**242 Final Proposal**

**Introduction, Literature Review and Methodology**

**Student Self-Evaluation Instrument**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Introduction and Literature Review (Revisions)** | | | |
| **Component** | **Excellent** | **Adequate (some improvements needed)** | **Not Adequate**  **(numerous improvements needed)** |
| **REVISED Introduction** | The research topic is clearly articulated. The significance of the topic is presented in a logical and specific manner. The transcultural model is effectively applied to the research topic. Up-to-date scholarly works are cited in the introduction to help frame the topic and its importance. | The research topic is vaguely presented, or too many ideas are presented. The significance of the topic is presented in a general way, or the information provided is not clearly connected to the topic. The transcultural model is applied vaguely or is poor developed. Scholarly works cited may not be current. | No developed research topic is presented. The topics’ significance is missing or unclear. The transcultural model application is not included or is applied incorrectly. Scholarly works are not included or are not connected to the topic. |
| **REVISED Background** | Information on the extent of the problem/issue and/or the population is thoroughly presented and is logically connected to the research topic. Statistical, demographic and/or other scholarly works are included and cited. | Information on the extent of the problem/issue and/or the population is too broadly or too narrowly presented and may not be logically connected to the research topic. Statistical, demographic and/or other scholarly works are included and cited. | Information on the extent of the problem/issue and/or the population is missing, superficial or it not connected to the research topic. Statistical, demographic and/or other scholarly works may not be included or cited. |
| **REVISED**  **Theory** | The theory is clearly and concisely described. The application of the theory to the research topic is specific and logically presented. | The theory is too broadly or too narrowly described. The application of the theory to the research topic is not fully developed and connections with the topic are not consistently clear. | The description of the theory is missing or poorly developed. The application of the theory to the topic is not clear and the connection to the topic is weak. |
| **REVISED “Body” sections** | Each subsection is well-organized and explains with evidence (i.e., an integrated review of relevant literature) the connection between each independent and dependent variable consistent with the hypothesis (if using quantitative methods) and/or how each theme relates to the research question (if using qualitative methods).  This part of the literature review also includes in its integrated discussion the current status of the specific topic in the professional knowledge base, limitations of previous studies related to the specific topic, and how the proposed study will make a contribution. | Each subsection is somewhat organized and attempts to explain with evidence the connection between each independent and dependent variable consistent with the hypothesis (if using quantitative methods) and/or how each theme relates to the research question (if using qualitative methods). Yet, paper lacks some evidence and/or somewhat weak presentation of argument.  This part of the literature review includes a somewhat vague or incomplete discussion of the current status of the specific topic in the professional knowledge base, limitations of previous studies related to the specific topic, and how the proposed study will make a contribution. | Subsections are poorly organized and are vague and lack explanation and evidence regarding the connection between each independent and dependent variable consistent with the hypothesis (if using quantitative methods) and/or how each theme relates to the research question (if using qualitative methods).  This part of the literature review is vague and incomplete, with limited discussion of the current status of the specific topic in the professional knowledge base, limitations of previous studies related to the specific topic, and how the proposed study will make a contribution. |
| **REVISED Research Question and/or Hypothesis** | The literature review contains clearly and correctly worded research question(s) and/or hypothesis(es) consistent with the proposal’s focus. | The literature review contains somewhat clearly and correctly worded research question(s) and/or hypothesis(es) fairly consistent with the proposal’s focus. | The literature review contains poorly worded research question(s) and/or hypothesis(es) inconsistent with the proposal’s focus, or lacks a research question or hypothesis. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Methods** | | | |
|  | **Excellent** | **Adequate (some improvements needed)** | **Not Adequate**  **(numerous improvements needed)** |
| **Research Design** | Methods section contains a specific design or method for the quantitative and/or qualitative components of the study. | Methods section contains a general design or method for the quantitative and/or qualitative components of the study, or is somewhat incomplete in identifying and describing the design. | Methods section does not contain a specific design or method for the quantitative and/or qualitative components of the study, or its description is vague. |
| **Sample** | Methods section contains a specific sampling frame, sampling method, anticipated sample size, and a general demographic description of prospective study participants. | Methods section attempts to describe the sampling frame, sampling method, anticipated sample size, and a general demographic description of prospective study participants. However, an element above is missing or is somewhat vague. | Methods section does not contain a description of sampling frame, sampling method, anticipated sample size, and a general demographic description of prospective study participants, or multiple elements above are missing or are vague. |
| **Study Site** | Methods section clearly identifies and describes the potential study site(s). | Methods section identifies and describes the potential study site(s), but is somewhat vague. | Methods section does not identify or describe the potential study site(s). |
| **Variables and Measurement and/or Themes**  **Reliability and Validity and/or Credibility and Verification of Qualitative data** | Methods section describes how informed consent is obtained, how participants’ confidentiality or anonymity is ensured, and how participants are protected from harm.  It also includes a statement that the proposal will be submitted to an IRB for review and approval. | Methods section vaguely describes how informed consent is obtained, how participants’ confidentiality or anonymity is ensured, and how participants are protected from harm.  It also includes a statement that the proposal will be submitted to an IRB for review and approval. | Methods section poorly describes, or does not describe, how informed consent is obtained, how participants’ confidentiality or anonymity is ensured, and how participants are protected from harm.  It also lacks a statement that the proposal will be submitted to an IRB for review and approval. |
| **Human Subjects Considerations** | Methods section describes how informed consent is obtained, how participants’ confidentiality or anonymity is ensured, and how participants are protected from harm.  It also includes a statement that the proposal will be/has been submitted to an IRB for review and approval. | Methods section vaguely describes how informed consent is obtained, how participants’ confidentiality or anonymity is ensured, and how participants are protected from harm.  It also includes a statement that the proposal will be/has been submitted to an IRB for review and approval. | Methods section poorly describes, or does not describe, how informed consent is obtained, how participants’ confidentiality or anonymity is ensured, and how participants are protected from harm.  It also lacks a statement that the proposal will be submitted to an IRB for review and approval. |
| **Procedures and Data Collection Techniques** | Methods section describes the procedures of the study and how each component of data will be collected.  If conducting an intervention, program, or treatment, a thorough and clear description of the curriculum is provided. | Methods section somewhat describes the procedures of the study and how each component of data will be collected.  If conducting an intervention, program, or treatment, a general description of the curriculum is provided. | Methods section poorly describes, or does not describe, the procedures of the study and how data will be collected.  If conducting an intervention, program, or treatment, a clear description of the curriculum is lacking. |
| **Proposed Analysis: Quantitative** | Methods section describes appropriate analysis of proposed variables at all three levels (univariate, bivariate, and multivariate). | Methods section somewhat describes appropriate analysis of proposed variables at all three levels (univariate, bivariate, and multivariate). | Methods section poorly describes, or lacks description of appropriate analysis of proposed variables at all three levels (univariate, bivariate, and multivariate). |
| **Proposed Analysis: Qualitative** | Methods section describes appropriate analysis of qualitative data (process of coding, thematic analysis, and/or content analysis procedures), if applicable. | Methods section somewhat describes appropriate analysis of qualitative data (process of coding, thematic analysis, and/or content analysis procedures), if applicable. | Methods section poorly describes appropriate analysis of qualitative data (process of coding, thematic analysis, and/or content analysis procedures), if applicable. |

**Writing Evaluation**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Writing Component** | **Excellent** | **Adequate (Some improvements needed)** | **Not Adequate (Numerous improvements needed)** |
| **Structure**  The structure of your paper should include a logical organization that guides the reader in understanding your topic. A well-structured paper allows readers to see the relationships between your research statement, the evidence presented and the overall relevance. | The introduction clearly defines the research topic  The subsequent sections of the paper support the research topic and ideas presented in the introduction.  Conclusion summarizes main idea and shows why it matters (not applicable in Written Assignment #1). | The introduction defines the research topic, although it may be too broad or too narrow for the length of the paper  The subsequent sections of the paper support the thesis with evidence from reliable sources  Conclusion restates main idea | The introduction does not define the research topic.  The subsequent sections of the paper are not sufficient to support the ideas presented in the introduction.  Ending does not tie paper together |
| **Flow**  The flow of your paper should include smooth transitions between paragraphs, good organization within paragraphs, and logical organization of ideas. | Ideas are arranged in a clear, logical order that is easy to follow  Transitions guide the reader smoothly from one idea to the next | Ideas are arranged logically  Transitions give the reader some help in following the argument | Movement between ideas is abrupt or illogical |
| **Depth**  The depth of your paper should reflect a comprehensive and critical review and analysis. A thorough understanding of the topic is evident, as well as an analysis of gaps in the current knowledge base, or key questions for the field to address. | Paper shows extensive knowledge of standard works and terms in the field  Readers’ questions and objections are anticipated and answered  Writer provides new information, clarity, or a unique perspective to scholarly discussion of topic | Paper shows familiarity with standard works and terms in the field  Readers may be left feeling that an important aspect of the subject has not been explored  Paper reviews what others have written about the topic | Paper appears to be hastily written  Arguments are unsupported  Exploration of the topic is superficial or contains numerous inaccuracies |
|  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Writing Component** | **Excellent** | **Adequate**  **(Some improvements needed)** | **Not Adequate (Numerous improvements needed)** |
| **Use of sources**  Your paper should include an integration of academic sources so that references are used in relation to your research topic and are organized around core ideas.  APA (6th ed.) should be used for all references in the paper. | Material from other authors is smoothly integrated into text    Quotations are limited to statements that are particularly striking or examples in which the source’s precise wording is important  APA is used correctly and consistently | Material from other authors is credited and used as supporting evidence  Material from sources is introduced, but order of ideas depends on the original  APA is mostly used correctly or consistently | Material is plagiarized  Material from other authors appears to have been cut-and-pasted into text  APA is not correct or consistent |
| **Conventions**  Your paper should follow all conventions related to grammar, punctuation, and spelling. | Writing follows the grammatical and spelling conventions of standard English  Diction is formal, avoiding “I” and “we,” slang, and contractions  [for exception, see APA 2.04] | Writing generally follows the grammatical and spelling conventions of standard English | Writing is difficult to follow because of numerous errors in spelling and grammar |

From: A Writing Tutorial for Graduate Students  
by Cecelia Munzenmaier
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