

The Learning Objectives

The student is able to:

- Search, select, evaluate, and synthesize representative scientific sources for the topic from several perspectives (for example, economic, ethical-environmental, -and health) relevant to the topic;
- apply best practices for conducting methodological searches in the literature review;
- write a comprehensive and balanced, opinionated literature review that deeply explores the issues in the area of study, leading to new insights in academic language;
- clearly define the purpose and objectives of the literature review;
- draw conclusions related to the literature research problem and give recommendations towards new research opportunities, applications and consequences for the field;
- argument a statement using the information from literature, including counter arguments.
- manage the individual learning process, including time management and adequate planning (minimally exceeding allotted time);

Rubric: MSc Literature Review

Student name:

Student number:

Date:

Course code:

Criteria	Levels		Comments and feedback				
	Excellent (10-9)	Good (8)			Satisfactory (7)	Poor (6)	Insufficient (<6)
Content of written report (65%)	Introduction	Offers a strong, clear, and thorough, yet concise, overview of the research problem leading to a specific, clear, and answerable research question. Describes the scientific, practical (engineering) and social relevance and adds a substantial new perspective or insight to the field. The relevance is described excellent from several perspectives (e.g., economic, ethical, environmental, social, medical, health) and technological developments.	Offers a clear, and thorough, yet concise, overview of the research problem leading to a specific, clear, and answerable research question. Describes the scientific (engineering) and social relevance and adds a new perspective or insight to the field. The relevance is described from several perspectives (e.g., economic, ethical, environmental, social, medical, health) and technological developments.	Offers a concise and correct overview of the research problem leading to a specific, clear, and answerable research question. Describes the (engineering) scientific and social relevance. Relevance is described from several perspectives (for example, economic, ethical, environmental, social, health, perspectives) and technological developments, but misses some essential perspectives/developments.	The introduction offers a limited selection of relevant literature, and the research problem misses focus. The research question is unclear.	The introduction does not offer a selection of relevant literature and the research problem misses. The research question is unanswerable/missing.	Final grade
	Literature retrieval/documentation	The report includes all relevant parts of the research field, has excellent focus, is up to date. The review is based on a thorough, well-documented search strategy in scientific papers, book chapters, theses, or patents and it is clearly and thoroughly documented. Any necessary data or tools required to replicate the review are clearly provided.	The report includes relevant parts of the research field, has a good focus, is up to date. The review is based on a thorough, documented search strategy in scientific papers, book chapters, theses, or patents and it is well-documented with appropriate references and citations. However, there may be some minor gaps in the documentation or some tools or data required to replicate the review may not be fully provided.	The report covers relevant parts of the research field with a focus that is sufficient. The review is based on a documented search strategy in scientific papers, book chapters, theses, or patents and it is adequately documented, with appropriate references and citations. However, there may be some gaps in the documentation that make it difficult to fully replicate the review.	The report covers some relevant parts but also lacks main themes. The review is hardly based on a documented search and it is poorly documented, with incomplete or inconsistent references and citations. The documentation may be difficult to follow and may not provide enough information to fully replicate the review.	The report does not cover relevant parts but also lacks main themes. The review is not based on a documented search and it is completely lacking in documentation or references. It is impossible to replicate the review based on the information provided.	
	Body / literature synthesis	The body/literature synthesis is an excellently critical and in-depth ¹ evaluation of the literature, which is technically correct. The interpretation of the literature is convincing, comprehensive and balanced, opinionated that deeply explores the issues in the area of study, leading to new insights.	The body/literature synthesis is a critical and in-depth evaluation of the literature with acceptable technical information. The interpretation of the literature is convincing, comprehensive and balanced, opinionated that deeply explores the issues in the area of study, leading to new insights in academic language	The body/ literature synthesis is a sufficiently critical evaluation of the literature with satisfactory technical information. The interpretation of the literature is convincing, comprehensive and balanced, opinionated and deeply explores the issues in the area of study, leading to new insights.	Incomplete display of the literature. The critical synthesis of information is poorly opinionated and hardly explores issues in the area of study. The technical information is poor.	Absent display of the literature. A critical synthesis of information with an exploration of issues in the area of study is missing, proper technical information is missing.	
	Discussion / conclusions & recommendations/ research plan	The discussion is an excellent critical and in-depth reflection on the findings, integrating the new findings with the current state of (technical) knowledge very well, and corresponds with the research question. The results are discussed in the light of the research problem. Excellent depth of the contribution achieved making use of the existing literature with new insights, new models, and hypotheses discussed. Recommendations are to-the-point and well-linked to the findings; the formulated research plan follows logically and consistently from the given conclusions and recommendations.	The discussion is a critical and in-depth reflection on the findings, integrating the new findings with the current state of (technical) knowledge well, and corresponds with the research question. The results are discussed in the light of the research problem. New insights, new models, and hypotheses are discussed. Recommendations are linked to the findings; the formulated research plan follows logically and consistently from the given conclusions and recommendations.	The discussion is a reflection on the findings and corresponds with the research question but has room for improvement. Integrating new findings with the current state of (technical) knowledge is sufficient. The results are discussed in the light of the research problem. New insights, new models, and hypotheses are discussed. Recommendations are linked to the findings; the formulated research plan follows from the given conclusions and recommendations.	In the discussion, connections with findings from the literature synthesis are hardly made and a link to the research question is not established. New (technical) findings are hardly integrated. Recommendations are absent or trivial. The formulated research plan does not follow logically from the given conclusions and recommendations; the formulated research plan does not follow logically and consistently from the given conclusions and recommendations.	The discussion is missing. The results are not discussed. Recommendations are missing and the formulated research plan does not follow from the given conclusions and recommendations. The discussion, conclusion and recommendations miss an integration of any new findings with the current state of (technical) knowledge.	
	Structure and reasoning	The line of reasoning is easy to follow and supported by the structure and follows the generic literature review structure. Consistently makes well-informed and rational decisions about the content and structure of the writing, showing a high level of critical thinking and self-awareness.	The line of reasoning is clear. The structure supports the legibility of the text and follows the generic literature review structure. Generally, makes well-informed and rational decisions about the content and structure of the writing, demonstrating critical thinking and self-awareness well.	The line of reasoning is mostly clear. The structure supports the legibility of the text and follows the generic literature review structure in a satisfactory manner. Makes informed and rational decisions about the content and structure of the writing but may demonstrate limited critical thinking and self-awareness.	The line of reasoning is unclear, and the paper is badly structured. Makes few well-informed and rational decisions about the content and structure of the writing, demonstrating little critical thinking or self-awareness.	The line of reasoning is absent, and the paper is very badly structured. Makes no well-informed or rational decisions about the content and structure of the writing, showing no critical thinking or self-awareness.	
Citations and reference list	Citations are independently adjusted to the dominant style of the field? and consistent, complete and correct in an academic style. Citations and reference list include all resources cited in the review and corresponds perfectly with the academic annotation-style.	Citations are correct, consistent, and complete and correct in an academic style. Citations and reference list include all resources cited in the review and corresponds well with the academic annotation-style.	Citations in the text are not always in the right place, used consistently and correctly throughout the review. Citations and reference list are properly formatted in an academic annotation-style .	The citations in the text are incorrectly cited. An academic format for citations and the reference list has been used poorly.	The citations in the text are absent or incorrectly cited. An academic format for citations and the reference list has not been used.		
Use of academic language	Proficient use of academic language, the use of English is always consistent in use of either British or American English. The use of (technical) language is scientific, nuanced, logical, and clear. Language errors, spelling mistakes/grammatical errors are exceptionally rare.	Proficient use of academic language, the use of English is mostly consistent in use of either British or American English. The use of (technical) language is mostly scientific, nuanced, logical, and clear. Language errors, spelling mistakes/grammatical errors are rare.	Proficient use of academic language, the use of English is mostly consistent in use of either British or American English. The use of (technical) language is mostly scientific, nuanced, logical, and clear. Only a few language errors, spelling mistakes/grammatical errors.	Advanced use of academic language, the use of English is not consistent in use of either British or American English. The use of (technical) language is not scientific, nuanced, logical, and clear. Regular language errors, spelling mistakes/grammatical errors.	Advanced use of academic language, the use of English is mostly consistent in use of either British or American English. The use of (technical) language is not scientific, nuanced, logical, and clear. A lot of language errors, spelling mistakes/grammatical errors.		
Transferable skills (25%)	Scientific attitude	The student actively raises critical questions and suggestions and integrates suggestions, ideas and solutions of the supervisor, demonstrating flexibility and adaptability to changing research questions, priorities, or sources of information.	The student raises critical questions and suggestions and integrates suggestions, ideas and solutions of the supervisor, demonstrating flexibility and adaptability to changing research questions, priorities, or sources of information.	The student critically reflects on questions and integrates suggestions, ideas and solutions of the supervisor, demonstrating flexibility and adaptability to changing research questions, priorities, or sources of information.	The student is not able to be critical and reflective and relies on supervisor's instructions only.	Supervisor name	
	Management of (individual learning) process	Excellent management of the individual learning process, including time management and adequate planning (not exceeding allotted time). Changes to scope are strongly justified.	Managed the individual learning process well, including time management and adequate planning (not exceeding allotted time). Changes to scope are justified.	Managed the individual learning process satisfactory, including time management and sufficient planning (not exceeding allotted time); changing scope on request examiner.	Managed the individual learning process poorly, including time management and inadequate planning (exceeding allotted time with 1 – 4 days); scope changed poorly after request examiner.		Manage the individual learning process inadequately, including time management and poor, inadequate planning (exceeding allotted time with > 5 days); scope not changed after iterations on request examiner.

¹ The body/ literature synthesis shows integration of a variety of sources (for example, diversity in research methods, domain knowledge, time period).