

Literature Review Manuscript

Objective:

Utilize current professional references and develop a well-written cohesive, organized, thorough, and accurate manuscript of appropriate depth and breadth at a knowledge level appropriate for an entry-level dietitian.

To assist with the development of your Literature Review Manuscript, you will develop:

1. Organizational Outline
2. Web Outline
3. Rough Draft

Literature Review Manuscript Components:

1. Author's page (with title)
2. Final Manuscript (10 page minimum)
3. References (24 minimum)
4. *Submit previously graded rough draft again at this time*

A grading rubric with scoring is attached.

- This rubric delineates scoring (points) in each category/element of the manuscript. "Meeting requirements with excellence" means meeting (or a student may elect to exceed) the criteria established to create a well-written research report. Satisfactory means acceptable, but not top level. There are 6 levels of point designation.

Elements: Scale: →	Introduction (10 points)	Body – Content Mechanism Depth (10 points)	Body – Content Depth (30 points)	Body – Breadth/ Content Coverage (10 points)
4 Excellent; Exceeds Requirements at an Exceptional Level	Content includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear overview of main ideas or thesis • Supporting statistics • Background information Content is relevant and accurate and captures interest of reader.	Supporting content coverage of mechanism(s) is(are) in appropriate depth and detail. Thus as appropriate, the biological, biochemical, physiological, and/or psychological (may include educational psychology or learning) mechanisms are discussed in depth and detail. Results of many relevant research studies are reported. AND As needed, tables are included in the appendix to diagram mechanisms. AND Consistently addresses the appropriate audience (i.e., entry-level nutritionist/RD).	Supporting content coverage is in appropriate depth and detail. Results of many relevant research studies are reported. AND As needed, tables are included in the appendix to identify relevant food sources and nutrients. AND Consistently addresses the appropriate audience (i.e., entry-level nutritionist/RD).	Relevant related principles are discussed to provide excellent topic coverage breadth. AND All relevant principles and subtopics included in discussion. For example include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant mechanisms. • Related subtopics. • As appropriate, results of studies in related areas of nutrition (e.g., if you are covering GI education, include results of CV & DM).
3.5 Very Good; Exceeds Requirements	Content includes overview of all relevant main ideas with accurate background information, but some supporting statistics lacking.	Slightly lacking depth/detail about mechanism(s) (1 concept slightly lacking depth (i.e., needing expansion/detail).	Areas/subtopics covered in appropriate depth and level, BUT 1-2 concepts slightly lacking depth (i.e., needing expansion/detail).	Excellent topic coverage and all relevant subtopics included, BUT also includes an unrelated or irrelevant subtopic.
3 Good; Meets Minimal Standards	Content includes overview of most relevant main ideas with accuracy. Most supporting statistics lacking.	Somewhat lacking depth/detail about mechanism(s) (2 concepts slightly lacking depth (i.e., needing expansion/detail).	Areas/subtopics covered in appropriate depth, BUT 3-4 concepts slightly lacking depth. OR Areas/subtopics covered in appropriate depth, BUT 1 area/subtopic significantly lacking depth.	Excellent topic coverage and all relevant subtopics included, BUT also includes 2 unrelated or irrelevant subtopics.
2 Fair; Below Minimal Standard; Does Not Meet Requirements; Revisions Needed; Writing below entry-level nutritionist/RD.	Overview missing most main ideas and/or includes irrelevant information and statistics.	Mechanism significantly lacking depth and/or detail (a lot more expansion/detail needed)	Slightly lacking depth/detail about areas/subtopics (s) as 5-6 concepts slightly lacking depth. OR 3-4 concepts slightly lacking depth AND 1 area/subtopic significantly lacking depth. OR 2 areas/subtopics significantly lacking depth.	Coverage of relevant mechanism(s) discussed, BUT Entirely missing 1 relevant subtopic.
1 Poor; Significantly Below Standards; Needs Substantial Revisions	Overview does not provide introduction of relevant ideas. Statistics may be missing.	Mechanism mentioned, but little to no explanation (detail/depth) provided.	Areas/subtopics significantly lacking depth. > 6 concepts slightly lacking depth. OR >2 areas/subtopics significantly lacking depth.	Lacking coverage of relevant mechanism(s). OR Entirely missing 2 relevant subtopics.
0 Very Substandard or Absent	Introduction missing.	Plagiarism. OR Excessive use of quotations.	Plagiarism. OR Excessive use of quotations.	Entirely missing > 2 relevant subtopics.

Elements: Scale: →	Body – Content Accuracy (10 points)	Flow & Clarity (10 points)	Conclusions and Applications (10 points)	References (10 points)
4 Excellent; Exceeds Requirements at an Exceptional Level	There are no errors of accuracy in content or description, including having no misleading statements and NO writer opinions. Minor errors are confined to 1 sentence; major errors extend into connected sentences or entire paragraph. Errors include unfounded opinions NOTE: Errors of accuracy are often made when the appropriate type of reference isn't utilized, from incomplete research to fully understand concepts. Remember one study does not "prove."	Logical progression of concepts. Within paper and subtopics, ideas proceed from general to specific. AND Transitions within each subtopic tie paragraphs together. AND Writing style is clear and concise (succinct). Does not use bullet points.	Components include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insights to the problem(s) presented in the paper • Appropriate suggestions for solutions to problem. Solutions supported by the evidence provided in the body of the paper. • Explanation/specific recommendations for the role of the nutritionist/RD and/or other health care professionals (or others) in combating problem(s). • Future related research? Conclusions based on evidence presented in body, but may be the educated opinion of the writer. Content is relevant, valid and accurate	Format correct: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sources are cited when specific claims are made and supporting <i>results</i> reported. • Sources are listed on a separate reference page at the end. • Citations and reference page listings adhere to <i>J Amer Diet Assoc</i> format.
3.5 Very Good; Exceeds Requirements	1-2 minor error.	Excellent logical progression with a couple of areas of redundancy. OR Logical progression the majority of the time (slightly "choppy").	Content includes 3 components of essential information, but could use further elaboration. AND Information is accurate and relevant.	1-3 individual errors. NOTE: Errors include improper or lack of citations within the body of the paper, and format (e.g., punctuation, italics, content)
3 Good; Meets Minimal Standards	3 minor errors.	Needs slight reorganization of subtopics, but basic flow from one subtopic to next present. Not all paragraphs within subtitles flow in a natural and logical manner. Occasionally "choppy." May have a few areas of redundancy.	Content missing 2 essential components, AND Information is accurate, valid, and relevant.	4-6 individual errors.
2 Fair; Below Minimal Standard; Does Not Meet Requirements; Revisions Needed; Writing below entry-level nutritionist/RD.	4 minor errors. OR 1 major error.	Needs significant reorganization of subtopics and/or paragraphs (several paragraphs are "choppy") OR Writing overly wordy and somewhat redundant. Sentences may run on. OR Overuse of quotations OR Inappropriate use of bullet points	Content missing 3 essential components, BUT information is accurate, relevant, and valid. OR Information lacks some accuracy, relevancy, or validity. OR conclusions illogical and poorly developed.	7-12 individual errors OR 25-50% of references are newsletters &/or lay magazines &/or questionable web references &/or books (that are not written by author of the theory) OR less than 24 references
1 Poor; Significantly Below Standards; Needs Substantial Revisions	5 minor errors. OR 1 major error and 1-2 minor error	Many sentences do not flow in a logical manner. The paper appears to have little to no direction, with subtopics and paragraphs appearing disjointed.	Content missing > 3 components. OR Application section written like conclusion (reverse of introduction) vs. application OR Gross errors of accuracy or relevancy	13-19 individual errors OR > 50% of references are newsletters &/or lay magazines &/or questionable web references &/or books (that are not written by author of the theory)
0 Very Substandard or Absent	> 5 minor errors. OR > 1 major error. OR 1 major error with > 2 minor error.	Writing is too convoluted to know what is trying to be expressed.	Application section missing.	> 20 individual errors OR no citations within manuscript. OR no reference pages.

Elements: Scale: →	Grammar, Spelling, Vocabulary Use ¹ and Improvement (25 points)	Separate Author's Page (5 points)	Format of Manuscript (10 points)
4 Excellent; Exceeds Requirements at an Exceptional Level	Use APA format for grammar. Written in 3rd person No more than two individual departures per page from Edited Standard Written English (ESWE): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of active voice when appropriate. • Sentences correct grammatically • Sentences correct mechanically (e.g., mid and end of sentence punctuation, apostrophes, capitalization) • Proper verb forms and tense. Agreement of subject and verb. • Sentence structure varies • Two spaces following periods. • Use of quotation marks correct, if used. • No errors in spelling (a typo counts as a misspelling). • Proper sentence sense (no words omitted, scrambled, or incomprehensible) Grammar, vocabulary use, and spelling errors noted in the first draft have been corrected.²	Includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Title – appropriate content & length • 2-4 key words • Word count for paper • Author name, address, e-mail, phone 	Includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate subtitle use. • 1" margins. • 12 pt. font size for all text, including headers • Consistent Font Style: Times New Roman, Arial, Garamond, or Georgia • Double space. • Page numbers consistent position and font style (with text). • Separate reference page is included in page numbering. • White paper • Paper is appropriate length (10 pages)
3.5 Very Good; Exceeds Requirements	Sentence structure may be too repetitive. Only few distracting errors in sentence mechanics and grammar. 3 avg. departures from ESWE per page.		Margins are 1.25" (BUT final version of manuscript is at least 11 pages)
3 Good; Meets Minimal Standards	Sentence structure may be too repetitive. Several distracting errors in sentence mechanics and grammar. 4 avg. departures from ESWE per page.		
2 Fair; Below Minimal Standard; Does Not Meet Requirements; Revisions Needed; Writing below entry-level nutritionist/RD.	Sentence structure too repetitive. Many distracting errors in sentence mechanics and grammar. Redundancy - student makes comment "as previously stated" in paper. 5-6 avg. departures from ESWE per page. OR Little effort has been made to correct errors in grammar, vocabulary use, and spelling noted in the first draft. ²	Title appropriate in content and/or length, BUT 1 other component missing or in error.	Margins and body text font size are correct, BUT 1-2 other format components missing or in error. OR font size for body text is 13-14 point OR ≤ 10 point OR margins are 1.5"
1 Poor; Significantly Below Standards; Needs Substantial Revisions	Written in 1st person. OR Most of paper in need of revision in terms of sentence structure (grammar and mechanics). 7-8 avg. departures from ESWE per page. OR NO first draft submitted.	2 components missing or in error.	Margins and body text font size are correct, BUT 3-4 other format components missing or in error. OR font size for body text is >14 point OR margins are >1.5"
0 Very Substandard or Absent	Sentence structure (mechanics and grammar) so poor it is difficult to read. >8 avg. departures from ESWE per page.	> 2 components missing or in error. OR Author's page missing.	> 4 other format components missing or in error.

1. From Barbara Walvoord, *Effective Grading: A Tool for Learning and Assessment*. Eds. Barbara E. Walvoord and Virginia Johnson Anderson. San Francisco: Jossey -Bass, 1998.

2. From: Beth Vinkler, Benedictine University

Notes:

The final Literature Review Manuscript Grade is 150 points; 140 points are outlined in the rubric.

The completion and Peer review of the outlines contribute 5 points towards the final Literature Review Manuscript Grade.

The Peer review of the Rough Draft contributes 5 points towards the final Literature Review Manuscript Grade.