ESSAY or LITERATURE REVIEW

Category	10 - 8	7 - 5	4 - 2	1 - 0	Score out of 10	Weighted Score
Abstract - Value 10%	The abstract is an accurate and concise description of the essay/literature review is provided, including introduction, content, discussion and conclusion.	The abstract is a description of the essay/literature review with some information provided on introduction, content, discussion and conclusion but some sections are unclear.	The abstract is a description of the essay/literature review, but it is vague, sometimes unclear or wordy.	The abstract is not a good reflection of the essay/literature review. The abstract is excessively wordy.		0
Introduction - Value 10%	Background information is engaging and leads to a clear purpose/thesis statement. Thesis/ purpose statement on importance of topic is clear and concise. 2-3 main discussion points of essay/literature review are clearly identified in the purpose statement.	Background information leads to a purpose/thesis statement. Thesis/purpose statement on importance of topic is mostly clear. 1-2 main discussion points of essay/literature review are identified in the purpose statement.	Background information is at times unclear or uninteresting. Thesis/purpose statement on importance of topic is vague and could be more clearly articulated. Main discussion points could be more clearly articulated.	Background information is not clearly articulated. Thesis/purpose statement and importance of topic is unidentifiable. Main discussion points are not identified.		0
Content: Method, Description & Discussion - Value 30%	Content shows a large amount of original and creative thought. Method: Concise details are provided about topic/article selections, inclusions/exclusion criteria, search engines etc. Description & Discussion: Provides in-depth details and relevant examples for etiology, pathophysiology and treatment. Subject knowledge is excellent.	Content shows some original thought. Method: Some details are provided about topic/article selections, inclusions/exclusion criteria, search engines etc. Description & Discussion: Provides some essential knowledge for etiology, pathophysiology and treatment. Subject knowledge appears to be good.	Content uses other people's ideas (giving them credit) but little evidence of original thought. Method: Details about topic/article selections, inclusions/exclusion criteria, search engines etc. are occasionally unclear or wordy. Description & Discussion: Information provided does not entirely cover etiology, pathophysiology and treatment.	Content uses other people's ideas and does not give them credit. Content is minimal OR there are several factual errors.		0
Integration and Application - Value 20%	High level thinking skills were used to thoroughly discuss main ideas. Relevant example and/or application to ultrasound practices are logical, relevant and clear.	Main ideas are somewhat discussed to elaborate essay/literature review. Relevant but limited examples of applications to ultrasound practices are included.	Little evidence that higher level critical thinking skills were used in this essay/literature review. Applications to ultrasound practice are included but lack logic, relevant and clarity.	No evidence that higher level thinking skills were used in this project. The main ideas provide no relevant examples or application to ultrasound.		0
Conclusion - Value 10%	A brief summary of main points is highlighted and well articulated.	A brief summary of important content is presented but missing some points.	A summary of the main points is presented but clarity could be enhanced.	A summary of the main points is not clearly presented. Applications to ultrasound practice are absent, irrelevant or unclear.		0
Mechanics & Organization - Value 10%	Paper is well organized using headings or bulleted lists to indicate a clear introduction and thesis, body and conclusion. Sections of the paper flow logically from one to another. No misspellings or grammatical errors.	Paper uses headings or bulleted lists to indicate introduction and thesis, body and conclusion but the overall cohesiveness and flow could be improved. Three or fewer misspellings and/or grammatical errors.	Paper uses some headings or bulleted lists to indicate sections but for the most part lacks consistency. Four to five misspellings and/or grammatical errors.	Paper does not use clear or logical organizational structure, just lots of facts. More than 5 errors in spelling or grammer.		0
Sources - Value 10%	Appropriate and consistent referencing style is used with no errors for all graphics, facts and quotes.	Appropriate and consistent referencing style is used with 1-2 errors for all graphics, facts and quotes.	Inconsistent referencing style is used with multiple errors for all graphics, facts and quotes.	Very little or no source information was collected.		0