



**F3- LITERATURE REVIEW EVALUATION FORM**

<b>STUDENT NAME</b>		<b>STUDENT ID</b>	
<b>PROGRAM</b>			
<b>SUPERVISOR</b>			
<b>PROJECT TITLE</b>			

<b>Assessment Criteria</b>	<b>Weight (W)</b>	<b>Score (S) [0-10] (Refer to rubric)</b>	<b>Marks (W*S)</b>
<b>Relevance and context</b> (Identify problems/issues/opportunities)	2		
<b>Knowledge of the field/sources</b> (Knowledge of the field/sources)	4		
<b>1. Writing</b> (Summary based on references)	4		
<b>Total</b>			

Lecturer's Name

Signature

Date

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_



**F3 - LITERATURE REVIEW EVALUATION RUBRIC**

No.	Assessment Criteria	Excellent (8-10)	Good (6-7)	Satisfactory (5)	Poor (1-4)	0
1.	<b>Relevance and context</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shows exceptional understanding of project's relevance.</li> <li>• Skillfully aligns the literature with project's context.</li> <li>• Sets in-depth context for the problem.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shows capable understanding of project's relevance.</li> <li>• Makes some associations of the literature with project's context.</li> <li>• Places the problem in context beyond basic leave.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shows limited understanding of project's relevance.</li> <li>• Displays some perspective of project's context.</li> <li>• Sets a basic context for the problem.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not explain project's relevance.</li> <li>• Does not place the project into context of the literature.</li> <li>• Does not set the context for the problem .</li> </ul>	No evidence
2.	<b>Knowledge of the field/sources</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates exceptional depth of knowledge of the field.</li> <li>• Comprehensive use of most recent and relevant sources.</li> <li>• Clearly discriminates among seminal sources.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates proficient knowledge of the field.</li> <li>• Thorough selection of sources pertinent to project.</li> <li>• Shows some discrimination among relevant sources.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates a basic knowledge of the field.</li> <li>• Selected sources relevant to project.</li> <li>• Limited discrimination among relevant sources.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lacks a basic knowledge of the field.</li> <li>• Selected sources irrelevant to project.</li> <li>• Does not discriminate among relevant sources.</li> <li>• Misinterprets sources.</li> </ul>	No evidence
3.	<b>Writing</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exemplary writing quality.</li> <li>• Components are connected in a seamless way.</li> <li>• No grammatical, punctuation, and/or errors.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is well written and coherently organized.</li> <li>• Few grammatical, punctuation, and/or spelling errors.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate writing quality.</li> <li>• Organized but tends to discuss papers in succession.</li> <li>• Several grammatical, punctuation, and/or spelling errors.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Writing is confusing.</li> <li>• Structure is disorganized.</li> <li>• Many grammatical, punctuation, and/or spelling errors.</li> </ul>	No evidence