|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Quality of introduction**  **5 points** | Introduction is excellent. Presents a well thought out and articulate introduction that engages the reader with a clearly defined topic. Provides a concise and clear overview of relevant background information. Provides a logical and succinct description of the scope of the review. | Presents an articulate introduction that engages the reader with a clearly defined topic. Provides a concise and clear overview of relevant background information. Provides a logical and succinct description of the scope of the review. | An introduction that adequately describes the content and scope of the review. Provides adequate background information but may be lacking conciseness and review direction. | Introduction that describes the content and scope of the review. Provides some background information but may be lacking in detail and depth. | Superficial or unclear description of topic. Poor outline of the content and scope of the review. Lacks the essential background information needed to put the study into context. Length may be inappropriate (too long or too short). |
| **Topic comprehension and content**  **50 points** |  |  |  |  |  |
| The review is excellent, providing a comprehensive coverage of the topic. Strongly articulates the main influencing factors and impacts of the issue. Thoroughly identifies and discusses valid solution/s to the chosen issue. Interprets the results of all sources to develop a logical analysis of the issue. Content is all highly relevant, indicates synthesis of ideas, in-depth and critical analysis and evidence original thought. | The review is strong, providing a good coverage of the topic. Identifies the main influencing factors and impacts of the issue. Discusses valid solution/s to the chosen issue. Strong attempt at discussing the issues. Content is relevant. Has made some attempt to indicates synthesis of ideas, critical analysis and evidence original thought. | The review provides an adequate coverage of the topic. Articulates the main influencing factors and impacts of the issue. Discusses valid solution/s to the chosen issue. Good attempt at discussing the issues. Content is mostly relevant. Has made some attempt to present a synthesis of ideas, critical analysis and provides some evidence original thought. | The review provides limited understanding of the topic. Poorly articulates the main factors influencing the chosen issue. Poorly identifies (or fails to identify) some valid solutions to the chosen issue. Poor attempt at discussing the issues. Limited attempt to interpret and analyse the data. Content is questionable. | Fails to provide any links between the reference material and the topic. Discussion shows no understanding of the topic |
| Quality of conclusion  5 points |  |  |  |  |  |
| Conclusion is excellent. Presents a well thought out and articulate conclusion that provides a succinct, articulate and convincing summary of the topic/issues discussed. Confidently outlines gaps in knowledge or evidence. Implications of main findings on future research are clearly and adequately identified and are logical. | Conclusion provides a convincing summary of the topic/issues discussed. Outlines gaps in knowledge or evidence. Implications of main findings on future research are clearly and adequately identified and are logical. | Presents a conclusion that summarising the topic and has identified some gaps in knowledge. An attempt has been made to articulate the logical implications of main findings on future research but could be clearer. | A conclusion has been attempted. But simply provides a brief summary. | Either no attempt at providing concluding remarks or introduction is simply regurgitated. |
| Quality of written communication  10 points |  |  |  |  |  |
| Communication in the literature review is concise, well structured, engaging and error free. The review is stimulating to read, logically organised. Sentence structure is excellent. Language used is a formal scientific language. Free of grammatical and spelling errors. | Communication in the literature review is good, well structured, easy to follow and mostly error free. Sentence structure is good. Language used is reasonable, mostly formal scientific language. Some minor errors throughout. | Communication in the literature review is basic, not always clear but just provides the information. Sentence structure is poor. Language used is basic and requires improvement. Numerous minor errors throughout. | Communication in the literature review is difficult to follow. Language expression is poor making the review difficult to follow, language and written communication requires improvement. Numerous errors throughout. | Communication in the literature review is difficult to follow. Language expression is poor making the review difficult to follow, language and written communication requires improvement. Many errors throughout. |
| Format consistency & mechanics  10 points |  |  |  |  |  |
| Excellent formatting – consistent use of fonts, numbering, spacing, table/figure numbering. Citations are formatted correctly and consistently. Review has leveraged headings and where appropriate uses subheadings throughout. Review is formatted to 12-point font and 1.5 or double-spaced. Vocabulary is varied, sophisticated and appropriate. | Clear format, easy to follow with consistent formatting including font, line spacing and table/figure numbering. Review has leveraged headings and where appropriate uses subheadings throughout. Review is formatted to 12-point font and 1.5 or double-spaced. Review has leveraged headings and where appropriate uses subheadings throughout. Review is formatted to 12-point font and 1.5 or double-spaced. Vocabulary is varied, and appropriate. | Literature review has a consistent format. Review partially follows the set outline. Review has leveraged headings and where appropriate uses subheadings throughout. Review is formatted to 12-point font and 1.5 or double-spaced. | Literature review has an inconsistent format. Review does not follow the prescribed outline. Review has leveraged headings and where appropriate uses subheadings throughout. Review is formatted to 12-point font and 1.5 or double-spaced. | Literature review has an inconsistent format. Literature review is difficult to follow Review does not follow the set outline. Not attempt to follow guidelines or provide consistent presentation. |