

Rubric for the assessment of a research proposal

	excellent (5)	good (4)	sufficient (3)	weak (2)	insufficient (1)
1. Research objectives and questions					
1.1 Relevance, context and research need	Societal and scientific context are given and linked with consistent reasoning. Examples and references are included.	Societal and scientific context are given and linked with consistent reasoning. No examples and references are included.	Societal and scientific context are given but the reasoning linking them is absent or weak.	Only the societal context or only scientific context are given.	No societal or scientific context (link to existing research) identified.
1.2 Identification of problem knowledge gap (problem statement) and research objective	Knowledge gap and objective emerge directly from the given scientific context with consistent reasoning. Formulations are clear and concise.	Knowledge gap and objective emerge directly from the given scientific context with consistent reasoning.	Knowledge gap and objective are linked to the given scientific context, but the reasoning is weak.	Knowledge gap or objective are given, but link to the scientific context (existing research) is absent.	Knowledge gap and objective are absent.
1.3 Research question – link to objective	Research questions and hypothesis address the research objective. Consistent and clear reasoning shows the connection.	Research questions and hypothesis address the research objective. The reasoning connecting questions to objectives is consistent, but not clearly formulated.	Research questions and hypothesis address the research objective. The reasoning connecting questions to objectives is partly inconsistent.	Research questions and hypothesis are stated but do not address the research objective (an answer to the research question should contribute to the objective). The reasoning connecting questions to objectives is weak or inconsistent.	Research questions and hypothesis are absent.
1.4 Research question – formulation Properties of a well formulated research question: the theoretical construct is clearly identified (a) and defined (b); the research question yields complex insights (c) and has	The research questions have all desired properties.	The research questions have at least 3 of the desired properties.	The research questions have at least 2 of the desired properties.	The research questions have at least 1 of the desired properties.	Research questions are absent.

capacity to surprise (d).					
2. Research method					
2.1 Link between research questions and experiments	Link between research questions and proposed experiments is given with consistent and clear reasoning that is formulated concisely.	Link between research questions and proposed experiments is given with consistent reasoning.	Link between research questions and proposed experiments is given, but the reasoning is incorrect in places.	Link between research questions and proposed experiments is suggested, but it is unclear how experiments will answer the questions.	There is no link between research questions and proposed experiments.
2.2 Design of experiments	The experiments can answer the research question(s), the optimal set of experiments has been chosen.	The experiments can answer the research question(s), but this is not the optimal set of experiments (too many or too few experiments, inconsistent variation of parameters etc.).	The experiments can answer the research question(s) approximately only. Design of experiments incorrect in some aspects (values for initial or boundary conditions, variables that are varied etc.).	The experiments cannot answer the research questions.	No description of experiments.
2.3. Description of experiments	Description of model experiments is complete and clear so that exact reproduction of the research is possible. Information on experiments is clearly organized.	Description of model experiments is complete and clear so that exact reproduction of the research is possible.	Description of model experiments is lacking in a number of places. Because of this it is only possible to perform a more or less similar research.	Research cannot be reproduced due to insufficient information on setup of experiments.	No description of experiments.
2.4 Analysis of experimental results	Clear description of the analysis of experimental results, with reference to the research questions.	Clear description of the analysis of experimental results., without a clear reference to the research questions.	Description of the analysis of experimental results is given, but detail is missing for full reproducibility.	Description of the analysis of only some of the experimental results is given.	No indication is given how results will be analysed.

Author: Arnold Moene, Wageningen University



This document is released under the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 3.0 Netherlands License