|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Excellent** | **Good** | **Fair** | **Needs development** |
| **Abstract**  Brief overview of the proposed literature review, including anticipated contribution to the field.  Briefly outline aims, proposed methodology, significance and expected outcomes. | Clearly and succinctly outlines the scope and focus of the research and methods. Includes relevant information for all elements of the abstract. | Specifies topic; clearly outlines the scope and focus of the research and methods, but some information is missing and/ or significance is unclear. | Attempts to outline the scope and focus of the research and methods, but the information is vague and/ or too broad. There is opportunity to more concisely present the main elements/ overview of the proposed literature review. | Limited or missing abstract with some elements missing, significance unclear, and focus for the research and methods not clearly stated. |
| **Introduction/ Background**  Provide the context and rationale for the proposed literature review.  This includes:   * providing a brief topic overview/ summarise key and relevant literature on the topic * defining key terms * providing a brief overview of current knowledge in the field * indicating the gap(s) in knowledge   Finish this section with **aims, objectives,** **and specific research question(s)** for your proposed literature review.  Include PICO (population, intervention, comparison, and outcomes) if relevant. | Exceptional knowledge and in-depth understanding of the topic area. Presents a logical and persuasive argument that establishes the context of the research and specific research questions.  Convincing arguments to support the research is presented resulting in a well-developed and coherent justification/ significance for the research. | Comprehensive knowledge and depth of understanding of the topic area. Logically establishes the research questions in the context of the knowledge about the broader area/field. Sound justification for research provided and an argument for the significance of the research presented. | Satisfactory knowledge and depth of understanding of the topic area. The research question is partly established in the context of the knowledge about broader area/field. Somewhat clearly presents the topic to be examined and broadly situates topic in relation to existing knowledge base.  Some justification for research provided and significance of the research addressed. | Limited or no knowledge of the topic area. Does not clearly introduce topic to be examined; does not link existing knowledge to specific topic or research questions. No clear justification for research; significance poorly addressed |
| **Methods/ methodology**  Describe how you plan to conduct the literature review.  Explain each step.  Identify search strategy/ parameters (inclusion/ exclusion criteria and rationale, date range, keywords, names of databases/ sources to be searched, etc.)  Describe the process you will use for article selection, screening (title/abstract, then full text), data extraction, and how you plan to analyse/ synthesise the findings from the literature.  Include PRISMA details if relevant.  Describe the way you intend on communicating/ disseminating the findings *(NB: this links to your communication of findings assessment; what you propose in your proposal doesn’t necessarily need to be the final product you develop for your communication of findings assessment, but this is intended to get you to start thinking about how you might do it, and make sure it is appropriate for the audience you are wishing to/ needing to target)* | Exceptional overview of the planned steps that will be taken to conduct the literature review.  Detailed and very clear identification of the proposed: search strategy/ parameters (inclusion/ exclusion criteria and rationale, date range, keywords, names of databases/ sources to be searched, etc.).  Clearly articulates the planned process for article selection, screening, extraction, and synthesis. Clear, logical, and appropriate planned communication/ dissemination of findings described. | Good overview of the planned steps that will be taken to conduct the literature review.  Somewhat detailed and clear identification of: search strategy/ parameters (inclusion/ exclusion criteria and rationale, date range, keywords, names of databases/ sources to be searched, etc.).  Somewhat clearly articulates the planned process for article selection, screening, extraction, and synthesis.  Somewhat clear and logical planned communication/ dissemination of findings described, but reconsider how appropriate it is for the stated audience. | Satisfactory overview of the planned steps that will be taken to conduct the literature review, however, some components are missing.  Satisfactory identification of: search strategy/ parameters (inclusion/ exclusion criteria and rationale, date range, keywords, names of databases/ sources to be searched, etc.).  Attempts to outline the planned process for article selection, screening, extraction, and synthesis, but could be further justified.  States the planned communication/ dissemination of findings, but is too brief and/ or not appropriate for the stated audience. | Limited or no presentation of the planned methods that will be used to conduct the literature review.  Unclear how the review will be conducted independently by the student.  Planned communication/ dissemination of findings is not described or is unclear. |
| **Conclusion**  Briefly restate the aims/ objectives/ research questions; reiterate the gap(s) the scoping review plans to fill and summarise how the scoping review will advance knowledge in the field. | Concisely restates the aims/ objectives/ research questions, and convincingly reiterates the gap(s) the scoping review plans to fill. Well defined summary of how the scoping review will advance knowledge in the field. | Briefly restates the aims/ objectives/ research questions, but could be more concisely presented. Reiterates the gap(s) the scoping review plans to fill, but could be more convincing and/ or explained further. Good summary of how the scoping review will advance knowledge in the field. | Attempts to restate the aims/ objectives/ research questions, but some of it is unclear.  Attempts to reiterate the gap(s) the scoping review plans to fill, but could make stronger links to the research question(s).  States how the scoping review will advance knowledge in the field, but could be more convincing. | Does not restate the aims/ objectives/ research questions, and/ or it is unclear.  Does not reiterate the gap(s) the scoping review plans to fill, and/ or is not relevant nor linked to the research question(s).  Does not convincingly state how the scoping review will advance knowledge in the field. |
| **Timeline**  Present the various stages of your project against a timeline within the scope of your topic and semester. | Very well presented timeline, realistic within the scope. | Good timeline, but some stages of the project may be missing and/ or the timelines may not be realistic within the scope. | Attempts to provide a realistic timeline for the project, but is too brief and/ or may not be within the scope of the topic and semester. | Does not present a timeline and/ or timeline is not appropriate, unrealistic, and out of scope. |
| **Overall presentation and communication**  Organisation/ Structure of paper Writing style  Including accurate spelling and grammar | Excellent professional succinct writing style with appropriate grammar, punctuation, and spelling; Paper is clearly and logically structured. Exceptional use of tables and/or figures and subheadings; Exceptional formatting in line with the assignment instructions | Good succinct writing style throughout with mostly appropriate grammar, punctuation, and spelling; Paper structure is good and mostly well organised. Good use of tables and/or figures and subheadings; Formatting mostly in line with the assignment instructions | Satisfactory writing style but some problems with repetition, grammar, punctuation, or spelling; Attention could be given to effective structure of paper; Some use of tables and/or figures and subheadings; Some errors with formatting | Unacceptable repetitive writing style with numerous errors; No use of tables and/or figures; Inadequate formatting |
| **References**  **APA 7th Referencing style** | Accurate referencing; Reference list is complete and accurate and follows APA conventions accurately.  Intext referencing is consistent with APA conventions. | Mostly accurate referencing; Reference list is mostly complete and accurate, but there are minor errors.  Intext referencing is consistent with APA conventions, but there are minor errors. | Some errors with referencing; Reference list attempts APA conventions, but contains several errors.  Intext references are present consistent with APA conventions, but some information is missing/ inaccurate. | Inadequate referencing; Reference list is missing, incomplete or contains significant errors.  Intext referencing is missing, inappropriate, or not consistent with APA conventions. |