

ED457 Literature Review Rubric

RSD Assessment Criteria	MARKING RUBRIC					
	Level 1. Highly Proficient > 75%		Level 2. Proficient 50 – 74%		Level 3. Limited Proficiency <50%	
Embark & Clarify (10 marks)	Succinct coverage of all parts of the literature review.	(3.75 – 5m)	Some sections poorly developed or lacking.	(2.5 - 3m)	Lacks focus with some inaccuracies and important sections lacking development.	(0 – 2m)
	Well-grounded in Pacific/ home country context.	(3.75 – 5m)	Some contextualization.	(2.5 - 3m)	Little/no contextualization.	(0 – 2m)
Find & Generate (20 marks)	Elicits and fleshes out all/ most key themes & relevant ideas.	(6 – 8m)	Identifies Some relevant ideas or themes.	(4 – 5.5m)	Unrelated/irrelevant information, identification of ideas and themes is disjointed.	(0 – 3.5 m)
	Holistic understanding & ideas coherently linked,	(6 – 8m)	Some areas lack development.	(4 – 5.5m)	Little/no attempt to link/connect ideas.	(0 – 3.5m)
	Comprehensive selection of relevant, credible sources of information.	(3 - 4m)	Heavy reliance on readings, some questionable sources identified.	(2 – 2.5m)	Course materials main source of information; and/or, many questionable sources.	(0 – 1.5m)
Evaluate & Reflect (20 marks)	Good understanding of limitations, strengths and weaknesses of the scope of the literature.	(7.5 – 10m)	Some reference to limitations, strengths and weaknesses	(5 – 7m)	Little/no treatment of limitations, no evidence of understanding of strengths and weaknesses	(0 – 4.5m)
	Critical theoretical analysis of discourse	(3.75 – 5m)	Inconsistent treatment of literature analysis	(2.5 - 3m)	Little/no theoretical analysis	(0 – 2m)
	High level of understanding and critical reflection	(3.75 – 5m)	Marginal understanding with some attempt at reflection	(2.5 - 3m)	Little/no critical reflection.	(0 – 2m)
Organize & Manage (20 marks)	Literature Review is fluid and well linked to main research topic and emergent key ideas	(7.5 – 10m)	Some underdevelopment and fragmentation in ideas/themes.	(5 – 7m)	Little/no development, repetition, long/ short paragraphs and/or main purpose and rationale is unclear and disconnected from research questions.	(0 – 4.5m)
	Evidence of high level concept mapping of topic area and ideas linked cohesively to research questions.	(7.5 – 10m)	Some attempt at concept mapping with some deviation for research scope and focus.	(5 – 7m)	Little/ no apparent sequence or relational value to themes/ ideas.	(0 – 4.5m)
Analyse & Synthesise (20 marks)	Comprehensive analysis of literature selected	(3 - 4m)	Some surface analysis of literature	(2 – 2.5m)	Incomplete, and/or little/no analysis.	(0 – 1.5m)
	Logical reasoning applied to high level analysis/interpretation of the literature.	(6 - 8m)	Limited/Technical analysis and interpretation.	(4 – 5.5m)	Little/no analysis of data, presentation of facts, and/or no interrogation of information.	(0 – 3m)
	Reasoned personal standpoints in summarizing information and making connections between international and Pacific discourse.	(3 – 4m)	Weak positioning of personal/creative synthesis and may or may not make some connections to links between international and Pacific discourse.	(2 – 2.5m)	Little/no personal standpoint and/or connections between international and Pacific discourse.	(0 – 1.5m)
	Synthesis of select discourse analysis shows mapping of potential new knowledge/ ideas.	(3 – 4m)	Some middle range discourse analysis evident with new knowledge/ideas alluded to but not overtly stipulated.	(2 – 2.5m)	Simply summaries select literature with no critical synthesis and has not recognized the potential for the creation of new knowledge/ideas.	(0 – 1.5m)
Communicate & Apply Ethically (10 Marks)	Within word limit. Appropriate/formal academic writing style.	(3 – 4m)	Within word limit but writing style informal/ inconsistent.	(2 – 2.5m)	Ignores word limit and writing style inappropriate.	(0 -1.5m)
	Similarity <23%. Consistent referencing style & proper in-text citation and bibliography.	(2.5 – 3m)	Similarity % may be within range, but inconsistency in referencing & bibliography.	(1.5 - 2m)	Similarity % > 35%. Many referencing/ bibliographical errors, and may not include a bibliography.	(0 -1m)
	Appropriate titles/sub-headings, few errors in grammar, spelling & punctuation.	(2.5 - 3m)	Long/vague subheadings; common grammatical, spelling & punctuation errors.	(1.5 - 2m)	Long, confusing, off-topic headers. Errors in grammar, spelling, and punctuation errors affect the overall flow/quality of the paper.	(0 -1m)

ED457 Literature Review Mark sheet

Assessment Criteria	Scores
Embark & Clarify: Assessment task demonstrates good understanding of question requirements; and, the student's ability to contextualize topic to the wider Pacific & home country. 10 Marks	
Succinct coverage of all parts of the concept paper	/5
Well-grounded in Pacific/ home country context.	/5
Find & Generate: Assessment task shows the student's conceptual understanding of subject area through effective mapping of key ideas/themes and linkages between these; and, ability to access and use a wide range of credible references. 20 Marks	
Elicits and fleshes out all/ most key themes & relevant ideas.	/8
Holistic understanding & ideas coherently linked,	/8
Comprehensive selection of relevant, credible sources of information.	/4
Evaluate & Reflect: Assessment task demonstrates student recognition of the important link between research limitations & holistic treatment of the topic discussion. The high level thinker attempts to address these demonstrating deep learning/ reflective thinking in the quality of discussion. 20 Marks	
Good understanding of limitations, strengths and weaknesses of the scope of the literature.	/10
Critical theoretical analysis of discourse	/5
High level of understanding and critical reflection	/5
Organize & Manage: Assessment task shows the student's ability to translate information into focused, well developed paragraphs. Ideas are succinctly sequence d and student makes effective use of examples, figures and tables. 20 Marks	
Literature Review is fluid and well linked to main research topic and emergent key ideas	/10
Evidence of high level concept mapping of topic area and ideas linked cohesively to research questions.	/10
Analyse & Synthesise: Assessment task includes signposts that indicate analytical skills through effective data analysis & interpretation. There is a clear summary & synthesis of data and new knowledge is generated. 20 Marks	
Comprehensive analysis of literature selected	/4
Logical reasoning applied to high level analysis/interpretation of the literature.	/8
Reasoned personal standpoints in summarizing information and making connections between international and Pacific discourse.	/4
Synthesis of select discourse analysis shows mapping of potential new knowledge/ ideas.	/4
Communicate & Apply Ethically: Assessment task adheres to formal academic format/ presentation & writing style. The Turnitin similarity % is within the acceptable range and there is consistency in referencing and bibliography. Due attention is given to technical aspects. 10 Marks	
Formal academic writing style is adhered to.	/4
Similarity % is within the acceptable range and there is consistency in referencing and bibliographical citations.	/3
Titles and Sub-headings are appropriate. Due attention is given to spelling, grammar and punctuation.	/3
Total score out of 100%	/ 100
Assignment Mark %	/30



Markers Comments:

1. Overall Assessment of task

Excellent
 Very Good
 Good Effort
 Recommendation to seek writing assistance

2. General Comments:

Signature of Marker: _____

Date: _____