

School of Biomedical Sciences
BIOM6301 – Research Proposal

Research Proposal Feedback

Examiners are to circle the relevant achievement level of the candidate on the accompanying criteria sheet and insert any relevant comments on specific aspects. Specific comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's research proposal are to be made at the bottom of the criteria sheet. Additional sheets with feedback can be attached to the criteria sheet where the issue is not addressed in the criteria provided.

Candidates are strongly encouraged to review the criteria carefully during the preparation of their research proposal.

The assessment has been divided into three major components:

Content 70%
References 20%
Presentation 10%

Note that each component does not contribute equally to the final mark.

Examiners, please note the general assessment criteria below when awarding final mark:

>80 (Hons 1)	Work of superior quality in all aspects of the proposal, containing clear examples of excellent critical skills and personal insights into research area.
70-79 (Hons IIa)	Work of very good quality in all aspects of the proposal, but showing lesser critical skills and personal insights into research area.
60-69 (Hons IIb)	Good quality in all aspects of the proposal, but with inadequacies in understanding, critical skills, organisation and presentation.
50-59 (Hons III)	Adequate quality work with significant deficiencies in understanding, critical skills, organisation and presentation.
<50 (Fail)	No understanding of area or incomprehensible.

Candidate: _____

Mark(%): _____

Examiner: _____

Examiners Signature: _____

Date: _____



I would like to remain as an anonymous marker

Category	Comments	High Hons I (>85%)	Med-Low Hons I (80-85%)	High Hons IIA (76-79%)	Med-Low Hons IIA (70-75%)	Honours IIB (60-69%)	Honours III (50-59%)	Fail (<50)
Content 70% Background		Very comprehensive, detailed and focused background. Completely clear and logical plan. Clear links between experimental design and literature.	Highly detailed and focused background. Clear and logical plan. Clear links between experimental design and literature.	Detailed and focused background. Clear and logical plan. Clear links between experimental design and literature.	Detailed background. Logical plan. Links between experimental design and literature.	Some key basic information missing in background. Links between experimental design and literature.	Some key basic information missing in background. No clear links between experimental design and literature.	Lack of significant detail in background. No projected experiments.
Hypotheses & Aims		Hypotheses and aims clearly outlined and comprehensively justified.	Hypotheses and aims clearly outlined and justified.	Hypotheses and aims outlined and justified.	No clear hypotheses. Aims outlined and justified.	No clear hypotheses. Aims outlined.	No clear hypotheses. Aims not clearly outlined.	No hypotheses or aims apparent.
Methodology		Clear and detailed description of proposed experiments. Comprehensively planned and accurately outlined experiments.	Clear and detailed description of proposed experiments. Accurately outlined experiments.	Clear description of experiments, but minor detail lacking. Accurately outlined experiments.	Description of experiments mostly clear, but minor detail lacking. Minor inconsistencies in experimental design.	Description of experiments lacked some major detail. Minor inconsistencies in experimental design.	Description of experiments lacked some major detail. Major inconsistencies in experimental design.	Experiments not described.
Context		Effectively discussed big picture and specific detail clearly throughout. Own insights presented and clearly justified.	Discussed big picture and specific detail clearly. Own insights presented and clearly justified.	Discussed big picture, but some jargon used. Own insights presented and justified.	Referred to big picture, but some jargon used. Own insights presented.	Referred to big picture. Some jargon used. No clear insight.	No mention of big picture. Jargon use distracting. No clear insight.	No attempt to synthesise and describe literature.
Critical analysis		Critical appraisal throughout proposal. Clear and thorough outline and justification of study.	Critical appraisal throughout proposal. Clear outline and justification of study.	Critical appraisal through most of proposal. Clear outline and justification of study.	Some evidence of critical appraisal. Clear outline and justification of study.	Some evidence of critical appraisal. Clear outline of study.	No clear evidence of critical appraisal. Clear outline of study.	No evidence of critical appraisal. No study outline apparent.
References 20%		Predominant and comprehensive use of primary articles. All articles presented from recent and seminal publications.	Predominant use of primary articles. All articles presented from recent and seminal publications.	Predominant use of primary articles. Most articles presented from recent and seminal publications.	Some over reliance on reviews. Most articles presented from recent and seminal publications	Some over reliance on reviews. Many articles not from recent and seminal publications.	Significant over reliance on reviews. Limited number of recent or seminal articles used.	Use of literature limited to a few articles and reviews. Poor attempt to explore literature.
		Citation style correct and consistent throughout. Reference list completely accurate with no errors.	Citation style correct and consistent. Reference list complete, but a few minor errors.	Citation style consistent. Reference list complete, but many minor errors.	Citation style consistent. Some references inconsistent between text and list with many minor errors.	Citation style mostly consistent. Many references inconsistent between text and list with many minor errors.	Citation style incorrect / inconsistent. Many inconsistencies between text and list. Some major errors.	Inappropriate citation style used. Many references inconsistent between text and list. Many major errors.

Category	Comments	High Hons I (>85%)	Med-Low Hons I (80-85%)	High Hons IIA (76-79%)	Med-Low Hons IIA (70-75%)	Honours IIB (60-69%)	Honours III (50-59%)	Fail (<50)
Presentation 10%		No grammatical or spelling errors. Professional expression and style used consistently. All figures accurate and informative.	No grammatical or spelling errors. Professional expression and style used. All figures accurate and informative.	No grammatical errors and minor spelling errors. Professional expression and style used. All figures accurate and informative.	Minor grammatical errors and minor spelling errors. Professional expression and style used. Most figures accurate and informative.	Minor grammatical errors and minor spelling errors. Professional expression used. Most figures accurate.	Major grammatical and spelling errors. Professional expression used. Numerous errors in figures.	Major grammatical and spelling errors. Language used not professional. Numerous errors in figures.

Specific Comments - BIOM6301 Research Proposal Feedback (cont.)

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Suggestions: