







## 2.3 Course learning outcomes (CLO)

## 2.4 Relationship between course and program learning outcomes and assessments

--	--	--





---

### 3.2 Expectations of Students

### 3.3 Attendance requirements

## 4. Course schedule and structure

			<b>0</b>

	<b>P</b>		<b>J</b>	<b>2</b>
	<b>7 P</b>			
	<b>P</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>G</b>	<b>4</b>

**7**





**Learning Outcomes**

- ◁ To clearly define a research question
- ◁ Provide a brief background and rationale for the review
- ◁ Provide an overview of the methods and the hypothesis
- ◁ To synthesize and present data from a critical review of the literature

The Proposal is to be a concise overview of the research topic, rational and relevance to exercise physiology, any hypotheses and any protocols or procedures being used, with a discussion on potential outcomes

**General Assessment Guidelines:**

**Word Count** 1000 to 1500-word limit

	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	<b>Below Average</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Excellent</b>
<b>BACKGROUND</b> Introduction to the area being reviewed	Introduction lacking detail	Minimal Detail given. Some relevant background.	Clear account of the scientific background	Concise and clear account of the scientific background	Very concise and clear account of the scientific background
<b>RATIONALE</b> Aims, why review being done, search strategies, inclusion exclusion criterion	Poor rationale for the review and poor logic	Attempted to give a logical rational but lacks detail	Good rationale provided and sound logic demonstrated	Clear and logical rationale for the review/research area	Very concise, clear and logical rationale for the review/research area
<b>POSSIBLE CLINICAL SIGNIFICANCE</b>  Overview of reviews structure/ area being reviewed with reference to literature	Poor association between the possible clinical significance and the background and review outline  Poor overview of structure seems disjointed with no connections to background and previous studies	Minimal association between the possible clinical significance and the background and review outline  Poor overview of structure, Minimal discussion or relation to previous studies	Association between the possible clinical significance and the background and review outline  Review structure is sound with reference to previous studies	Links between the possible clinical significance and the background and review outline	Very clear links between the possible clinical significance and the background and review outline

# Research Proposal Marking Scheme - Review HESC4551

Student

Date

Examiner

<b>Background</b>	<b>Max. Marks</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory (mark = 0)</b>	<b>Below average (0.5)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (mark = 1.0)</b>	<b>Good (mark = 1.5)</b>	<b>Excellent (mark = 2.0)</b>	<b>Mark</b>
<i>Overview of field:</i>  Clear description of field investigated	= 4						

## Assessment Task 2 *ORAL PRESENTATION*

Of the format **6 minutes** presentation, 2 minutes questions/discussion followed by 2 minutes of Feedback/ direction from the markers

### Learning Outcomes

- < To be able to organise, present and discuss a research topic
- < To generate original scientific illustrations

### Assessment Criteria

Use this to guide your preparation of the presentation. Note that the marking scheme on next page will be used to grade your presentation. Each category will be marked on a sliding scale from 0 to full marks for that division.

Presentation	Unsatisfactory	Below Average	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
<p><i>on</i></p> <p><i>/</i></p> <p><i>t to</i></p>	<p>Selection of articles inappropriate for the assignment (e.g. textbook chapters).</p> <p>No attempt to identify clinical relevance.</p>	<p>Selection of some appropriate articles (original research articles or reviews).</p> <p>Unclear at times, with minimal description of the clinical relevance.</p>	<p>Selection of appropriate articles (original research articles or reviews).</p> <p>Clear and accurate description of the clinical relevance.</p>	<p>Selection of appropriate original research articles.</p> <p>Clear and accurate description of the clinical relevance. Possibly critical thought</p>	





**Literature review Marking Scheme - Review HESC4551**

**Student**

**Date**

**Examiner**

**Background**

<b>Max Marks = 10</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory (mark = 0)</b>	<b>Below average (0.25)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (mark = 1.0)</b>	<b>Good (mark = 1.5)</b>	<b>Excellent (mark = 2.0)</b>
-------------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

### 5.3 Submission of assessment tasks





