LUNDS UNIVERSITET
Medicinska fakulteten

Scoring rubrics for assessment of scientific essays term 5 and term 10

The scoring rubrics below are intended to support assessment of scientific essays in terms 5 and 10. They should also clarify, to students and supervisors, the requirements for passing the essay, the oral presentation and the opposition.

Each criterion will be judged as Passed (P), Residual (R) or Failed (F). R or F may be considered as corresponding to Minor and Major revisions in a peer review when a paper is submitted to a scientific journal. The essay as a whole is considered as Failed if three or more of the criteria marked with CORE receive a Fail (F) at examination or if the student fails to submit and obtain a Pass, within ten (for term 5) / fourteen (for term 10), calendar days after the examination, on all criteria that received R or F.

For the essay as a whole to pass, all criteria must receive a pass.

Title……
……

Author……
……

Supervisor……
……

Assessor……
……

Most recent revision 2021-01-24/MG

ESSAY

Criterion	Fail	Pass T5	Pass T10	T5 P/R/F	T10 P/R/F
1. Title	Too vague. Not representative of the content of the study. Discrepancies between Swedish and English title.	Clearly stated; complete. Representative of the content of the study. Interesting. English and Swedish titles are and corresponding.	Clearly stated; complete. Representative of the content of the study. Interesting. English and Swedish titles are and corresponding.		
2. Abstract (max 300 words)	Missing, too long or too short. The different parts of the abstract are not proportional to each other.	Correct length. Contains background, purpose, methods, results and conclusion in adequate proportions.	Correct length. Contains background, purpose, methods, results and conclusion in adequate proportions. Excellently written, clear and concise.		
3. Background CORE	Missing, too short or with limited relevance to the topic. No references or inadequate references.	Gives a general perspective on the topic supported by adequate number of relevant references.	Gives both a general and an in-depth perspective on the topic, supported by an adequate number of relevant references describing what is known and what is not known.		
4. Purpose	Missing or irrelevant to the topic or unclearly formulated.	Well formulated and relevant to the topic.	Well formulated, highly relevant and well anchored in the background.		
5. Scientific questions or hypothesis CORE	Missing, irrelevant to the topic or inadequately formulated. Unreasonable in relation to the extent of the project. Poorly reflecting the purpose.	Well formulated and reflecting the purpose. Well-defined and reasonable in relation to the extent of the project.	Well formulated and very clearly reflecting the purpose. Well-defined and reasonable in relation to the extent of the project.		

6. Methods **CORE**	Inadequate for answering the scientific questions. Wrongly applied. Description of methods missing or inadequate. Choice or description of methods not sufficiently supported by a suitable number of adequate references. Description of analyses (in applicable cases statistical methods) inadequate.	Adequate for answering the scientific questions. Method correctly applied. Description and choice of methods sufficiently supported by a suitable number of adequate references. Analyses (in applicable cases statistical methods) are clearly described and correctly used.	Adequate for answering the scientific questions. Method correctly applied. Description and well-argued choice of methods sufficiently supported by a suitable number of adequate references. Analyses (in applicable cases statistical methods) are very clearly described and correctly used.		
7. Ethics Ethical permits should not be discussed, as this fall under the responsibility of the supervisor and course leader.	Research ethical considerations are missing, irrelevant for the project or inadequately described	Research ethical considerations relevant for the project are correctly identified and applied, described and discussed under a separate heading. If the project does not require ethical considerations this should be clearly stated.	Research ethical considerations relevant for the project are correctly identified and applied, well described and discussed under a separate heading. If the project does not require ethical considerations this should be clearly stated. Present and future ethical implications are included if applicable.		
8. Results **CORE**	Results not clearly related to scientific questions. Too many or too few results are presented, without specifying which are the main findings. Tables or figures with faults or missing insufficient. For qualitative projects: Quotes missing.	Results based on the scientific questions are clearly presented. Tables and figures contain relevant characteristics of the study. Main results highlighted in tables or figures.	Results based on the scientific questions are clearly structured and presented. Tables and figures contain relevant characteristics of the study. Main results are clearly highlighted in tables or figures. Drop-outs clearly stated. Flowcharts used when applicable.		

9. Discussion CORE	Not relevant to the study or poorly structured. No connection to the results or to previous research. Strengths and weaknesses of the study are not mentioned.	Adequate discussion of the main results in relation to scientific questions and previous research in the field, with references given. Most of the study´s strength and weakness and limitations of the methods are discussed. Adequately structured. Novelty clearly described.	Well written discussion of the main results in relation to scientific questions and previous research in the field, with references given. Most of the study´s strength and weakness, limitations of the methods and potential bias are exhaustively discussed in relation to present knowledge. Excellently structured. Novelty clearly described.		
10. Conclusion	Missing or not clearly related to results or not relevant to scientific questions or purpose.	Concisely states main findings and relates them to scientific questions and purpose. Clarifies importance of the findings. Adequately formulated.	Concisely states main findings and relates them to scientific questions and purpose. Clearly states importance of the findings and their implications in short and long perspectives. Concise and well formulated.		
11. References (formalia)	Missing, irrelevant, too basic or poorly organized references.	Relevant references, mainly scientific papers, used and referred to properly. All references in correct order and in the same format. The numbers of references in the different sections are in parity with the extent and depth of the project.	Relevant references, mainly scientific papers, used and referred to properly. All references in correct order and in the same format. The numbers of references in the different sections are in parity with the extent and depth of the project.		
12. Popular science abstract in Swedish	Missing or irrelevant. Scientific or medical terms that may be unknown to the public are used.	Relevant, clear and easy to grasp, using terminology understandable to lay people.	Relevant, clear and easy to grasp, using terminology understandable to lay people. Markedly interesting.		
13. Structure and language CORE	Unstructured overall impression, inaccurate use of specialist terminology or a grammatically incorrect language management.	Written in a structured way, correct use of specialist terminology; grammatically correct language management,	Written in a well-structured way with a good flow between the different parts of the essay, correct use of specialist		

	Inaccurate choice of Swedish/English in relation to syllabus.	correct language in relation to syllabus.	terminology; grammatically correct language management, correct language in relation to syllabus. Tables and figures must be readable without the main text		
14. Declaration of own contribution	The declaration of the student´s own specific contribution is missing, is incomplete or difficult to understand.	The declaration of the student´s own specific contribution is adequate, concise and easy to understand.	The declaration of the student´s own specific contribution is adequate, concise and easy to understand.		
15. Control of plagiarism	High degree of overlap with previously published texts, which cannot be motivated.	Minor or reasonable degree of overlap with previously published texts, which can the student can motivate.	Minor or reasonable degree of overlap with previously published texts, which can the student can motivate and discuss.		

ORAL PRESENTATION

The assessor will judge the student's oral presentation and defense of the project. To pass the oral presentation and the defense, the requirements below have to be fulfilled. The score is Passed (P) or Failed (F). The final assessment has to be in line with the scoring rubrics.

	Failed	**Passed T5**	**P/F**	**Passed T10**	**P/F**
Oral presentation	Not meeting the criteria	• Stating the problem; verbally expressing the purpose and aim of the research • Theoretical background; motivating the chosen method • Analysis; knowledge about the results, the strengths and weaknesses • Conclusion; relating the findings to the problem and highlighting the central aspects in the presentation • A common thread running through the presentation and the essay • Generalization; the results have to be placed in a wider perspective • Reflection; self-critical, discussion about future studies • Defense; a constructive and objective stance		• Stating the problem; verbally expressing the purpose and aim of the research • Theoretical background; motivating the chosen method • Analysis; knowledge about the results, the strengths and weaknesses • Conclusion; relating the findings to the problem and highlighting the central aspects in the presentation • A common thread running through the presentation and the essay • Generalization; the results have to be placed in a wider perspective • Reflection; self-critical, discussion about future studies • Defense; a constructive and objective stance	

OPPOSITION

The assessor will judge the student's opposition of another student's essay. The score is Passed (P) or Failed (F). To pass the opposition the requirements below have to be fulfilled.

	Failed	**Passed T5**	**P/F**	**Passed T10**	**P/F**
Oral presentation	Not meeting the criteria	• The opposition; the student has to be prepared (read and analyzed the work) and criticize in a constructive and objective way • Questions; the student has prepared a number of questions/claims (5-8) concerning the actual work based on the opposition • Presentation; the questions are presented clearly to the respondent • Analysis; discussion about strengths and weaknesses with the respondent • Feedback; giving the final criticism, positive and negative • A common thread running through the opposition		• The opposition; the student has to be prepared (read and analyzed the work) and criticize in a constructive and objective way • Questions; the student has prepared a number of questions/claims (5-8) concerning the actual work based on the opposition, using PowerPoint or corresponding • Presentation; the questions are presented clearly to the respondent • Analysis; discussion about strengths and weaknesses with the respondent • Feedback; giving the final criticism, positive and negative • A common thread running through the opposition	