

## LITERATURE REVIEW ASSESSMENT FORM

Examiners are to circle the relevant achievement level of the candidate on the accompanying criteria. Specific comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's Literature Review are to be made at the bottom of the criteria sheet. Additional sheets with feedback can be attached to the criteria sheet where the issue is not addressed in the criteria provided.

The assessment has been divided into four major components:

*Introduction 50%*

*Hypothesis, Aims and Methods 15%*

*References 20%*

*Presentation 15%*

Note that each component does not contribute equally to the final mark.

Examiners please note the general assessment criteria below when awarding final mark:

- >85 (Hons 1): Work of superior quality in all aspects of the Literature Review, containing clear examples of excellent critical skills and personal insights into research area.
- 75-84 (Hons IIa): Work of very good quality in all aspects of the Literature Review, but showing lesser critical skills and personal insights into research area.
- 65-74(Hons IIb): Good quality in all aspects of the Literature Review but with inadequacies in understanding, critical skills, organisation and presentation.
- 50-64 (Hons III): Adequate quality work with significant deficiencies in understanding, critical skills, organisation and presentation.
- <50 (Fail): No understanding of area or incomprehensible.

**Student:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Mark (%):** \_\_\_\_\_

**Examiner:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Examiners Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

## SUMMARY OF THE LITERATURE REVIEW ASSESSMENT

The literature review should be not more than 3,000 words and as the name implies should give a detailed account of published scientific investigations which are relevant to the project being undertaken. It should contain an introduction, and aims, hypotheses and methods sections. The introduction should identify the limitations of the literature and areas of controversy and assess them critically. It should be adequately referenced with recent and appropriate studies and have clear and logical flow. The aims, hypotheses and methods sections should be between 250-300 words only (*i.e.* approximately a tenth of the literature review). The stated aims should clearly relate to the areas of controversy outlined in the introduction and the hypotheses should also be clear and valid. Methods are to be summarised clearly and concisely and be appropriate and valid for the stated aims. Absolutely no results are to be included in the literature review. The word count for the literature review excludes diagrams, tables etc. which can be used. Penalties will apply for an inability to observe the word limit. The general and referencing style should follow the “School of Medical Sciences Honours Report Instructions to Authors”.

Category	High Hons I (>90%)	Med-Low Hons I (85-90%)	High Hons IIA (80-84%)	Med-Low Hons IIA (75-79%)	Honours IIB (65-74%)	Honours III (50-64%)	Fail (<50%)
<b>Introduction (50%)</b> 3000 words							
Background	Very comprehensive, detailed and focused introduction.	Highly detailed and focused introduction.	Detailed and focused introduction	Detailed introduction.	Some key basic information missing in introduction.	Some key basic information missing in introduction.	Lack of significant detail in introduction.
Critical analysis	Comprehensive critical analysis of strengths and limitations of the literature	Critical analysis of strengths and limitations of the literature	Some critical analysis of strengths and limitations of the literature.	Some critical analysis of strengths and limitations of the literature but mostly descriptive	Limited critical analysis of strengths and limitations of the literature, mostly descriptive	Very limited critical analysis of strengths and limitations of the literature.	No critical analysis of strengths and limitations of the literature presented
<b>Hypothesis Aims and Methods (15%)</b> 250-300 words							
Hypotheses & Aims	Hypotheses and aims clearly outlined and comprehensively justified.	Hypotheses and aims clearly outlined and justified.	Hypotheses and aims outlined and justified.	No clear hypotheses. Aims outlined and justified.	No clear hypotheses. Aims outlined.	No clear hypotheses. Aims not clearly outlined.	No hypotheses or aims apparent.
Methods	Clear and detailed description of proposed experiments. Comprehensively planned and accurately outlined experiments.	Clear and detailed description of proposed experiments. Accurately outlined experiments.	Clear description of experiments, but minor detail lacking. Accurately outlined experiments.	Description of experiments mostly clear, but minor detail lacking. Minor inconsistencies in experimental design.	Description of experiments lacked some major detail. Minor inconsistencies in experimental design.	Description of experiments lacked some major detail. Major inconsistencies in experimental design.	Experiments not described.
	Clear links between hypotheses, aims and methods and literature.	Clear links between hypotheses, aims and methods and literature.	Clear links between hypotheses, aims and methods and literature.	Links between hypotheses, aims and methods and literature.	Links between hypotheses, aims and methods and literature.	No clear links between hypotheses, aims and methods and literature.	No hypotheses, aims or methods
<b>References (20%)</b>							
	Predominant and comprehensive use of primary articles. All articles presented from recent and seminal publications.	Predominant use of primary articles. All articles presented from recent and seminal publications.	Predominant use of primary articles. Most articles presented from recent and seminal publications.	Some over reliance on reviews. Most articles presented from recent and seminal publications	Some over reliance on reviews. Many articles not from recent and seminal publications.	Significant over reliance on reviews. Limited number of recent or seminal articles used.	Use of literature limited to a few articles and reviews. Poor attempt to explore literature.
	Citation style correct and consistent throughout. Reference list completely accurate with no errors.	Citation style correct and consistent. Reference list complete, but a few minor errors.	Citation style consistent. Reference list complete, but many minor errors. Citation style consistent.	Some references inconsistent between text and list with many minor errors. Citation style mostly consistent.	Many references inconsistent between text and list with many minor errors. Citation style incorrect / inconsistent.	Many inconsistencies between text and list. Some major errors. Inappropriate citation style used.	Many references inconsistent between text and list. Many major errors.
<b>Presentation (15%)</b>							
	No grammatical or spelling errors. Professional expression and style used consistently. All figures accurate and informative.	No grammatical or spelling errors. Professional expression and style used. All figures accurate and informative.	No grammatical errors and minor spelling errors. Professional expression and style used. All figures accurate and informative	Minor grammatical errors and minor spelling errors. Professional expression and style used. Most figures accurate and informative.	Minor grammatical errors and minor spelling errors. Professional expression used. Most figures accurate. .	Major grammatical and spelling errors. Professional expression used Numerous errors in figures.	Major grammatical and spelling errors. Language used not professional. Numerous errors in figures.

**Specific Comments –**

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Suggestions:**