**CMHP Project Award Marking Criteria**

Marker:

Title:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Abstract** | **0-3** | **4** | **5** | MARK |
| No abstract provided or so poorly constructed that it is without merit. Key findings not identified. No implications drawn from the findings. | Summarizes research but fails to emphasize key findings or prioritization of key findings could be improved. Attempts to highlight implications of research. | Fully summarizes research so as to be comprehensible by an external reader. Identifies key findings, includes actual numerical data from findings (if appropriate) and draws insightful implications of the research. |  |
| **Background/ Introduction**  | **0-3** | **4** | **5** |  |
| Fails to identify many of the important previous research papers or policy documents/ reports. No explanation of why topic is a worthy research area. Aims and objectives not stated or bear little relevance to the introduction. | Identifies some key research but little critical evaluation. Makes a case as to why this is a worthy research area. Aims and objectives could be better linked to background.  | Identifies most or all key research and critically evaluates papers. Clearly states why this is an important research area. Logically leads up to need for research in the area and aims and objectives.  |
| **Method** | **0-3** | **4-6** | **7-10** |  |
| Method not clear with process incomplete or vague. Little discussion of why the methods used were chosen. Reader struggles to follow what was done. Little or no attention to analysis method or ethical issues. | Method described but incomplete, difficult to follow or may be poorly articulated. Some attention given to how or why the methods used were chosen but minor gaps or inaccuracies. Incomplete attention to analysis methods and ethical issues. | Thorough, step-wise description of Methods so the reader is able to follow process. Describes the reason for the method(s) chosen, how research tools were developed, who was sampled (inclusion and exclusion criteria), any pilot studies, how data will be analysed and any other relevant information. Demonstrates a thorough understanding of the ethical issues. |
| **Results and Presentation of Data** | **0-5** | **6-10** | **11-15** |  |
| Very poorly done. Large omissions and inappropriate presentation methods used. No appendices or incomplete presentation.  | Poorly describes response rate and characteristics or respondents or errors in doing so. Summarizes project findings but with some major errors or is very difficult to follow. Does not attempt to differentiate between important findings and less significant findings. May be errors or omissions in use of appropriate appendices/ work. | Fully describes response rate and characteristics of respondents if appropriate. Summarizes project findings in a clear and coherent manner. Differentiates between important findings and less significant findings. Attaches and refers to appropriate appendices. |
| **Discussion** | **0-5** | **6 -10** | **11-15** |  |
| No or little mention of the limitations of the data collection method. Superficial discussion of the findings and little or no mention of the relevant literature and the aims / objectives. Fails to explain how the findings are relevant for pharmacy practice and health care. | Mentions some of the limitations of the research but gaps or poorly articulated. Some discussion of the findings and relevant literature and linking to the aims / objectives but could be more thorough. Some attempt to explain the relevance of the research findings to practice but not fully elaborated. | Recognizes the limitations of the research which are well articulated. In-depth discussion of the important findings in relation to the relevant literature and the aims / objectives. Thoroughly explains the project findings’ relevance for pharmacy practice and health care.  |
| **Structure & Style** | **1 to 5** |  |
| For the highest marks, projects will be written in a coherent and logical manner, with excellent structure of sentences and no (or very few) errors in spelling or grammar. Formatting and presentation will be of a publishable standard. |
| **Total/55** |  |
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