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| Review of related Literature | 10 |  |  |
| Statement of the Problem | 15 |  |  |
| Methodology | 30 |  |  |
| Feasibility | 15 |  |  |
| Significance | 10 |  |  |
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| Evaluation Criteria | Poor  1 | Satisfactory  2-3 | Excellent  4-5 |
| 1. Format | * More than a few citations do not appear in the references and vv. In text citation is not consistent with the prescribed referencing style. * Figures, tables, or graphs are not properly labeled or missing. * Several aspects of style, formatting, grammar, sentence structure, headings, or page numbers are missing. | * A few citations do not appear in the references and vice versa. In text citation is not consistent with the prescribed referencing style. * Figures and tables not properly cited or labeled. * Some aspect of style, formatting, grammar, sentence structure, headings, or page numbers are missing. | * Citations all appear in the references and vice versa and in-text citation consistent with the prescribed referencing style. * All tables, figures, graphs, charts, etc. complete. * Style, formatting, grammar, sentence structure, headings, page numbers all consistent. |
| 1. Introduction | * Material is not presented logically with extraneous (unnecessary) information cluttering the argument or presentation. * Relevance of the proposal not clear. * Does not include topics that support and/or oppose the research. | * Material is not presented logically but makes a good case for the relevance of the proposal. * Includes topics related to theory and studies that support the research but no opposing studies. | * Sufficiently researched and referenced making a good case for the relevance of the proposal. * Comprehensive with topics related to theory and related studies that support or oppose research. |
| 1. Review of related literature | * The related literature provides limited information on the issue or theory under consideration. * Some of the literature used are irrelevant to the study. * Limited use of available literature. * Gaps in the literature are not explicitly stated and areas that need to be addressed are not discussed. * Illustrations and descriptions of theoretical and conceptual frameworks are not appropriate with the research questions and research design. Vague and confusing descriptions of frameworks in a few paragraphs without supporting and relevant literature. | * The related literature provides a contextual overview of the issue or theories under consideration; however, review of literature relevant to the study is limited. * Gaps in the literature are explicitly stated and areas that need to be addressed are discussed. * Theoretical and conceptual frameworks are illustrated and briefly described in line with the research questions and research design. Brief descriptions of frameworks in a few paragraphs with relevant literature are presented. | * The related literature provides a contextual overview of the issue or theories under consideration through a comprehensive review of sources relevant to the study. * Gaps in the literature are explicitly stated and areas that need to be addressed are comprehensively discussed. * Theoretical and conceptual frameworks are appropriately illustrated and described in line with the research questions and research design. Clearly describes frameworks in a couple of paragraphs with relevant literature. |
| 1. Statement of the Problem | * Objectives not relevant to the problem. * Objectives are not clearly stated or relevant to the problem, nor are the objectives measurable. | * Objectives of the Study cover limited aspects of the problem. * Objectives are not clearly stated and one or two objectives are not measurable or relevant to the problem. | * Objectives of the Study cover the different aspects of the problem. * Objectives are clearly stated and each objective easily measurable. |
| 1. Research Design and Methodology | * The research design adapted is/are not sound, defensible, or applicable in obtaining data to answer the posed research. * The sampling typology used does not suit the research design. * All sources of data, are described to a limited extent. Validity, reliability, and credibility of adapted instruments are not established nor substantiated with relevant literature * Analysis of the data is poorly described. There are no references or use of frameworks or its equivalent in the analysis of data. | * Only some parts of the research design are sound & applicable in obtaining data to answer the posed research. * The sampling typology used does not suit the research design. * All sources of data, are moderately described. Validity and reliability of adapted instruments are not well established or substantiated with relevant literature. * Analysis of the data with vague or generic descriptions. There are no references or use of frameworks or its equivalent in the analysis of data. | * The research design is sound & appropriate in obtaining data to answer the posed research. * The sampling typology used suits the research design. * All sources of data, including research instruments, are well described. Validity and reliability (for quantitative instruments) and credibility (for qualitative) considerations are reported &substantiated with relevant literature. * Analysis of the data are well explained and explicitly described and substantiated by the literature. Frameworks are well explained and substantiated by the literature. |
| 1. Feasibility | * The scope of work is unreasonable in terms of time and resources available. * The implementation of said study is an impractical use of time and resources and the nature of the issue being studied is not relevant. * Proponents’ academic profile or potential does not support his/her ability to conduct and complete the proposed study. | * Scope of work is moderately reasonable in terms of time and resources available. * The implementation of said study is a practical use of time and resources given the moderately relevant nature of the issue being studied. * Proponents are reasonably qualified to conduct and complete the proposed study. | * Scope of work can be accomplished within the time frame proposed using only the resources requested. * The implementation of said study is a practical use of time and resources given the highly relevant nature of the issue being studied. * Proponents are well qualified to conduct and complete the proposed study. |
| 7. Significance | * There are significant deficiencies in the thesis with regard to language or layout. Written expression is stilted and hard to comprehend. The thesis is organized in an illogical manner and/or forms a fragmented whole. * The paper is not coherently written. The author did not demonstrate in his or her writing fluidity of thought and logical thinking. Scholarly, formal, and academic language is not evident at all. The paper has numerous grammatical errors. | * The thesis is mostly faultless with regard to its language use and layout. Written expression is understandable. The thesis forms a balanced whole. * Only some parts of the paper are coherently written. The author demonstrates in his or her writing fluidity of thought and logical thinking only to a moderate extent. Scholarly, formal and academic language is not consistently used. The paper has few grammatical errors. | * The thesis is faultless with regard to its linguistic form and appearance. Written expression is clear and smooth. The thesis forms a coherently organized, uniform whole presenting the key facts. * All parts of the paper are coherently written. The author demonstrates in his or her writing fluidity of thought and logical thinking. Scholarly, formal and academic language is consistently used. The paper has very few grammatical errors. |