**EVALUATION (1650 words in total)**

**No name (just SACE ID) or reference to school**

**SUMMARY (150 words)**

My research project is………..

Processes I used include………………

Main key findings (brief)…………

My outcome is in the form of……………………….

**EXAMPLE**

**QU: What are the effects of Dystonia on immediate family members and how can they be managed?**

My research question was inspired by the need to understand a relatively rare condition which affects the use of muscles called Dystonia. My auntie has this condition and has a lot of trouble explaining dystonia and the effects it has on her immediate family. Dystonia is a neurological movement disorder which can cause twisting, repetitive movements and obscure postures. Many people do not understand dystonia and often confuse it with Parkinson’s disease as was shown in both my interviews and surveys. The key finding of my research was that there was not enough information on Dystonia and this was why I chose to present this information in the form of a letter to a family who had been recently diagnosed.

**E1: EVALUATION OF RESEARCH PROCESSES USED, SPECIFIC TO THE RESEARCH QUESTION (approx. 700 words)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | **B** | **C** | **D** | **E** |
| **INSIGHTFUL EVALUATION** of the research processes, specific to the research question | **CONSIDERED EVALUATION** of the research processes, specific to the research question | **RECOUNT** with some evaluation | **SUPERFICIAL DESCRIPTION** of the research processes used | **ATTEMPTED DESCRIPTION** of the research processes used |

**RESEARCH PROCESS = Something that produces data**

**JUDGEMENTS = Useful, important, not useful, critical, highly valuable, limiting etc**

**In your folio you selected research processes as being appropriate – surveys, websites, interviews, trial and error, articles, practicing/experimenting, blogs, journals, books, etc …………….now you evaluate these!**

**You need to make judgements** about the relative **effectiveness** of the research **processes** used which are **insightful** –and very specific to the research question

To be **insightful** you will need to provide **examples** which will give reasons to support the judgement

* Provide judgements in relation to the depth/quality of the information provided from the research process
* In terms of the **validity** of the processes eg, their level of appropriateness to the specific research question  
  -show a sophisticated understanding of the problematic and context driven specificity of the process with your research question *eg, a government sponsored site may be highly valid/fit for purpose/appropriate to you if looking at issues to do with management of the River Murray, but not valid for a study about perspectives of the residents on the Murray.*
* **Reliability** of the process (or source) for providing accurate, trustworthy information specific to your research question.  
  -consider the source of the information, how it was obtained, the purpose in communicating it (eg, accurate objective information, or biases and selective-to persuade), the level of expertise (how do you know this?)  
  -the extent to which the process is likely to provide trustworthy information and whether or not it did
* Judgements need to be **balanced** consider the positives as well as the limitations of the research processes with respect to depth of information, validity, reliability, bias.
* Concluding judgements are made about which process is more useful and why.  
  -can order your processes in order of usefulness
* Will look at the way ethical processes were followed or not, where relevant.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***PROCESS*** | ***EVALUATION*** |
| *Internet/websites* | *Strengths/Weaknesses* |
| *Interviews* | *Reliability* |
| *Surveys* | *Credibility* |
| *Articles/databases* | *Validity* |
| *Observations* | *Bias* |
| *Trial and error* | *Relevance* |
| *Experiments* | *Useful/Not useful* |
| *Documentaries* | *Ethical appropriateness* |
| *Books* |  |

**EXAMPLE**

**Question: How do you maintain a bicycle for optimum performance and enjoyment with minimal resources?**

Interviewing Jim Pedal from Standish Cycles in Adelaide was a **worthwhile** process as he is co- owner of the shop and has worked in the industry for 17 years making him **credible**. The information he was able to share on removing a bicycle tube safely using a tyre lever was **pivotal** as I was unaware of how quick and easily it could be to remove a tyre without puncturing the tube. The method he provided on tube removal was also **reliable** as I had previously viewed something similar on [www.bikestuff](http://www.bikestuff). Due to his invested interest in the tyre lever tools and products he recommended, as he sold these in his store, I acknowledged his **bias**. I did this by **seeking further product advice** from non-commercial sources such as surveying regular bicycle riders, a majority of whom just used items such as old spoons or other blunt thin metal objects found in most households. A **strength** of the interview process with Jim was that he was actually able to demonstrate the technique and then let me practice while he supervised, rather than watching it on a computer screen alone. Upon returning home I realised I did not have the same tyre lever or the money to invest in one. This was a **challenge** and given my research question focus was to minimise cost I decided to use the tyre lever tools I already had. Further research led me to discover a range of tools that could do the same job that were either free or much cheaper. This was extremely beneficial as although it showed similar technique to Jim, the tools used were what I had available in my shed. This enabled me to keep within my budget and requirements of my research and show a simple and effective method of changing tyres.

**CHIEF ASSESSORS REPORT OF SUCCESSFUL RESPONSES STUDENTS;**

* Gave a general overview of a process and then talked specifically about a source, providing concrete examples of reliability, credibility and bias
* Used a range of qualifiers to differentiate between the levels of usefulness. (highly useful, less useful)
* Used and named specific research sources and provided balanced judgements comprising of both strengths and limitations of the usefulness, value, and reliability of the process, particularly in relation to their research question. In doing so, they showed understanding of how the usefulness of a process may vary, according to what question it is being employed to help answer.
* Provided reasons as to why a process was valid, reliable, or credible.
* Made clear links between the research process and its value to the research and how it contributed to the increase in the student’s knowledge and/or quality of the outcome.
* Clearly distinguished between the terms credible and reliable and did not use them together as though they were one word.

**E2-*****Evaluation of decisions made in response to challenges and/or opportunities specific to the research processes used’***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | **B** | **C** | **D** | **E** |
| **CRITICAL EVALUATION** of decisions made in response to challenges and/or opportunities **specific to the research processes used** | **SOME COMPLEXITY** in evaluation of decisions made in response to challenges and/or opportunities **specific to the research processes used** | **SOME EVALUATION,** with mostly description of decisions made in response to challenge and/or opportunities **specific to the research processes used.** | **BASIC DESCRIPTION** of decisions made in response to challenges and/or opportunities **specific to the research processes used** | **ATTEMPTED DESCRIPTION** of decisions made in response to challenges and/or opportunities **specific to the research processes used** |

***2 or 3 challenges/opportunities in depth***

The challenge/opportunity should be in the context of the research – ability to find appropriate information.

Each challenge/opportunity **must** :

* Identify a challenge and/or opportunity
* Describe the action taken in response to the challenge/opportunity
* Describe and justify ***why*** the action/decision was taken in response to the challenge/opportunity
* Evaluate (good/bad/no difference) giving examples, the effect this action had on the research processes used and on the quality of your research outcome.

**Example**

When conducting my research, **I found that my survey was ineffective** because I only had a sample size of 10. As a result of this, **I decided to approach the Year 10 home group teachers** to distribute my surveys in order to increase my sample size. This approach seemed to be the easiest way to create more reliable information because I had more responses – even though some of the responses were not able to be used because they contained some inappropriate comments. Looking back**, I think this decision to seek more responses was effective** because although I had some inappropriate responses from the younger students, I was able to collect more samples which allowed me to determine that my data was more reliable than it was previously. The reliability is important because **I now have more data to support my suspicion that students would like the school to introduce more healthy foods in the canteen.**

**CHIEF ASSESSORS REPORT OF SUCCESSFUL RESPONSES STUDENTS;**

* Identified a problem that arose, but mostly focused on the decision they made regarding the problem/challenge and based their judgment around the consequences of the decision in light of how well they progressed in their research as a result
* Focused their evaluation primarily on the decisions made and their consequences, rather than just describing the problem or challenge
* Critically weighed up the consequences of the decisions made and how these impacted on their research outcome; whether the decision had a negative or positive impact on their research
* Evaluated rather than recounted their challenges, and recognised the fact that when something goes wrong or not to plan it can open up other (often better) avenues
* Did not consider ‘time management, lack of motivation, wasting time, not doing homework, lack of responses to email, losing USB’s, etc’ as a challenge
* Focused on only a few challenges/opportunities and decisions in detail

**E3-*****Evaluation of the quality of the research outcome***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | **B** | **C** | **D** | **E** |
| **INSIGHTFUL EVALUATION** of the quality of the research outcome | **CONSIDERED EVALUATION** of the quality of the research outcome | **SATISFACTORTY EVALUATION** of the quality of the research outcome | **SUPERFICIAL EVALUATION** of the quality of the research outcome | **ATTEMPTED EVALUATION** of the quality of the research outcome |

**Quality of the research outcome means;**

Justifying the quality of your answer to your research question

Use your research processes to justify the resolution/answer to your question

NOT- discussing the form in which you delivered it eg. Brochure, video, product

**CHIEF ASSESSORS REPORT OF SUCCESSFUL RESPONSES STUDENTS;**

* Provided a realistic rather than an exaggerated evaluation of the quality of the outcome. Eg Do not be afraid to say it was bias/unreliable and why?
* Made it clear how the question was answered and how well it was answered, discussing weaknesses/strengths/limitations etc.
* Provided several reasons for their judgements about the outcomes quality, including value to self and others. They then made balanced comments on the value of outcome to self but did not overestimate its importance to others, showing awareness that their research is not the greatest work on that subject ever undertaken.
* Provided specific discussion on how quality could be improved linking this to processes.
* Discussed how a range of sources backed up their key findings or discussed how some credible source conflicted, therefore showing different views on the question.
* Gave a balanced view as to the quality of the outcome, including evidence produced, conclusions reached, and if they were able to produce new evidence.

**S3-*****Evaluation of the quality of the research outcome***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | **B** | **C** | **D** | **E** |
| **CLEAR AND COHERENT** expression of ideas | **MOSTLY clear and coherent** expression of ideas | **GENERALLY clear** expression of ideas | **BASIC EXPRESSION** expression of ideas | **ATTEMPTED EXPRESSION** expression of ideas |

* Separate the summary from the rest of the evaluation and do not include in final word count
* Set out in a clear logical manner and clearly structured according to the three specific features
* Make good use of vocabulary specific to the question, research processes, and outcome; also appropriately use terminology such as credibility, reliability, validity, and accuracy.
* Logical and easy-to-follow paragraph and sentence structure