



Feedback for RRMP Literature Review Summative

Tutor completing summative feedback: Karen Outram	Student number: 250380
Details of any extensions etc:	Submission Attempt: First submission Second submission

Criteria and weighting	Level	Comments:
Knowledge and understanding of the topic/ issues under consideration (30%)	Satisfactory	There is an abstract introduction, that reflects the context of the intended discussion regarding the Literature review. There are quite a few different disability contexts discussed that are linked to AI solutions. Moving forward, narrow this down and just focus on one aspect of discussion, [and so just one disability linked to AI for example], because unless you are completing a very extensive study with a very high word count, you would not be able to cover all these subjects in sufficient detail. There are too many different contexts being discussed in the Literature Review overall, and this means that there is no real depth in the discussion.
Criticality (30%)	Satisfactory	There is some discussion regarding limitations of research in the conclusion for example, but there is no real explicit discussion regarding the gaps in research to reflect the rationale of why the Literature review is taking place. The content is very descriptive and almost, 'lists' all the concepts and possibilities to assist in the numerous disabilities named, with given solutions, but there is no real depth, debate or comparison happening in the text. Please consider these points when you move forward to your next academic paper, regarding the point of criticality. There are some links regarding theory and practice via real world applicability, but these opportunities are limited in your Literature Review, due to the approach that you have taken to complete it.
Use of relevant sources (20%)	Satisfactory	In the Literature review there should be an explicit mention of the types of research methodologies that are going to be used to develop the Literature review via research. There is a very limited reference list, and in turn very limited in-text citation, and you will need to improve this for your next summative assignment. The content is quite weak from this perspective, and the outcome here only just borders on satisfactory.



Structure and Presentation (as detailed in the assessment guidance) (10%)	Satisfactory	The structure of your presentation is completed to a satisfactory standard. There are several crucial aspects to observe moving forward. The font style should be Arial, you need to double line space your assignment, your reference list needs to be on its own page at the end of your assignment. It is good professional and academic practice to add a cover page to your assignment and a contents page. These aspects were also discussed in our seminars.
Academic integrity (10%)	Satisfactory	Don't use italics in an academic assignments, do just use a standard font. Don't use semi colons instead of full stops or commas. Break sentences off where necessary and then start a new sentence. Proofread your content before final upload to identify any small typos and ensure that all sentences and syntax flow fluidly. Your writing style is formal, but it needs to be more academically fluid and in some cases a little more concise. Some of the content feels 'wordy' and so please do just focus on using word count to say specifically what you need to. Please use more time planning moving forward to reflect upon what the summative assignment is actually asking for, and focus on specifically answering the summative brief. The Literature review is within word count which is good practice.
Overall		
<u>Positives:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Literature Review was handed in on time • The content is within word count • The assignment is completed to a satisfactory standard 		
<u>Points for development:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Literature review reads more like a report • There are too many contexts being discussed and as a result the assignment lacks depths • Not enough research references in evidence • Limited citation as a result of the above • Not enough focus on identifying research gaps • Due to the nature of the way the Literature Review has been written its rationale feels 'sketchy' • Moving forward, please read what the summative brief is actually asking you do, so that the content and context is more appropriate in answer to this. 		