**Student name:**

**First reviewer's name:**

**Name of second reviewer:**

**Date of review:**

**Plagiarism rate: % Interpretation plagiarism rate by first reviewer:**

Prerequisite: module Practical Exploration completed. Completed? Yes / no

The obligatory parts of the article are:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1 | Title page with title, name and student number |
| 2 | Table of contents (not mandatory) |
| 3 | Introduction, practice exploration and research question (guideline 750 words)  |
| 4 | Theoretical framework (guideline 1000 words) |
| 5 | Description of intervention (guideline 1000 words) |
| 6 | Method (guideline 1,000 words) |
| 7 | Results |
| 8 | Conclusion and discussion |
| 7 | Reference list  |
| 8 | Appendices, including elaborated interventions and elaborated measurement instruments |
| 9 | Reflection report (guideline 500 words) |

Are the all mandatory components present? Yes / no

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scores on standards (each standard must be satisfactory)** | **Score first reviewer** | **Score second reviewer** | **Final score** | **Weighting** |
| 1. Intervention
 |  |  |  | **20 %** |
| 1. Method
 |  |  |  | **20 %** |
| 1. Analysis and results
 |  |  |  | **20 %** |
| 1. Conclusion and discussion
 |  |  |  | **20 %** |
| 1. Academic writing
 |  |  |  | **10%** |
| 1. Reflection on philosophy of science
 |  |  |  | **10%** |
|  **FINAL Mark:** |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Standard 1: Intervention** |
| Criterion | Insufficient | Sufficient | Good  | Excellent |
| Coherent and informed choice of intervention | The intervention you choose is not logically related to the outcome of the exploration of your practice problem and/or the outcomes you aim to achieve. And/or you have not properly justified the choice of a specific intervention.  | You have adequately justified the choice of a specific intervention, using literature, and practical arguments. The choice of this intervention fits the outcomes you have in mind. | You make an informed and logical choice of intervention. The intervention you choose is a logical link between the context of the problem and the outcomes you want to achieve.You asked stakeholders (=colleagues) for their opinions. | See Good and: you have asked stakeholders for their opinions.Stakeholders include not only peers but also students, to enhance the participatory nature of your intervention. |
| logical and reasoned design of the intervention | In the description, you do not clarify exactly what the intervention(s) look like and/or you do not describe what mechanisms you set in motion with the intervention and/or you do not sufficiently substantiate from the literature. | In the description of the intervention, you indicate which mechanisms you set in motion, but the description of the intervention is not always consistent with the described design requirements. You do not always consistently substantiate the mechanisms you set in motion with the interventions from the literature. You describe the mechanisms in such a way that it is clear how your intended intervention will lead to the desired outcomes (CIMO). | In the description of the intervention, you indicate the mechanisms you put in place. The description of the intervention is fully consistent with the described design requirements. The mechanisms you set in motion with the intervention are always supported by literature. You describe the mechanisms in such a clear way that it is clear how your proposed intervention will lead to the desired outcomes (CIMO). | The description of the interventions is crystal clear, with no room for interpretation by the reader. The mechanisms you set in motion with the interventions are all clearly substantiated from the literature. The description of the intervention is completely consistent with the described design requirements. You describe the mechanisms in such a clear way that it is clear how your intervention will lead to the desired outcomes (CIMO). |
| Innovative and transferable | You have designed an intervention that is not innovative and/or transferable within the context of your school. You use little or no scientific didactic literature.  | Your intervention is innovative for you as a subject teacher and for your school, but outside it has been tried before. Your research is transferable within the context of your own school. You use general didactic sources that you translate into your own subject didactics and your own subject didactic actions. You uses multiple scientific subject didactic sources and/or general didactic (scientific) sources that you translate into your own subject.  | Your intervention is innovative for you as a subject teacher and for your school. You clearly justify why your intervention is innovative. Your research is transferable within the context of your own school and you indicate how this can be realised. You have explicitly involved others in your research. In the school context, you make use of innovative didactics based on principles from scientific didactic literature. You make a connection between the didactic literature and what you do in the workplace.  | Your intervention is innovative for you as a subject teacher and for your school. Your research is transferable within the context of your own school and beyond. You have explicitly involved others in your research. You justify clearly why your intervention is innovative beyond your school.In terms of subject didactics, you show a surprisingly innovative perspective, Doconsistently underpinned by scientific subject didactic literature, among others.  |
|  | Unsatisfactory (<5.5) | Satisfactory (5.5-7.0) | Good (7.0-8.5) | Excellent (8.5-10.0) |
| Notes on assessment: |

|  |
| --- |
| **Standard 2: Method** |
| Criterion | Insufficient | Sufficient | Good | Excellent |
| Consistency and substantiation of research question and research design  | You have not asked a design-oriented or change-oriented research question and/or your sub-questions do not have different functions such as describe, compare, evaluate and explain. You do not substantiate the chosen data collection methods with appropriate literature. | Your research question is design-oriented or change-oriented. You have posed matching sub-questions that incorporate various research functions such as evaluation and description. The substantiation and implementation of the chosen research methods could be improved in a number of ways.  | Your research question is design-oriented or change-oriented. You have posed matching sub-questions that incorporate different research functions such as evaluation and description. Based on the chosen method, your research is well conducted. | The chosen method demonstrates innovative design and creativity. It involves a participatory form of applied research. |
| Reliable and valid | In your method, you do not or hardly demonstrate the extent to which your research is reliable and valid. For example, you do not operationalise the variables in your research sufficiently. | In your method, in the choices you make (choices for data collection, participants, research design, and so on), you indicate the extent to which reliability and validity of your research are enhanced. The justification of reliability and validity in connection with your choices made is not always consistent and well-founded. | In your method, in all the choices you make (choices for data collection, participants, research design, and so on), you consistently indicate the extent to which reliability and validity of your research are enhanced. The justification for reliability and validity in relation to your choices are well founded.  | See Good. And: You use other forms of validity in your method besides the classical definitions (internal and construct validity), such as, for example, dialogic validity or democratic validity.  |
| coherence / consistency | Looking at your research as a whole, there is no logical red line from research question to conclusions. That is, several parts are out of order: 1) main and sub-questions do not fit together, 2) it is not clear what mechanisms the intervention sets in motion to achieve a certain outcome, 3) the chosen research design does not fit your question, 4) your methods of data collection are not a reliable and valid measurement of the concepts in your research question, 5) your results are not logical given your methods of data collection or 6) your conclusions are not appropriate to your question and results.  | Looking at your research as a whole, there are still minor inconsistencies here and there, but overall the logical red line from research question to conclusions is clear. | Looking at your research, the logical red line from research question to conclusions is clear and consistent.  | If at good, but you show this in the context of a more complex research than we normally see in master's students.  |
| Adhering to the code of conduct of practice-based research HBO | The research shows that you do not or hardly adhere to the code of conduct of practice-based research HBO. Examples of principles include acting respectfully, carefully and with integrity towards respondents and stakeholders and justifying choices and behaviour in your research. | The research shows that you adhere to the code of conduct of practice-based research HBO. But you only do so on one or a few principles of this code of conduct.  | The examination shows that you adhere to the code of conduct of practice-based research HBO. You do so on several principles of this code of conduct.  | The examination shows that you fully adhere to the code of conduct of practice-based research HBO. U |
|  | Unsatisfactory (<5.5) | Satisfactory (5.5-7.0) | Good (7.0-8.5) | Excellent (8.5-10.0) |
| Notes on assessment: |

|  |
| --- |
| **Standard 3: Analysis and results**  |
| Criterion | Insufficient | Sufficient | Good | Excellent |
| proper analysis | From the description of your results, it appears that you have done little or no analysis of the data. | The description of your results shows that you have analysed the data obtained quantitatively and/or qualitatively. However, you have written this down in your results in such a way that the concrete results of your analyses remain unclear. There seems to be some kind of gap between the description of the analysis in the methods and the description of your results.  | The description of your results shows what the concrete results were of the quantitative and/or qualitative analyses you did. This means that in the case of quantitative data, you present the data in a statistically correct and well-organised manner and, in the case of qualitative data, you properly include the reader in the intermediate results (labelling, way of categorising) of the qualitative analysis. This makes it completely transparent how you got from a (data) to b (results).  | You have correctly performed analytical methods that can be called innovative and/or are not very common in practical research by master's students. For quantitative analysis, consider things like correlation and regression, and for qualitative analysis, things like narrative analysis or social networking. |
| efficient, clear and transparent | You describe the results in a chaotic way and/or totally inappropriate to the research question and the chosen design, making it difficult for the reader to get an idea of what exactly the results are.  | You describe the results appropriate to the research question and/or the chosen design (e.g. per case in the case of a case study) so that the reader can easily understand them. This sometimes involves duplicate and/or superfluous information and/or a different method of presentation than is usual in research.  | You describe the results appropriate to the research question and/or the chosen design (e.g. per case in the case of a case study). The description ensures that the reader has a clear overview of the results of the research in an efficient way (not too much, not too little information). In doing so, you have adhered to the standard conventions that apply to quantitative and qualitative research.  | You meet the criteria at well and have been able to describe the results of a complex study with multiple methods of data collection and/or many variables in an efficient and transparent way.  |
|  | Unsatisfactory (<5.5) | Satisfactory (5.5-7.0) | Good (7.0-8.5) | Excellent (8.5-10.0) |
| Notes on assessment: |

|  |
| --- |
| **Standard 4: Conclusion and discussion** |
| Criterion | Insufficient | Sufficient | Good | Excellent |
| logical and appropriate answer | You do not answer or do not fully answer the sub-questions and main question and/or your answer does not follow logically from the results.  | You give a complete answer to the sub-questions and main question, and that answer emerges logically from your results.  | You give an appropriate answer to the sub-questions and main question, and that answer emerges logically from your results. You are able to substantiate your answer with similar results from other research.  | You give an appropriate answer to the research question and that answer emerges logically from your results. You are able to compare your answer with the results of other research and point out any differences.  |
| critical review | You do not critically discuss your answer in the conclusions of your study. | You give sensible comments on the answer you have given to your research questions, but do not yet always know how to link it correctly to the concepts of reliability, construct validity or internal validity.  | You comment on the answer to your research questions in terms of reliability and (construct) validity of your data collection and the internal validity of your entire study. For example, you provide a number of concrete rival explanations for the outcomes of your research. In doing so, you apply the concepts of reliability, construct validity and internal validity appropriately.  | If at good, but your work stands out because you manage to make critical comments on both reliability and validity of data collection and internal validity without completely undermining the value of your research. You name alternative approaches for when the study would be repeated again.  |
| transferabilityand usability | You give no description of how your results/interventions be useful in other contexts and/or makes no proposals for adjustments to your intervention(s) to in response to the results.  | You give a description of how your results/interventions are usable in other contexts and what adjustments need to be made to the intervention to make it more usable. In doing so, you pay no attention to any differences between your context and others.  | You give a description of how your results/interventions are usable in other contexts and what adjustments need to be made to the intervention to make it more usable. You pay attention to what is specific to your context and might be different in other contexts.  | You give a description of how your results/interventions are usable in other contexts and what adjustments need to be made to the intervention to make it more usable. You pay attention to what is specific to your context and might be different in other contexts. You also describe which adaptations can be made to make your results applicable in other contexts.  |
| professional development | You hardly address the value your research has for your professional development as a teacher.  | You describe what professional development you experienced as a teacher by doing the research but still do so in too global terms.  | You describe, using some concrete examples, the professional development you have experienced as a teacher by doing the research.  | Using a number of concrete examples, you describe the professional development you have experienced as a teacher by doing the research and, in doing so, you have also demonstrably stimulated the professional development of colleagues.  |
|  | Unsatisfactory (<5.5) | Satisfactory (5.5-7.0) | Good (7.0-8.5) | Excellent (8.5-10.0) |
| Notes on assessment: |

|  |
| --- |
| **Standard 5: Academic writing**  |
| Criterion | Insufficient | Sufficient | Good | Excellent |
| Language proficiency | Your text is difficult to read and not well understood because it does not conform to the standard conventions for layout and paragraph arrangement in a research paper. Word usage is insufficiently appropriate for a research paper. Errors in grammar hinder comprehension of the text. Errors in spelling and punctuation are numerous.  | You have produced a comprehensible text that complies with standard conventions for layout and paragraph structure (still occasional errors in signal and reference words) in a research paper. In grammar, you make no errors that lead to misunderstandings. Word usage is sufficiently appropriate for a research paper. Spelling and punctuation are largely in order.  | You have produced a comprehensible text that meets the standard conventions for layout and paragraph arrangement (appropriate use of signal and reference words) in a research paper. Word usage is well suited to a research paper. Grammatical errors still occur occasionally. Spelling and punctuation are largely in order. | You have written a text that fully complies with standard conventions for layout and paragraph arrangement in a research paper. Word usage of a research paper has been applied very effectively. Language care (grammar, spelling and punctuation) is error-free.  |
| Academic writing style | Your text is not logically structured and/or not written in a coherent way. This makes the text difficult for the reader to follow. There are many errors in the APA references.  | Your text is logically and generally coherently written and easy for readers (colleagues and educational researchers) to follow. You make occasional errors in your APA references. | Your text is logically and coherently written and not misunderstood by the reader (colleagues and educational researchers). You make no errors in your APA references. Your text demonstrates a degree of academic complexity. | Your research paper is concisely written and unambiguously clear for the reader to interpret. You have written a text that is at a high level in terms of academic complexity.  |
| clear, traceable and transparent | Your research paper is not easy for the reader to follow. Consequently, the research is not repeatable in similar contexts. | Your research paper is for the reader to follow, but still leaves room for other interpretations which can make repeating your research difficult.  | Your research paper is so easy for readers to follow that they can easily repeat the research in their own context.  | As in well, but you show this in the context of a more complex investigation than we normally see in master's students.  |
|  | Unsatisfactory (<5.5) | Satisfactory (5.5-7.0) | Good (7.0-8.5) | Excellent (8.5-10.0) |
| Notes on assessment: |

|  |
| --- |
| **Standard 6: Reflection**  |
| Criterion | Insufficient | Sufficient | Good | Excellent |
| Appropriate  | You do not justify the choices you make within your plan from the philosophy of science. | You justify the choices you make in your research plan from the perspective of the philosophy of science.  | You identify and describe (in)consistency in your research plan with regard to your scientific-philosophical orientation.  | You identify and describe (in)consistency in your research plan with regard to your scientific-philosophical orientation. You also substantiate this with self-selected literature. |
|  | Unsatisfactory (<5.5) | Satisfactory (5.5-7.0) | Good (7.0-8.5) | Excellent (8.5-10.0) |
| Notes on assessment: |