|  |
| --- |
| **Standard 1: Identification and description of a relevant issue (entire research report)** |
| Criterion | **Unsatisfactory** | **Satisfactory** | **Good**  | **Excellent** |
| *Feasible* | One of the following issues is present in your report: * Your problem description incorporates a possible solution path.
* Your described problem or selected aspect of the problem presents does not present sufficient opportunities for personal intervention or is too extensive to be resolved using the means at your disposal within your context.
* The problem is difficult to research in terms of time and money.
* It is impossible to research the problem within the context of further applied research due to ineffective delineation.
 | While in principle, it should be possible to research your chosen problem within the given context and time, for it to be a truly feasible object of study, you will need to delineate it a bit more precisely before starting on your research plan. And/or the way in which you have influence or could be able to intervene still requires further attention. This matter can be resolved and you have demonstrated an awareness of your position in this context.  | You have effectively described your problem. As a result you will be able to successfully research it during the remainder of the applied research courses. You have sufficient personal influence to effectively intervene in practice. Your school demonstrably supports you in the execution of your research.  | You have effectively described your problem. As a result, you will be able to successfully research it in the remainder of the applied research courses. You have sufficient personal influence to effectively intervene in practice. A number of your colleagues have been found willing to support you in your research (data collection, designing interventions, etc.). |
| *Relevance* | One of the following issues is present in your report: * The problem should be classified as a learning question rather than something that calls for further research, since the knowledge that you require is already available.
* The problem does not fall within the domain of the first degree professional master’s programme.
* Your research into this issue is not in the interest of your professional practice.
 | Your problem exploration has yielded a description that makes it clear that new knowledge is required to arrive at a solution for the chosen problem. The chosen problem falls within the domain of the first degree professional master’s programme. It immediately becomes clear upon reading your description that researching your chosen problem will contribute to your professional development.  | In addition to the points set out in the Satisfactory column: Your applied research will also demonstrably contribute to the professional development of your immediate colleagues.  | In addition to the points set out in the Good column: You have succeeded in involving your management and direct managers in the process and they demonstrably see your applied research as highly relevant to the school’s overall development.  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Complete* | One of the following issues is present in your report: * You have provided an incomplete context description, so that it is not entirely clear how this problem relates to your own professional practice.
* The different aspects, causes and factors that play a role in the problem are unclear, or your treatment is still too one-sided.
 | You have clearly set out how this problem relates to your own concrete professional practice. In the conclusion of your research report, your problem orientation has yielded a clear description of the different aspects of the problem and the possible causes and factors that contribute to its development. In this context, you have used both the results of both your literature review and data collection and analysis. This still has the character of a list.  | In addition to the points set out in the Satisfactory column: In your conclusion, you are able to connect the results of your data collection and analysis with theoretical aspects, by means of critical argumentation. This allows you to describe to which extent your practice shows comparable or contrasting results to the findings of similar research covered in the literature.  | In addition to the points set out in the Good column: Throughout your report, you demonstrate an ability to critically reflect on the various aspects, possible causes and factors that you have identified.  |
| *Description* | One of the following issues is present in your report: * You have not established a clear connection between your literature review and data collection/analysis, or one of the two has not been worked out in sufficient detail.
* You have not substantiated your decision to choose the specific aspect of the problem that serves as a point of departure for your intervention, or this decision is not a logical outcome of the preceding problem orientation.
 | Based on your context, you have chosen a certain problem aspect that you intend to study further within the applied research courses. You support this decision with both substantive (which aspect truly calls for further study?) and practical (what is feasible?) arguments. Based on this choice, you are able to formulate an initial research question that you can use to proceed with the Applied Research Plan module.  | In addition to the points set out in the Satisfactory column: You have weighed which aspects, causes and factors are more or less relevant than others. | In addition to the points set out in the Good column: You have demonstrably succeeded in getting colleagues within your school on board as stakeholders in and contributors to your selection process and/or you have conferred with the school management about your selection.  |
|  | Unsatisfactory (<5.5) | Satisfactory (5.5-7.0) | Good (7.0-8.5) | Excellent (8.5-10.0) |
| Possible notes to the assessment: |

|  |
| --- |
| **Standard 2: Theoretical framework (Literature review)** |
| Criterion | **Unsatisfactory** | **Satisfactory** | **Good** | **Excellent** |
| *In line with the problem* | One of the following issues is present in your theoretical framework: * The framework does not offer a survey of the different aspects of the problem and/or the possible causes or factors that have played a role in its development, or this survey is unclear.
* Concepts that play a role in your problem have not been supported with definitions from theory.
* The framework does not give a clear survey of the theoretical domain in which your problem could be placed.
 | Your theoretical framework provides insight into the theoretical domain that your problem can be placed; based on theory, you have given a survey of the different aspects of the problem and factors that have played a role in its development. The key concepts and terms involved in your problem have been defined with the aid of theory.  | In addition to the points set out in the Satisfactory column: You offer different definitions for the concepts involved in your problem and use them to arrive at a substantiated choice and/or you offer your own definition as a complement to the information from your sources.  | In addition to the points set out in the Good column: You offer extensive critical reflection on the theoretical domain that your problem can be placed in.  |
| *Relevance and reliability of the consulted literature* | Your theoretical framework does not include the key theory or core literature published in the field of your problem and/or your theoretical framework relies too heavily on less relevant sources. | Your bibliography consists of reliable and relevant publications that include the most obvious core literature for your selected problem. The bibliography shows some variety in the list of consulted sources.  | Your bibliography consists of reliable and relevant core literature for your selected problem. You have used a range of different sources to define or describe matters.  | In addition to the core literature, your bibliography includes less familiar sources that are of clear added value to your problem orientation. You use research and theory from a variety of sources to define or describe different matters.  |
| *Standard of the consulted literature* | You have not made use of original, credible sources and/or you have not made use of international and/or scientific literature.  | You have generally made use of original sources. Besides referring to the professional literature, you have also made use of scientific articles. In addition to Dutch-language literature, you have also made use of international articles.  | Wherever possible, you have referred to the original source. In your use of scientific and/or international literature, you demonstrate an ability to clearly assess when this is necessary for and relevant to your problem orientation.  | In addition to the points set out in the Good column: you are able to effectively paraphrase and integrate your sources in a professional manner.  |
|  | Unsatisfactory (<5.5) | Satisfactory (5.5-7.0) | Good (7.0-8.5) | Excellent (8.5-10.0) |
| Possible notes to the assessment: |

|  |
| --- |
| **Standard 3: Methods and Results (research question, methods, results and conclusion)** |
| Criterion | **Unsatisfactory** | **Satisfactory** | **Good** | **Excellent** |  |
| *Quality of the research question* | One of the following issues is present in your report: * Your research question does not go into the aspects and causes of a problem, but into possible interventions and solutions.
* You did not phrase your question precisely enough, so that it remains unclear which matters you intend to research exactly.
* You sub-questions aren’t sufficiently relevant to your main question.
 | You have formulated a descriptive, exploratory question that assigns key importance to the causes and factors that play a role in your chosen problem. This question has been formulated precisely enough: it is clear whom and what will be researched. Your sub-questions are relevant to your main question but do not completely cover its key aspects.  | In addition to the points set out in the Satisfactory column: your sub-questions cover the key aspects of your main question and form points of departure for the constituent studies that are required to answer your main question.  | Same as set out in the Good column.  |  |
| *Participation of stakeholders* | You have not taken the diversity of perspectives of the different stakeholders within your problem into account.  | You have taken account of the diversity of stakeholders (>1) by involving them in your study as respondents – researching their perspectives on the problem.  | In addition to the point set out in the Satisfactory column: You have taken account of the diversity of stakeholders by discussing your research findings with them and adapting or expanding your research where required.  | You give the stakeholders a say in how the orientation research is structured and/or which aspects of the problem are particularly important in their view.  |  |
| *Transparency and substantiation of the research approach* | One of the following issues is present in your report: * You have not provided a complete description of your research approach. As a result, your research cannot be replicated by another researcher.
* You have not substantiated your chosen approach with relevant literature.
 | You have provided a complete description of your research approach (respondents, data collection methods, use of measuring instruments, analysis). As a result, your research can be replicated on the basis of this description. Most of the choices within your approach are supported with the relevant literature.  | In addition to the points set out in the Satisfactory column: You systematically justify all your choices with the aid of relevant literature. | In addition to the point set out in the Good column: In many cases, you weigh your options when presenting your choice and justify your considerations with the aid of relevant literature.  |  |
| *Effectiveness of research approach* | One of the following issues is present in your methods: * The data collection methods do not suit the function and nature of your research question.
* The data analysis method does not suit the type of data that you have collected.
* You have not provided an ethical justification for your approach.
* You have incorrectly collected or analysed the data.
 | Your chosen data collection methods suit the function and nature of your research question and your method of analysis also suits the type of data. Your chosen approach is ethically justified. You have correctly executed the required data collection and analysis. There are a few points of criticism that can be made regarding the reliability and validity of the set-up and measurements, but you actually reflect on these points in your conclusion.  | In addition to the points set out in the Satisfactory column: In your research approach, you have taken a number of initiatives to increase the reliability and validity of the answers to your research question: by making use of triangulation, for example, or existing validated measuring instruments.  | In addition to the points set out in the Good column: There are exceptionally few points of criticism that could be made with respect to the reliability and validity of your completed research.  |  |
|  | Unsatisfactory (<5.5) | Satisfactory (5.5-7.0) | Good (7.0-8.5) | Excellent (8.5-10.0) |  |
| Possible notes to the assessment: |

|  |
| --- |
| **Standard 4: Writing according to academic standards** |
| Criterion | **Unsatisfactory** | **Satisfactory** | **Good** | **Excellent** |
| *Language use* | Your text is difficult to read and understand due to poor use of language. | You have produced a text that can be read and understood and that conforms to the standard conventions regarding lay-out and structuring into sections within a research report. You have not made any grammar mistakes that could lead to misunderstandings. Spelling and punctuation are reasonably correct but may reflect influences from a different mother tongue.  | In addition to the points set out in the Satisfactory column: Language mistakes are rare and difficult to spot. | In terms of complexity, you have produced a higher quality text than your fellow students, in which your use of language is more or less free of mistakes.  |
| *Original train of thought* | You are unable to convey your original train of thought in a coherent and well-structured text. For example: your theoretical framework consists of unconnected summaries from a range of different sources. | You have written a logical and coherent report, in which you have managed to adequately convey your train of thought. It is a flowing, effectively structured text in which you have generally succeeded in correctly substantiating your statements with source references.  | You have written a logical and coherent report, in which you have managed to adequately convey your train of thought. It is a flowing, effectively structured text in which you present a variety of considerations that are easy to understand for the reader. You have succeeded in correctly substantiating your statements with the aid of source references.  | In addition to the points set out in the Good column: In terms of complexity, the text you have produced is of a higher quality than that submitted by your fellow students, yet it remains logical and coherent throughout. |
| *Academic writing* | The text of your research report does not deal with one of the following matters: * The text does not strike the right balance between formal and informal use of language – making it difficult for colleagues to understand your report or feel assured that it is satisfactorily objective.
* You have not correctly adhered to the required APA Style in your citations, paraphrases and bibliography.
* The description of your results is too extensive, contains too much raw data or makes incorrect use of diagrams, charts and/or statistics.
 | Your text conforms to the desired style for a report on a practice-based research; the text is easy to read and understand for both your colleagues and fellow educational researchers. You only incidentally make mistakes in your APA references or structural mistakes in non-essential APA elements. Using charts, diagrams and, where required, statistics, you have succeeded in presenting your findings so that the reader can quickly identify the key results.  | Your text conforms to the desired style for a report on a practice-based research; the text is easy to read and understand for both your colleagues and fellow educational researchers. You have not made any mistakes in your APA references. Using charts, diagrams and, where required, statistics, you have succeeded in presenting your findings so that the reader can quickly and efficiently identify the key results. | In addition to the points set out in the Good column: you have succeeded in producing a concise and informative report with no superfluous information.  |
|  | Unsatisfactory (<5.5) | Satisfactory (5.5-7.0) | Good (7.0-8.5) | Excellent (8.5-10.0) |
| Possible notes to the assessment: |

|  |
| --- |
| **Standard 5: Reflection on research and the philosophy of science** |
| Criterion | **Unsatisfactory** | **Satisfactory** | **Good** | **Excellent** |
| *Self-awareness* | Your reflective section does not demonstrate satisfactory insight into your personal views on when something can be considered true research and when something is evident. Or you have demonstrated insufficient awareness of the existence of multiple perspectives when answering the question whether something can be considered ‘research’.  | You have described the differences and similarities between various types of research as it relates to educational practice. In this context, you have offered your personal views on when something can be considered true research and when something is evident. | In addition to the points set out in the Satisfactory column:In your reflection, you have described the development of your personal perspectives in terms of scientific philosophy and which impact this degree programme has had on you so far. You are also able to describe how perspectives on research within your own classroom subject have influenced your personal views on what makes ‘true’ research.  | In addition to the points set out in the Good column: You have provided a substantiated opinion on the various perspectives on research within your own classroom subject as well as the various perspectives on applied research in educational practice.  |
| *Connection with given sources* | In you reflective section, you have not drawn a connection between your own views and the given sources on the philosophy of science.  | You have succeeded in phrasing your own views, the various perspectives on research within your own classroom subject and the various perspectives on applied research in educational practice in terms of the various movements within the philosophy of science that are dealt with in the literature.  | In addition to the points set out in the Satisfactory column: You have effectively compared and combined the various movements within the philosophy of science that are discussed in the suggested literature.  | In addition to the points set out in the Good column: You have made satisfactory and correct use of other theoretical structures relating to the philosophy of science or other sources in addition to those found in the suggested literature.  |
|  | Unsatisfactory (<5.5) | Satisfactory (5.5-7.0) | Good (7.0-8.5) | Excellent (8.5-10.0) |
| Possible notes to the assessment: |