

Criteria	Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Needs Improvement
Problem & Significance	Frames the topic with a compelling and nuanced problem. Convincingly establishes the review's critical importance and timeliness.	Clearly identifies the problem or topic. Establishes why the review is significant and necessary for the field.	The problem is stated but its significance is vague or not well-justified.	The problem or topic is missing, trivial, or confusing.
Search & Selection	Details a systematic and rigorous search strategy (e.g., databases, keywords). Inclusion/exclusion criteria are explicit, well-justified, and transparent.	Describes the search strategy and selection criteria. The process is logical and appears rigorous.	Mentions how literature was found, but the process is vague, unsystematic, or key criteria are missing.	No search process is described. Appears to be a "cherry-picked" or convenience sample of literature.
Organization	Organizes the review conceptually/thematically . The structure itself builds the argument and demonstrates a sophisticated understanding of the field.	Organizes the review by clear themes. Avoids organizing by author or in a simple "annotated bibliography" style.	Organization is attempted, but it is superficial or reverts to a study-by-study summary.	No clear organizational structure. Jumps between studies without a guiding logic.

<p>Synthesis vs. Summary</p>	<p>Masterfully synthesizes. Draws connections, highlights key debates, and identifies points of tension or convergence <i>across</i> studies.</p>	<p>Synthesizes, not just summarizes. Compares and contrasts studies to build a coherent picture of the field's knowledge.</p>	<p>Mostly summary. Describes individual studies one after another ("Author A found... Author B found..."). Thematic connections are weak.</p>	<p>Only summary. Simply lists what others have done with no apparent analysis or connection between them.</p>
<p>Critical Analysis</p>	<p>Critically evaluates the literature, assessing methodological strengths/weaknesses and theoretical assumptions of the field.</p>	<p>Provides some critical analysis of the literature, not just taking all findings at face value.</p>	<p>Analysis is absent or superficial. All studies are presented as equally valid or important.</p>	<p>Fails to provide any critical lens on the literature presented.</p>
<p>Implications</p>	<p>Provides insightful and specific implications for future research, theory, policy, or practice that stem directly from the review's findings.</p>	<p>Discusses logical implications and clear directions for future research based on the identified gap(s).</p>	<p>Implications are vague or disconnected from the main body of the review.</p>	<p>No implications or future directions are offered.</p>
<p>Clarity & Delivery</p>	<p>Speaks with clarity and enthusiasm. Pacing is perfect. The "story" of the literature is compelling and easy to follow. Keeps to time allocated.</p>	<p>Speaks clearly and professionally (does not read). Presentation is well-paced, organized, and respects time limits. Keeps to time allocated.</p>	<p>Relies heavily on notes or reads from slides. Delivery is monotone. Pacing is rushed or slow. Feels rushed but keeps to time allocated.</p>	<p>Reads verbatim from a paper. Delivery is unclear, disorganized, and shows a lack of preparation. Does not keep time allocated.</p>

<p>Visual Aids</p>	<p>Slides are professional, minimalist, and visually engaging. They <i>clarify</i> the complex relationships in the literature.</p>	<p>Slides are clear, uncluttered, and professional. They support the talk and are easy to read (accessible font size).</p>	<p>Slides are text-heavy, cluttered, or have distracting design elements.</p>	<p>Slides are unreadable, confusing, or absent.</p>
<p>Scholarly Dialogue (Q&A)</p>	<p>Responds to questions with nuance and confidence, demonstrating mastery of the literature well beyond the presentation slides.</p>	<p>Responds to questions clearly and respectfully. Answers are accurate and thoughtful.</p>	<p>Struggles with questions, appears unsure of the literature, or gives defensive/unclear answers.</p>	<p>Is unable to answer questions or responds unprofessionally.</p>
<p>APA Presentation</p>	<p>All sources are impeccably cited in-text (e.g., author, date). A final reference slide is complete and perfectly formatted. Language adheres to APA principles (e.g., non-biased).</p>	<p>All sources are clearly cited in-text with minor/no errors. A correct reference slide is included. Language is professional.</p>	<p>In-text citations are inconsistent, contain errors, or are sometimes missing. Reference slide is missing or has significant errors.</p>	<p>Ideas are presented without attribution (plagiarism). No in-text citations or reference slide.</p>