<i>High Performance level</i>	<i>Exceptional Performance Level</i>
Critically analyse and synthesise the information gathered (10%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The analysis is descriptive and lacks depth of knowledge and insight. Research question / hypothesis is not justified. Research question / hypothesis does not clearly emerge from the literature. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The analysis is constructive but lacks depth of knowledge and insight. Research question / hypothesis is somewhat justified. Research question / hypothesis emerges from some of the literature. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The analysis is constructive shows depth of knowledge and insight. Research question / hypothesis is justified. Research question / hypothesis emerges from the literature. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The analysis is constructive shows excellent depth of knowledge and insight. Research question / hypothesis is justified with depth and insight. Research question / hypothesis emerges easily from the literature.
Methods chosen to address the aims (10%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Method remains unjustified in terms of previous work. Method is not appropriate for information required. Selection/sampling method (if required) is not appropriate. Description of methods is incomplete and verbose. Does not demonstrate a clear understanding of limitations of method used. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Justification of method somewhat in terms of previous work. Method appropriate for information required. Selection/sampling method (if required) is appropriate. Description of methods is acceptable but remains incomplete. Clear understanding of limitations of method used. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Method in terms of previous work is well justified but not detailed. Method is clearly appropriate for information required. Selection/sampling method is justified and fitting (if required). Complete and concise description of methods. Good understanding of limitations of method used. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Method in terms of previous work is excellent with detailed justification. Method is obviously appropriate for information required. Selection/sampling method is justified and extensive (if required). Comprehensive and succinct description of methods. Advanced understanding of limitations of method used.
Results (15%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The analysis lacks depth of knowledge and insight. Does not demonstrate validity and interpretation of analyses. Figures and tables inappropriate and/or incorrect. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality of analysis is evident but lacks some depth of knowledge and insight. Acceptable validity and interpretation of analyses. Figures and tables acceptable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality of analysis is commendable and there is evidence of depth of knowledge and insight. Validity and interpretation of analyses is fitting. Figures and tables appropriate and correct. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The quality of analysis is clearly evident with strong demonstration of depth of knowledge and insight. Validity and interpretation of analyses is excellent. Advanced use of figures and tables that is fitting and accurate.

Learning outcome	Performance Indicator			
	Unacceptable Honours Level	Acceptable Honours Level	Achieves High Honours Level	Exceeds High Honours Level
Critical Discussion (15%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No evidence of critical analysis. Arguments unclear and does no attempt to integrate empirical evidence. Insufficient critical analysis which has no relevance to the research question/hypotheses.. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some evidence of critical analysis Basic cogency of argument and use of empirical evidence. Some attempt at critical analysis which has limited relevance to the research question/hypotheses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good evidence of critical analysis. Cogency of argument and use of empirical evidence. Critical analysis is well done and relevant to the research question/hypotheses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advanced evidence of critical analysis . Excellent coherence of argument and use of empirical evidence . Critical analysis is demonstrates depth of thinking and highly relevant to the research question/hypotheses.
Uniqueness of the research (5%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No identification of study weaknesses. No identification of further research opportunities. No justification of conclusions. Does not demonstrate originality. Research is not of a publishable standard. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some attempt to identify the study weaknesses. Some attempt to identify further research opportunities. A reasonable attempt is made to justify conclusions. Some originality evidenced. Research is of a publishable standard. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear identification of study weaknesses. Identification of further research opportunities is clear. Justification of conclusions. Originality demonstrated. Research is of a publishable standard in a well ranked journal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent discussion and identification of study weaknesses. Identification of further research opportunities is comprehensive. Broad justification of conclusions Originality is evidently articulated. Research is of high publishable standard in a well ranked journal.
Communicate information accurately (5%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Frequent spelling and/or grammatical errors. Paraphrasing uses too much of the authors words. Too much quoted material provided, and some presented incorrectly. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some spelling and/or grammatical errors. Some paraphrasing correct yet still uses too much of the authors words. Too much quoted material used, but presented correctly. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very minor spelling and/or grammatical errors. Paraphrasing correctly portrays another's ideas in student's own words. Quotations used sparingly and presented correctly. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No spelling and/or grammatical errors. Paraphrasing expertly applied. Quotations used expertly and presented correctly.
Refer to information sources accurately (5%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An attempt to use a consistent method (i.e. APA, Harvard etc.) has been made, but not entirely correct. In-text citations are mostly inaccurate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> References provided under a consistent method (i.e. APA, Harvard etc.) are accurate in most cases. In-text citations are accurate in most cases (minor, but consequential errors). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> References provided under a consistent method (i.e. APA, Harvard etc.) are accurate. In-text citations are accurate (minor, inconsequential errors). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> References provided under a consistent method (i.e. APA, Harvard etc.) are accurate. In-text citations are accurate.

OVERALL EVALUATION

Our best students should be capable of exceeding a high Honours level (i.e. 85 or above) for their project. High Honours results at the upper H2A level (75-79) or HI level (80 and above) should be the realistic objective of all students. Marks at an H3 level (50 - 59) and H2B (60 - 69) are acceptable, but not outstanding. I evaluate the project as follows (please tick one):

Project Evaluation	(Please tick one box)
Exceeds High Honours level (85 and over)	
First Class Honours (80-84)	
Honours IIA (70-79)	
Honours IIB (60-69)	
Honours III (50 - 59)	
Fail (below 50)	

My comments on the project and the grounds for my recommendations are as follows.

_____ / Please attach additional comments if more space is required. In arriving at the above evaluation I have followed the guidelines provided to me by the School of Management and Marketing.

Signed: _____ Dated: / / 201X

Students will be given a copy of your comments. If you wish, your name will not be passed to either the student or supervisor.

Project Feedback	(Please tick if appropriate)
I am happy to be identified to the student	
I am happy to be identified to the supervisor	