



### Evaluation criteria

Criteria	Excellent	Very good	Good	Satisfactory	Poor
<b>Abstract [20%]</b>	A highly effective and concise abstract covering all key areas of the work	Key areas highlighted in abstract, along with concise and effective arguments	Some key areas highlighted but shortage of a cogent and comprehensive overview	A few areas highlighted, but overall lacks comprehension and awareness of key aspects of work	Lack of a comprehensiveness and awareness of key aspects of the work
<b>Background [15%]</b> Size, scope, and importance	Clearly articulates the size, scope, and importance of the research topic.	Size, scope, and importance of the research topic is explained, but may lack clarity, depth, or linkages to the research question.	Size, scope, and importance of the research topic is outlined, but lacks clarity, depth, or linkages to the research question.	There is inadequate evidence about the size, scope, and importance of the research topic and linkages to the research question.	There is extremely inadequate evidence of the size, scope, and importance of the research topic and links to the research question.
<b>Project aim/ Research Question [10 %]</b>	Clear articulation of aims/ research questions  Research Questions justified in view of background and/or rationale for research	Clear statement of aims/research questions  Some justification of aims in view of background and/or rationale for research	Some confusion, vagueness in statement of aims/research questions  Aims/Research Questions not clearly justified in view of background and/or rationale for	A vague or confusing aims/research question statement  Aims/Research Questions not clearly justified in view of background and/or rationale for research.	Unclear aims/research questions  No clear justification in view of background and/or rationale for research

			research		
<b>Methodology</b> [10 %]	<p>A clear and detailed account of methodology</p> <p>Clear and convincing discussion of paradigmatic perspectives and rationale</p> <p>A creative and suitable adaption of methods</p>	<p>Good account of methods with occasional lapses</p> <p>Some discussion of paradigmatic perspectives</p> <p>Suitable adaptation of methods</p>	<p>Good account of methods but missing some critical aspects</p> <p>Some paradigmatic discussions but unclear with some confusion</p> <p>Little evidence of adaptation of method to suit question</p>	<p>Missing most of the critical aspects within the account of methods</p> <p>Little evidence of awareness of paradigmatic basis of methodology</p> <p>Little justification of methods</p>	<p>Lack of clear discussion of methods</p> <p>No/little evidence of awareness of paradigmatic basis of methodology</p> <p>Use of methods not justified</p>
<b>Research plan</b> [20 %]	<p>Very clear, realistic and well considered plan and timeline</p> <p>Considers key steps of the research process</p> <p>Outlines the key stakeholders. Well-adjusted to context</p> <p>All key areas included</p>	<p>Clear plan with a few lapses</p> <p>Addresses most steps of the research process</p> <p>Good consideration of context</p> <p>Good discussion of stakeholders</p> <p>Most key areas</p>	<p>Plan is somewhat clear - vagueness in key areas</p> <p>Some key steps missed from the project cycle</p> <p>Sparse on discussion of context</p> <p>Some key stakeholders missing</p>	<p>Mostly unclear or vague plan</p> <p>Most of the key areas missed from the project cycle</p> <p>Hardly any discussion on context</p> <p>Most key stakeholder missing</p> <p>Most key areas in budgeting missing</p>	<p>Unclear/vague plan</p> <p>Major areas missed from the project cycle</p> <p>Lack of contextual adaptations</p> <p>Poor consideration of budget or timelines.</p> <p>Inadequate treatment of stakeholders</p>

	in the budget Effective dissemination strategy	included in the budget Good dissemination strategy	Some key areas missed in budgeting Gaps in dissemination strategy	Mostly unclear or inappropriate dissemination strategy	Unclear and less appropriate dissemination strategy
<b>Discussion/ critique (Reflective account)</b> [15 %]	Key implications of the study discussed  Strengths and limitations of the methodology argued effectively  Challenges anticipated and discussed	Good discussion of implications of study  Some discussion of strengths and limitations  Some challenges highlighted	Some discussion of implications of study  Some key strengths and limitations – but lacking in some key areas  Some discussion of challenges	Little discussion of the implications of the study  Few key strengths and limitations identified  Little discussion of the challenges	Implications of study not clear  Confusion/ vagueness in discussion of strengths and limitations  Challenges poorly identified – unconvincing
<b>Presentation/ Writing</b> [10%]	Effective and clear  Engaging and readable  No major grammatical errors  Well cited and good range of references	Clear communication  Readable and largely coherent  No major grammatical errors  Minimal citation and reference errors	Clear use of language  Good coherence and flow of ideas  Some grammatical errors  Some citation and referencing errors	Some difficulties in clarity  Ideas may be muddled  Multiple grammatical errors  Citation and referencing errors	Difficult to grasp main idea and confusion  I Ideas largely muddled  Major grammatical errors  Major problems with citation and references

