



**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) [1-10] (Refer to rubric)</b>	<b>Marks (W*S)</b>
<b>1. Mind map/Diagram/Table</b> (Identify problems/issues/opportunities)	2		
<b>2. List of References</b> (Knowledge of the field/sources)	4		
<b>3. 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)
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 level.</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>
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 seminal 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 seminal 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 seminal 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 seminal sources.</li> <li>Misinterprets sources.</li> </ul>
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>