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# CLASS PARTICIPATION

| Rubric For Participation In Classroom Discussion(from PHMS-702 Methods in Health Services and Outcomes Research v2009.07.08) |
| --- |
| ***Criterion******(weight)*** | ***Assessment of Criterion******(Note: Assigned score within a range is assessment of degree criterion is met.)*** | ***Crit. Score*** | ***Wt.*** | ***Topic Points******(= Crit. Score x Wt.)*** |
| ***Exceeds expectations******(range 9.0-10.0)*** | ***Meets expectations******(range 8.0-8.9)*** | ***Below expectations******(range 7.0-7.9)*** | ***Not acceptable******(range 0.0-6.9)*** |
| ***Integration of reading and exercises into classroom discussions******(4.0)*** | * Often cites from reading
* Uses reading to support points
* Often articulates fit of reading with topic at hand
 | * Occasionally cites from reading
* Sometimes uses reading to support points
* Occasionally articulates fit of reading with topic at hand
 | * Rarely able to cite from reading
* Rarely uses readings to support points
* Rarely articulates fit of readings with topic at hand
 | * Unable to cite from readings
* Unable to use reading to support points
* Unable to articulate fit of readings with topic at hand
 |  | **x4.0** | **=** |
| ***Interaction and participation in classroom discussions******(4.0)*** | * Always a willing participant
* Responds frequently to questions
* Routinely volunteers point of view
 | * Often a willing participant
* Responds occasionally to questions
* Occasionally volunteers point of view
 | * Rarely a willing participant
* Rarely able to respond to questions
* Rarely volunteers point of view
 | * Never a willing participant
* Never able to respond to questions
* Never volunteers point of view
 |  | **x4.0** | **=** |
| ***Demonstration of professional attitude and demeanor******(2.0)*** | * Always demonstrates commitment through thorough preparation
* Always arrives on time
* Often solicits instructor’s perspectives outside class
 | * Rarely unprepared
* Rarely arrives late
* Occasionally solicits instructor’s perspectives outside class
 | * Often unprepared
* Occasionally arrives late
* Rarely solicits instructor’s perspectives outside class
 | * Rarely prepared
* Often arrives late
* Never solicits instructor’s perspectives outside class
 |  | **x2.0** | **=** |
| ***Gross points for participation in classroom discussions (maximum of 100) ∑*** |  |
| ***Weight of participation in classroom discussions in final grade (10%)*** | **x 0.1** |
| ***Point contribution of participation in classroom discussions to final grade (maximum of 10) =*** |  |

| Rubric for Class Participation(from PHST-704 Mixed Effect Models and Longitudinal Data Analysis v2009.03.13) |
| --- |
| ***Criterion*** | ***Exceeds expectations*** | ***Meets expectations*** | ***Below expectations*** | ***Not acceptable*** |
| ***Integration of reading and exercises into classroom discussions******(5% of final grade)*** | * Often cites from reading
* Uses reading to support points

Score: 5% | * Occasionally cites from reading
* Sometimes uses reading to support points

Score: 4% | * Rarely able to cite from reading
* Rarely uses readings to support points

Score: 3% | * Unable to cite from readings
* Unable to use reading to support points

Score: 2% |
| ***Interaction and participation in classroom discussions******(4% of final grade)***  | * Always a willing participant
* Responds frequently to questions
* Routinely volunteers point of view

Score: 4% | * Often a willing participant
* Responds occasionally to questions
* Occasionally volunteers point of view

Score: 3.25% | * Rarely a willing participant
* Rarely able to respond to questions
* Rarely volunteers point of view

Score: 2.5% | * Never a willing participant
* Never able to respond to questions
* Never volunteers point of view

Score: 2% |
| ***Demonstration of professional attitude and demeanor******(1% of final grade)*** | * Always demonstrates commitment through thorough preparation
* Always arrives on time

Score: 1% | * Rarely unprepared
* Rarely arrives late

Score: 0.8% | * Often unprepared
* Occasionally arrives late

Score: 0.6% | * Rarely prepared
* Often arrives late

Score: 0.4% |

| Rubric for Class Participation(from PHPH-630 Geographic Information Systems in Public Health v2008.05.1) |
| --- |
| ***Criterion*** | ***Exceeds expectations*** | ***Meets expectations*** | ***Below expectations*** | ***Not acceptable*** |
| ***Integration of reading and exercises into classroom discussions******(30%)*** | * Often cites from reading
* Uses reading to support points
* Often articulates fit of reading with topic at hand

Points: 60 | * Occasionally cites from reading
* Sometimes uses reading to support points
* Occasionally articulates fit of reading with topic at hand

Points: 45 | * Rarely able to cite from reading
* Rarely uses readings to support points
* Rarely articulates fit of readings with topic at hand

Points: 30 | * Unable to cite from readings
* Unable to use reading to support points
* Unable to articulate fit of readings with topic at hand

Points: 15 |
| ***Interaction and participation in classroom discussions******(30%)***  | * Always a willing participant
* Responds frequently to questions
* Routinely volunteers point of view

Points: 60 | * Often a willing participant
* Responds occasionally to questions
* Occasionally volunteers point of view

Points: 45 | * Rarely a willing participant
* Rarely able to respond to questions
* Rarely volunteers point of view

Points: 30 | * Never a willing participant
* Never able to respond to questions
* Never volunteers point of view

Points: 15 |
| ***Interaction and participation in classroom learning activities******(25%)*** | * Always a willing participant
* Acts appropriately during all discussions
* Responds frequently to questions
* Routinely volunteers point of view

Points: 50 | * Often a willing participant
* Acts appropriately during discussions
* Responds occasionally to questions
* Occasionally volunteers point of view

Points: 37.5 | * Rarely a willing participant
* Occasionally acts inappropriately during discussions
* Rarely able to respond to direct questions
* Rarely volunteers point of view

Points: 25 | * Never a willing participant
* Often acts inappropriately during discussions
* Never able to respond to direct questions
* Never volunteers point of view

Points: 12.5 |
| ***Demonstration of professional attitude and demeanor******(15%)*** | * Always demonstrates commitment through thorough preparation
* Always arrives on time
* Often solicits instructors' perspectives outside class

Points: 30 | * Rarely unprepared
* Rarely arrives late
* Occasionally solicits instructors' perspectives outside class

Points: 22.5 | * Often unprepared
* Occasionally arrives late
* Rarely solicits instructors' perspectives outside class

Points: 15 | * Rarely prepared
* Often arrives late
* Never solicits instructors' perspectives outside class

Points: 7.5 |

| Rubric for Class Participation(from PHMS-xxx Foundations of Public Health Management [withdrawn]) |
| --- |
| ***Criterion*** | ***Exceeds expectations*** | ***Meets expectations*** | ***Below expectations*** | ***Not acceptable*** |
| ***Integration of reading and exercises into classroom discussions******(42.5%)*** | * Often cites from reading
* Uses reading to support points
* Often articulates fit of reading with topic at hand

Points: 85 | * Occasionally cites from reading
* Sometimes uses reading to support points
* Occasionally articulates fit of reading with topic at hand

Points: 63.75 | * Rarely able to cite from reading
* Rarely uses readings to support points
* Rarely articulates fit of readings with topic at hand

Points: 42.5 | * Unable to cite from readings
* Unable to use reading to support points
* Unable to articulate fit of readings with topic at hand

Points: 21.25 |
| ***Interaction and participation in classroom discussions******(42.5%)***  | * Always a willing participant
* Responds frequently to questions
* Routinely volunteers point of view

Points: 85 | * Often a willing participant
* Responds occasionally to questions
* Occasionally volunteers point of view

Points: 63.75 | * Rarely a willing participant
* Rarely able to respond to questions
* Rarely volunteers point of view

Points: 42.5 | * Never a willing participant
* Never able to respond to questions
* Never volunteers point of view

Points: 21.25 |
| ***Demonstration of professional attitude and demeanor******(15%)*** | * Always demonstrates commitment through thorough preparation
* Always arrives on time
* Often solicits instructors' perspectives outside class

Points: 30 | * Rarely unprepared
* Rarely arrives late
* Occasionally solicits instructors' perspectives outside class

Points: 22.5 | * Often unprepared
* Occasionally arrives late
* Rarely solicits instructors' perspectives outside class

Points: 15 | * Rarely prepared
* Often arrives late
* Never solicits instructors' perspectives outside class

Points: 7.5 |

## Class And Chat Session Participation Scoring Rubric(fromPHPB-706 Introduction to Public Health Disasters and Response v2007.05.29)

: A portion (18%) of the final grade will be based on students’ active participation in class discussions, initiating questions, responding to instructors, other students, and guest speakers. The course director will select a sample of six class periods and five chat sessions in which to assess student participation. The selected class periods and chat sessions will be unannounced, and will be scattered throughout the course. For each class period or chat session, students will be assigned 0-2 points: 0 points for complete non-engagement or absence; ½ point for responding minimally to a direct question, with no further participation; 1 point for responding to a direct question as well as asking a question; 1 ½ points for responding to various questions from instructors and other students; 2 presenting new concepts or ideas about lecture material, reading assignments, or other learning activities associated with a specific class. The course director will assign points shortly after a class session or chat session is completed. Students will be advised of their point tally by the next class period, and will have an opportunity to discuss ways to improve their participation with the course director. The five highest scores for class sessions and the four highest scores for chat sessions will be used in determining the final grade.

# ORAL PRESENTATIONS

| Oral Communication Assessment Rubric(from PHPH-679 Public Health Practicum Experience v2009.07.10) |
| --- |
| ***Topic******(weight)*** | ***Assessment of Topic******(Note: Assigned score within a range is subjective assessment of degree criterion is met.)*** | ***Topic Score*** | ***Wt.*** | ***Topic Points******(=Topic Score x Wt.)*** |
| ***Exceptional******(range 9.0-10.0)*** | ***Acceptable******(range 8.0-8.9)*** | ***Marginal******(range 7.0-7.9)*** | ***Unacceptable******(range 0-6.9)*** |
| ***Content******(5.0)*** | Speaker provides an accurate and complete overview of the practicum experience and relates the public health competencies to the work completed at the practice site.  | Provides an overview of the practicum experience relating some of the public health competencies to the work completed at the practice site. | Provides an overview of the practicum experience but does not relate the public health competencies to the work completed at the practice site. | Inadequate description of the practice site experience with no effort to relate the public health competencies to the work completed at the practice site. |  | **x5.0** | **=** |
| ***Organiza-tion******(1.5)*** | Presentation is clear, logical, and organized. Listener can follow line of reasoning. | Presentation is generally clear and well organized. A few minor points may be confusing. | Listener can follow presentation only with effort. Some arguments are not clear. Organization seems haphazard. | Listener unable to follow presentation. Arguments are not clear. No evidence of organization in presentation. |  | **x1.5** | **=** |
| ***Level of Presenta-tion******(1.5)*** | Level of presentation is appropriate for the audience.Presentation is paced for audience understanding. It is not a reading of a paper.Speaker is clearly comfortable in front of the group and can be heard by all.  | Level of presentation is generally appropriate.Pacing is sometimes too fast or too slow. The presenter seems slightly uncomfortable at times, and the audience occasionally has trouble hearing him/her. | Aspects of presentation are too elementary or too sophisticated for audience.Much of the information is read.Presenter seems uncomfortable and can be heard only if listener is very attentive.  | The entire presentation is too elementary or too sophisticated for audience.The information is read with limited or no eye contact with the audience.Presenter is uncomfortable and cannot be heard by listener.  |  | **x1.5** | **=** |
| ***Contact with audience/******Handling questions******(2.0)*** | Consistently clarifies, restates, and responds to questions. Summarizes when needed. | Generally responsive to audience comments, questions, and needs. | Misses some opportunities for interaction.Responds to questions inadequately. | Lack of interaction with audience.No questions are answered. No interpretation made.  |  | **x2.0** | **=** |
| ***Gross points for evaluation component (sum of Topic Points in rightmost column; maximum of 100) ∑*** |  |
| ***Penalty for tardiness (mandatory 10% of gross points) (if any) -*** |  |
| ***Points for evaluation component to use in student evaluation rubric (gross points minus penalty) =*** |  |

| Rubric For Class Presentation(from PHMS-702 Methods in Health Services and Outcomes Research v2009.07.08) |
| --- |
| ***Criterion******(weight)*** | ***Assessment of Criterion******(Note: Assigned score within a range is assessment of degree criterion is met.)*** | ***Crit. Score*** | ***Wt.*** | ***Topic Points******(= Crit. Score x Wt.)*** |
| ***Exceeds expectations******(range 9.0-10.0)*** | ***Meets expectations******(range 8.0-8.9)*** | ***Below expectations******(range 7.0-7.9)*** | ***Not acceptable******(range 0.0-6.9)*** |
| ***Content******(3.5)*** | * An abundance of material clearly related to thesis
* Points are clearly made and all evidence supports thesis
* Varied use of materials
 | * Sufficient information that relates to thesis
* Many good points made but there is an uneven balance and little variation
 | * There is a great deal of information that is not clearly connected to the thesis
 | * Thesis not clear; information included that does not support thesis in any way
 |  | **x3.5** | **=** |
| ***Coherence and Organization******(2.5)*** | * Thesis is clearly stated and developed
* Specific examples are appropriate and clearly develop thesis
* Conclusion is clear; shows control; flows together well
* Good transitions
* Succinct but not choppy
* Well organized
 | * Most information presented in logical sequence
* Generally very well organized but better transitions from idea to idea needed
 | * Concept and ideas are loosely connected
* Lacks clear transitions
* Flow and organization are choppy
 | * Presentation is choppy and disjointed, does not flow
* Development of thesis is vague
* No apparent logical order of presentation
 |  | **x2.5** | **=** |
| ***Creativity******(1.5)*** | * Very original presentation of material
* Uses the unexpected to full advantage
* Captures audience's attention
 | * Some originality apparent
* Good variety and blending of materials/media
 | * Little or no variation
* Material presented with little originality or interpretation
 | * Repetitive with little or no variety
* Insufficient use of multimedia
 |  | **x1.5** | **=** |
| ***Speaking Skills******(2.0)*** | * Poised, clear articulation
* Proper volume
* Steady rate
* Good posture and eye contact; enthusiasm; confidence
 | * Clear articulation but not as polished
 | * Some mumbling;
* little eye contact
* Uneven rate
* Little or no expression
 | * Inaudible or too loud
* No eye contact
* Rate too slow/fast
* Speaker seemed uninterested and used monotone
 |  | **x2.0** | **=** |
| ***Length of Presentation******(0.5)*** | * Within one-two minutes of allotted time +/–
 | * Within two-four minutes of allotted time +/–
 | * Within four-six minutes of allotted time +/–
 | * Too long or too short; ten or more minutes above or below the allotted time
 |  | **x0.5** | **=** |
| ***Gross points for class presentation (maximum of 100) ∑*** |  |
| ***Weight of class presentation in final grade (10%)*** | **x 0.10** |
| ***Point contribution of class presentation to final grade (maximum of 10) =*** |  |

| Rubric for Student Presentation(from PHPH-630 Geographic Information Systems in Public Health v2008.05.1) |
| --- |
| ***Criterion*** | ***Standard*** | ***Out-standing*** | ***Above average*** | ***Average*** | ***Below average*** | ***Not acceptable*** |
| ***Content*** | Purpose clearly stated, good overview, clarity of argument, well sourced, credible conclusion | 40 | 30 | 20 | 10 | 0 |
| ***Organization*** | Good structure, effectively sequenced, interesting introduction, well developed main section, clear conclusion (or take-home message) | 20 | 15 | 10 | 5 | 0 |
| ***Delivery*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Pace and voice*** | Speed of delivery, good use of pauses, reacting to feedback from audience | 10 | 7.5 | 5 | 2.5 | 0 |
| ***Visual aids*** | Appropriate to talk, confident in use, well designed, handouts | 10 | 7.5 | 5 | 2.5 | 0 |
| ***Contact with audience*** | Good posture, eye contact, rapport, relaxed, moves about, engaged | 10 | 7.5 | 5 | 2.5 | 0 |
| ***Handling questions*** | Appears confident, is honest when doesn’t know answer, friendly, remains in control | 10 | 7.5 | 5 | 2.5 | 0 |

| Rubric For Evaluating Weekly Presentations(from PHEH-651 Advanced Environmental Health Sciences v2008.03.14) |
| --- |
| ***Topic******(Weight)*** | ***Unacceptable*** ***(0)*** | ***Marginal*** ***(1)*** | ***Acceptable*** ***(2)*** | ***Exceptional*** ***(3)*** |
| ***Content******(3)*** | Explanations of concepts and/or theories are inaccurate or incomplete. No attempt to tie theory to practice.  | Some explanations of concepts and/or theories are inaccurate or incomplete. Little attempt to tie theory to practice. Listeners gain little from presentation. | For the most part, explanations of concepts and theories are accurate and complete. Some helpful applications are included. | Speaker provides accurate and complete explanation of key concepts and theories, drawing upon relevant literature. Applications of theory are included to illuminate issues. Listeners gain insight. |
| ***Organization******(2)*** | Listener unable to follow presentation. Arguments are not clear. No evidence of organization in presentation. | Listener can follow presentation only with effort. Some arguments are not clear. Organization seems haphazard. | Presentation is generally clear and well organized. A few minor points may be confusing. | Presentation is clear, logical, and organized. Listener can follow line of reasoning. |
| ***Level of Presentation (1)*** | The entire presentation is too elementary or too sophisticated for audience. Presenter is uncomfortable and cannot be heard by listener. The information is read with limited or no eye contact with the audience. | Aspects of presentation are too elementary or too sophisticated for audience. Presenter seems uncomfortable and can be heard only if listener is very attentive. Much of the information is read. | Level of presentation is generally appropriate. Pacing is sometimes too fast or too slow. The presenter seems slightly uncomfortable at times, and the audience occasionally has trouble hearing him/her. | Level of presentation is appropriate for the audience. Presentation is a planned conversation, paced for audience understanding. It is not a reading of a paper. Speaker is clearly comfortable in front of the group and can be heard by all. Format is consistent throughout including heading styles/captions. |
| ***Contact with audience/******Handling questions******(2)*** | No questions are answered. No interpretation made. Lack of interaction with audience. | Misses some opportunities for interaction. Responds to questions inadequately. | Generally responsive to audience comments, questions, and needs. | Consistently clarifies, restates, and responds to questions. Summarizes when needed. |
| ***Use of Communication******Aids******(1)*** | Communication aids and/or referencing system inaccurate or irrelevant to presentation.  | Communication aids are poorly prepared or used inappropriately. Font is too small to be easily seen. Too much information is included. Unimportant material is highlighted. Inadequate list of references or references in text. | Communication aids contribute to the quality of the presentation. Font size is appropriate for reading. Appropriate information is included. Some material is not supported by visual aids.Minor inadequacies in references.  | Communication aids enhance the presentation. They are prepared in a professional manner: Font on visuals is large enough to be seen by all. Information is organized to maximize audience understanding. Details are minimized so that main points stand out. References complete and comprehensive. |
| ***OVERALL*** | ***Unacceptable******(F)*** | ***Marginal******(C)*** | ***Acceptable******(B)*** | ***Exceptional******(A)*** |
| **POINTS REQUIRED** | ***0–6*** | ***7–13*** | ***14–20*** | ***21–27*** |

|  |
| --- |
| Rubric For Evaluating Written Report Or Presentation(from PHEH-651 Advanced Environmental Health Sciences v2008.03.14) |
| ***Topic*** ***(Weight)*** | ***Unacceptable*** ***(0)*** | ***Marginal*** ***(1)*** | ***Acceptable*** ***(2)*** | ***Exceptional*** ***(3)*** |
| ***Organization******&******Style******(2)*** | Sequence of information is difficult to follow. No apparent structure or continuity.Purpose of work is not clearly stated. | Work is hard to follow as there is very little continuity.Purpose of work is stated, but does not assist in following work. | Information is presented in a logical manner, which is easily followed.Purpose of work is clearly stated assists the structure of work. | Information is presented in a logical, interesting way, which is easy to follow.Purpose is clearly stated and explains the structure of work. |
| ***Content******&******Knowledge******(3)*** | No grasp of information. Clearly no knowledge of subject matter.No questions are answered. No interpretation made. | Uncomfortable with content. Only basic concepts are demonstrated and interpreted. | At ease with content and able to elaborate and explain to some degree. | Demonstration of full knowledge of the subject with explanations and elaboration. |
| ***Format******&******Aesthetics******(1)*** | Work is illegible, format changes throughout, e.g. font type, size etc.Figures and tables are sloppy and fail to provide intended information. | Mostly consistent format.Figures and tables are legible, but not convincing. | Format is generally consistent including heading styles and captions.Figures and tables are neatly done and provide intended information. | Format is consistent throughout including heading styles and captions.Figures and tables are presented logically and reinforce the text. |
| ***Spelling******&******Grammar******(1)*** | Numerous spelling and grammatical errors. | Several spelling and grammatical errors. | Minor misspellings and/or grammatical errors. | Negligible misspellings and/or grammatical errors. |
| ***References******(2)*** | No referencing system used. | Inadequate list of references or references in text.Inconsistent or illogical referencing system. | Minor inadequacies in references.Consistent referencing system. | Reference section complete and comprehensive.Consistent and logical referencing system. |
| ***OVERALL*** | ***Unacceptable******(F)*** | ***Marginal******(C)*** | ***Acceptable******(B)*** | ***Exceptional******(A)*** |
| ***POINTS REQUIRED*** | ***0–6*** | ***7–13*** | ***14–20*** | ***21–27*** |

# PAPERS AND REPORTS

|  |
| --- |
| Written Communication Assessment Rubric(from PHPH-679 Public Health Practicum Experience v2009.07.10) |
| ***Topic******(weight)*** | ***Assessment of Topic******(Note: Assigned score within a range is subjective assessment of degree criterion is met.)*** | ***Topic Score*** | ***Wt.*** | ***Topic Points******(=Topic Score x Wt.)*** |
| ***Exceptional******(range 9.0-10.0)*** | ***Acceptable******(range 8.0-8.9)*** | ***Marginal******(range 7.0-7.9)*** | ***Unacceptable******(range 0-6.9)*** |
| ***Organiza-tion******&******Style******(1.5)*** | Information is presented in a logical, interesting way, which is easy to follow.Purpose is clearly stated and explains the structure of work. | Information is presented in a logical manner, which is easily followed.Purpose of work is clearly stated assists the structure of work. | Work is hard to follow as there is very little continuity.Purpose of work is stated, but does not assist in following work. | Sequence of information is difficult to follow. No apparent structure or continuity.Purpose of work is not clearly stated. |  | **x1.5** | **=** |
| ***Content******&******Know-ledge******(5.0)*** | Relates the goals of the learning Agreement to the learning experienceDemonstration of full knowledge of the core and cross-cutting public health competencies with explanations and elaboration | Relates most of the goals of the learning Agreement to the learning experience.Demonstration of full knowledge of the core competencies of public health with explanations and elaboration | Relates the goals of the learning Agreement to the learning experience.Fails to demonstrate knowledge of the public health competencies | Fails to relate the goals of the learning Agreement to the learning experience.Fails to demonstrate knowledge of the public health competencies |  | **x5.0** | **=** |
| ***Format******&******Aesthe-tics******(1.5)*** | Format is consistent throughout including heading styles and captions.Figures and tables are presented logically and reinforce the text. | Format is generally consistent including heading styles and captions.Figures and tables are neatly done and provide intended information. | Mostly consistent format.Figures and tables are legible, but not convincing. | Work is illegible, format changes throughout, e.g. font type, size, etc.Figures and tables are sloppy and fail to provide intended information. |  | **x1.5** | **=** |
| ***Spelling******&******Gram-mar******(1.0)*** | Negligible misspellings and/or grammatical errors. | Minor misspellings and/or grammatical errors. | Several spelling and grammatical errors. | Numerous spelling and grammatical errors. |  | **x1.0** | **=** |
| ***Refer-ences******(1.0)*** | Reference section complete and comprehensive.Consistent and logical referencing system.All appropriate persons and organizations appropriate acknowledged | Minor inadequacies in references.Consistent referencing system.Some organizations or persons not acknowledged | Inadequate list of references or references in text.Inconsistent or illogical referencing system.Some organizations or persons not acknowledged | No acknowledgements givenNo referencing system used. |  | **x1.0** | **=** |
| ***Gross points for evaluation component (sum of Topic Points in rightmost column; maximum of 100) ∑*** |  |
| ***Penalty for tardiness (mandatory 10% of gross points) (if any) -*** |  |
| ***Points for evaluation component to use in student evaluation rubric (gross points minus penalty) =*** |  |

| Rubric for Mid-Term Paper(from PHMS-xxx Foundations of Public Health Management [withdrawn]) |
| --- |
| ***Criterion*** | ***Exceeds Expectations*** | ***Meets Expectations*** | ***Below Expectations*** | ***Not Acceptable*** |
| ***Demonstrated Knowledge******(50%)*** | * Shows complete understanding of the exercise
* Demonstrates full knowledge of the subject with explanations and elaboration

Points: 150 | * Shows substantial understanding of the exercise
* At ease with subject content
* Able to elaborate and explain to some degree

Points: 112.5 | * Response shows some understanding of the exercise
* Uncomfortable with content
* Only basic concepts are demonstrated and interpreted

Points: 75 | * Response shows a lack of understanding for the exercise
* No grasp of information
* No clear knowledge of subject matter

Points: 37.5 |
| ***Requirements******(30%)*** | * Goes beyond requirements of the exercise

Points: 90 | * Meets requirements of the exercise

Points: 67.5 | * Does not meet requirements of the exercise

Points: 45 | * Fails to complete the exercise

Points: 22.5 |
| ***Report Format******(10%)*** | * Format is consistent throughout, including heading styles and captions
* Figures and tables are presented logically and reinforce the text

Points: 30 | * Format is generally consistent, including heading styles and captions
* Figures and tables are neatly done and provide intended information

Points: 22.5 | * Mostly consistent format
* Figures and tables are legible, but not convincing

Points: 15 | * Work is illegible, format changes throughout, e.g., font type, size, etc.
* Figures and tables are sloppy and fail to provide intended information

Points: 7.5 |
| ***Spelling and Grammar******(5%)*** | * Negligible misspellings and grammatical errors

Points: 15 | * Minor misspellings and grammatical errors

Points: 11.25 | * Several spelling and grammatical errors

Points: 7.5 | * Numerous spelling and grammatical errors

Points: 3.75 |
| ***References******(5%)*** | * Reference section complete and comprehensive
* Consistent and logical referencing system

Points: 15 | * Minor inadequacies in references
* Consistent referencing system

Points: 11.25 | * Inadequate list of references or references in text
* Inconsistent or illogical referencing system

Points: 7.5 | * No referencing system used

Points: 3.75 |

| Rubric for Final Paper(from PHMS-xxx Foundations of Public Health Management [withdrawn]) |
| --- |
| ***Criterion*** | ***Exceeds Expectations*** | ***Meets Expectations*** | ***Below Expectations*** | ***Not Acceptable*** |
| ***Demonstrated Knowledge******(50%)*** | * Shows complete understanding of the exercise
* Demonstrates full knowledge of the subject with explanations and elaboration

Points: 250 | * Shows substantial understanding of the exercise
* At ease with subject content
* Able to elaborate and explain to some degree

Points: 187.5 | * Response shows some understanding of the exercise
* Uncomfortable with content
* Only basic concepts are demonstrated and interpreted

Points: 125 | * Response shows a lack of understanding for the exercise
* No grasp of information
* No clear knowledge of subject matter

Points: 62.5 |
| ***Requirements******(30%)*** | * Goes beyond the requirements of the exercise

Points: 150 | * Meets the requirements of the exercise

Points: 112.5 | * Does not meet the requirements of the exercise

Points: 75 | * Fails to complete the exercise

Points: 37.5 |
| ***Report Format******(10%)*** | * Format is consistent throughout, including heading styles and captions
* Figures and tables are presented logically and reinforce the text

Points: 50 | * Format is generally consistent, including heading styles and captions
* Figures and tables are neatly done and provide intended information

Points: 37.5 | * Mostly consistent format
* Figures and tables are legible, but not convincing

Points: 25 | * Work is illegible, format changes throughout, e.g., font type, size, etc.
* Figures and tables are sloppy and fail to provide intended information

Points: 12.5 |
| ***Spelling and Grammar******(5%)*** | * Negligible misspellings and grammatical errors

Points: 25 | * Minor misspellings and grammatical errors

Points: 18.75 | * Several spelling and grammatical errors

Points: 12.5 | * Numerous spelling and grammatical errors

Points: 6.25 |
| ***References******(5%)*** | * Reference section complete and comprehensive
* Consistent and logical referencing system

Points: 25 | * Minor inadequacies in references
* Consistent referencing system

Points: 18.75 | * Inadequate list of references or references in text
* Inconsistent or illogical referencing system

Points: 12.5 | * No referencing system used

Points: 6.25 |

| Rubric for Student Paper(from PHPH-630 Geographic Information Systems in Public Health v2008.05.1) |
| --- |
| ***Criterion*** | ***Exceeds Expectations*** | ***Meets Expectations*** | ***Below Expectations*** | ***Not Acceptable*** |
| ***Demonstrated Knowledge******(50%)*** | * Shows complete understanding of the exercise
* Demonstrates full knowledge of the subject with explanations and elaboration

Points: 12.5 | * Shows substantial understanding of the exercise
* At ease with subject content
* Able to elaborate and explain to some degree

Points: 9.375 | * Response shows some understanding of the exercise
* Uncomfortable with content
* Only basic concepts are demonstrated and interpreted

Points: 6.25 | * Response shows a lack of understanding for the exercise
* No grasp of information
* No clear knowledge of subject matter

Points: 3.125 |
| ***Requirements******(30%)*** | * Goes beyond the requirements of the exercise

Points: 7.5 | * Meets the requirements of the exercise

Points: 5.625 | * Does not meet the requirements of the exercise

Points: 3.75 | * Fails to complete the exercise

Points: 1.875 |
| ***Report Format******(10%)*** | * Format is consistent throughout, including heading styles and captions
* Figures and tables are presented logically and reinforce the text

Points: 2.5 | * Format is generally consistent, including heading styles and captions
* Figures and tables are neatly done and provide intended information

Points: 1.875 | * Mostly consistent format
* Figures and tables are legible, but not convincing

Points: 1.25 | * Work is illegible, format changes throughout, e.g., font type, size, etc.
* Figures and tables are sloppy and fail to provide intended information

Points: 0.625 |
| ***Spelling and Grammar******(5%)*** | * Negligible misspellings and grammatical errors

Points: 1.25 | * Minor misspellings and grammatical errors

Points: 0.9375 | * Several spelling and grammatical errors

Points: 0.625 | * Numerous spelling and grammatical errors

Points: 0.3125 |
| ***References******(5%)*** | * Reference section complete and comprehensive
* Consistent and logical referencing system

Points: 1.25 | * Minor inadequacies in references
* Consistent referencing system

Points: 0.9375 | * Inadequate list of references or references in text
* Inconsistent or illogical referencing system

Points: 0.625 | * No referencing system used

Points: 0.3125 |

| Rubric for Evaluation of Written Reports(from PHST-703 Biostatistical Consulting Practicum v2008.04.11) |
| --- |
| ***Criterion*** | ***Poor****0 points* | ***Marginal****5 points* | ***Acceptable****10 points* | ***Exceptional****15 points* |
| ***Addresses Research Hypotheses***Does the report specifically address the relevant research hypotheses of interest to the client? | No mention of research hypotheses, hypotheses not clearly stated or defined | Some mention of hypotheses, but not clearly addressed in body of document | Hypotheses clearly stated and addressed in body of document | Hypotheses clearly stated addressed in body of document, in a manner that is easily accessible |
| ***Use of Appropriate Statistical Methodology*** | Use of methodology inappropriate for study design and research questions  | Appropriate methodology is mostly used, assumptions are not checked  | Appropriate methodology is used, but assumptions are not checked and need for alternate methods not explored | Appropriate methodology is used, modeling assumptions are checked, and alternative methods used if needed |
| ***Model Interpretation*** | No attempt at model interpretation | Some attempt at model interpretation, but insufficient translation of fitted model into prose and tables / figures | Correct model interpretation in the text supported with some support by tables and figures | Correct model interpretation in the text with tables and figures which clearly support the results |
| ***Tables & Figures******Are results illustrated by judicious use of tables and figures*** | No or minimal use of tables or figures | Use of tables and figures, but are only marginally helpful  | Tables and figures are helpful, reinforce results | Tables and figures clearly illustrate results in a manner that is easily accessible to investigators |
| ***Writing Style******Is appropriate structure and grammar used throughout?*** | Writing is not clear, frequent spelling and grammatical mistakes, poor organization | Spelling and grammar generally acceptable, organization is inconsistent | Minor spelling and grammatical errors, organization is mostly clear and logical  | Negligible spelling and grammatical errors, organization is logical and easy to follow |
| ***Overall Grade*** | ***F-Unacceptable*** | ***C-Marginal*** | ***B-Acceptable*** | ***A-Exceptional*** |
| ***Points Required*** | ***0-15*** | ***16-35*** | ***36-55*** | ***56-75*** |

|  |
| --- |
| Rubric For Evaluating Written Report Or Presentation(from PHEH-651 Advanced Environmental Health Sciences v2008.03.14) |
| ***Topic*** ***(Weight)*** | ***Unacceptable*** ***(0)*** | ***Marginal*** ***(1)*** | ***Acceptable*** ***(2)*** | ***Exceptional*** ***(3)*** |
| ***Organization******&******Style******(2)*** | Sequence of information is difficult to follow. No apparent structure or continuity.Purpose of work is not clearly stated. | Work is hard to follow as there is very little continuity.Purpose of work is stated, but does not assist in following work. | Information is presented in a logical manner, which is easily followed.Purpose of work is clearly stated assists the structure of work. | Information is presented in a logical, interesting way, which is easy to follow.Purpose is clearly stated and explains the structure of work. |
| ***Content******&******Knowledge******(3)*** | No grasp of information. Clearly no knowledge of subject matter.No questions are answered. No interpretation made. | Uncomfortable with content. Only basic concepts are demonstrated and interpreted. | At ease with content and able to elaborate and explain to some degree. | Demonstration of full knowledge of the subject with explanations and elaboration. |
| ***Format******&******Aesthetics******(1)*** | Work is illegible, format changes throughout, e.g. font type, size etc.Figures and tables are sloppy and fail to provide intended information. | Mostly consistent format.Figures and tables are legible, but not convincing. | Format is generally consistent including heading styles and captions.Figures and tables are neatly done and provide intended information. | Format is consistent throughout including heading styles and captions.Figures and tables are presented logically and reinforce the text. |
| ***Spelling******&******Grammar******(1)*** | Numerous spelling and grammatical errors. | Several spelling and grammatical errors. | Minor misspellings and/or grammatical errors. | Negligible misspellings and/or grammatical errors. |
| ***References******(2)*** | No referencing system used. | Inadequate list of references or references in text.Inconsistent or illogical referencing system. | Minor inadequacies in references.Consistent referencing system. | Reference section complete and comprehensive.Consistent and logical referencing system. |
| ***OVERALL*** | ***Unacceptable******(F)*** | ***Marginal******(C)*** | ***Acceptable******(B)*** | ***Exceptional******(A)*** |
| ***POINTS REQUIRED*** | ***0–6*** | ***7–13*** | ***14–20*** | ***21–27*** |

## Rubric For Written Assignments(from PHPB-721 Health Promotion and Healthcare-Associated Infection v2007.05.29)

* An excellent paper that not only addresses the assignment carefully and thoughtfully, but goes beyond it to say something original. Few, if any, mechanical errors or awkward spots. (Exercise Report, 24-26 pts; Final Report, 27-30 pts.)
* A good paper that addresses the assignment carefully and thoughtfully, and is effective. May contain a few minor mechanical errors or awkward spots. (Exercise Report, 20-23 pts; Final Report, 24-26 pts.)
* A satisfactory paper that addresses the assignment acceptably. May contain minor errors in style, tone, organization, or mechanics. It may be a “good” paper except for a major flaw. (Exercise Report, 17-19 pts; Final Report, 21-23 pts.)
* An unsatisfactory paper does not address the assignment (or is not done at all) and has totally unacceptable organizational, factual, and mechanical errors. (Exercise Report, <17 pts; Final Report, <21 pts.)

# IN-CLASS AND TAKE-HOME ASSIGNMENTS

| Rubric for Lab Exercises Completed in Class(from PHPH-630 Geographic Information Systems in Public Health v2008.05.1) |
| --- |
| *Criterion* | ***Exceeds Expectations*** | ***Meets Expectations*** | ***Below Expectations*** | ***Not Acceptable*** |
| ***Critical evaluation of findings******(30%)*** | * Recognizes defective results and eliminates the cause

Points: 30 | * Recognizes defective results and figures out the cause

Points: 22.5 | * Recognizes defective results but does not know what to do

Points: 15 | * Blind acceptance of clearly defective results

Points: 7.5 |
| ***Ability to recognize main sources of error******(15%)*** | * Clear understanding

Points: 15 | * Adequate understanding

Points: 11.25 | * Errors in understanding

Points: 7.5 | * Not understood

Points: 3.75 |
| ***Correlation between data and theory******(15%)*** | * Qualitative accounting for differences

Points: 15 | * Complete and done well

Points: 11.25 | * Done poorly or incompletely

Points: 7.5 | * Not done

Points: 3.75 |
| ***Ability to draw proper conclusions from lab exercise******(40%)*** | * Correct conclusions correlated to other material

Points: 40 | * Correct conclusions drawn

Points: 30 | * Incorrect conclusions drawn

Points: 20 | * Conclusions not drawn

Points: 10 |

| Rubric for Take-Home Assignments(from PHPH-630 Geographic Information Systems in Public Health v2008.05.1) |
| --- |
| ***Criterion*** | ***Exceeds Expectations*** | ***Meets Expectations*** | ***Below Expectations*** | ***Not Acceptable*** |
| ***Demonstrated Knowledge******(50%)*** | * Shows complete understanding of the exercise
* Demonstrates full knowledge of the subject with explanations and elaboration

Points: 50% of points for exercise | * Shows substantial understanding of the exercise
* At ease with subject content
* Able to elaborate and explain to some degree

Points: 37.5% of points for exercise | * Response shows some understanding of the exercise
* Uncomfortable with content
* Only basic concepts are demonstrated and interpreted

Points: 25% of points for exercise | * Response shows a lack of understanding for the exercise
* No grasp of information
* No clear knowledge of subject matter

Points: 12.5% of points for exercise |
| ***Requirements******(30%)*** | * Goes beyond the requirements of the exercise

Points: 30% of points for exercise | * Meets the requirements of the exercise

Points: 22.5% of points for exercise | * Does not meet the requirements of the exercise

Points: 15% of points for exercise | * Fails to complete the exercise

Points: 7.5% of points for exercise |
| ***Report Format******(10%)*** | * Format is consistent throughout, including heading styles and captions
* Figures and tables are presented logically and reinforce the text

Points: 10% of points for exercise | * Format is generally consistent, including heading styles and captions
* Figures and tables are neatly done and provide intended information

Points: 7.5% of points for exercise | * Mostly consistent format
* Figures and tables are legible, but not convincing

Points: 5% of points for exercise | * Work is illegible, format changes throughout, e.g., font type, size, etc.
* Figures and tables are sloppy and fail to provide intended information

Points: 2.5% of points for exercise |
| ***Spelling and Grammar******(5%)*** | * Negligible misspellings and grammatical errors

Points: 5% of points for exercise | * Minor misspellings and grammatical errors

Points: 3.75% of points for exercise | * Several spelling and grammatical errors

Points: 2.5% of points for exercise | * Numerous spelling and grammatical errors

Points: 1.25% of points for exercise |
| ***References******(5%)*** | * Reference section complete and comprehensive
* Consistent and logical referencing system

Points: 5% of points for exercise | * Minor inadequacies in references
* Consistent referencing system

Points: 3.75% of points for exercise | * Inadequate list of references or references in text
* Inconsistent or illogical referencing system

Points: 2.5% of points for exercise | * No referencing system used

Points: 1.25% of points for exercise |

| Rubric for Take-Home Assignments(from PHST-704 Mixed Effect Models and Longitudinal Data Analysis v2009.03.13) |
| --- |
| ***Criterion*** | ***Exceeds Expectations*** | ***Meets Expectations*** | ***Below Expectations*** | ***Not Acceptable*** |
| ***Demonstrated Knowledge******(70% of score for each assignment)*** | * Shows complete understanding of the exercises
* Demonstrates full knowledge of the subject with explanations and elaboration

Score: 70% | * Shows substantial understanding of the exercises
* At ease with subject content
* Able to elaborate and explain to some degree

Score: 60% | * Response shows some understanding of the exercises
* Uncomfortable with content
* Only basic concepts are demonstrated and interpreted

Score: 50% | * Response shows a lack of understanding for the exercises
* No grasp of information
* No clear knowledge of subject matter

Score: 40% |
| ***Requirements******(20% of score for each assignment)*** | * Goes beyond the requirements of the exercise

Score: 20% | * Meets the requirements of the exercise

Score: 15% | * Does not meet the requirements of the exercise

Score: 10% | * Fails to complete the exercise

Score: 5% |
| ***Report Format******(10% of score for each assignment)*** | * Format is consistent throughout, including heading styles and captions
* Figures and tables are presented logically and reinforce the text

Score: 10% | * Format is generally consistent, including heading styles and captions
* Figures and tables are neatly done and provide intended information

Score: 7.5% | * Mostly consistent format
* Figures and tables are legible, but not convincing

Score: 5% | * Work is illegible, format changes throughout, e.g., font type, size, etc.
* Figures and tables are sloppy and fail to provide intended information

Score: 2.5% |

# EXAM QUESTIONS

| Rubric for Midterm and Final Exam Questions(from PHST-704 Mixed Effect Models and Longitudinal Data Analysis v2009.03.13) |
| --- |
| ***Criterion*** | ***Exceeds Expectations*** | ***Meets Expectations*** | ***Below Expectations*** | ***Not Acceptable*** |
| **Demonstrated Knowledge****(100 % of score for each question)** | * Shows complete understanding of the question
* Demonstrates full knowledge of the subject with explanations and elaboration

Score: 100% | * Shows substantial understanding of the question
* At ease with subject content
* Able to elaborate and explain to some degree

Score: 85% | * Response shows some understanding of the question
* Uncomfortable with content
* Only basic concepts are demonstrated and interpreted

Score: 70% | * Response shows a lack of understanding for the question
* No grasp of information
* No clear knowledge of subject matter

Points: 50% |

# MISCELLANEOUS

|  |
| --- |
| Poster Assessment Rubric(from PHPH-679 Public Health Practicum Experience v2009.07.10) |
| ***Topic******(weight)*** | ***Assessment of Topic******(Note: Assigned score within a range is subjective assessment of degree criterion is met.)*** | ***Topic Score*** | ***Wt.*** | ***Topic Points******(=Topic Score x Wt.)*** |
| ***Exceptional******(range 9.0-10.0)*** | ***Acceptable******(range 8.0-8.9)*** | ***Marginal******(range 7.0-7.9)*** | ***Unacceptable******(range 0-6.9)*** |
| ***Content – Accuracy******(4.0)*** | All content in the poster is accurate. There are no factual errors. | Most of the content is accurate but there is one piece of information that seems inaccurate. | The content is generally accurate, but one piece of information is clearly inaccurate. | Content confusing or contains more than one factual error. |  | **x4.0** | **=** |
| ***Use of Graphics and Tables******(2.0)*** | All graphics/tables are attractive (size and colors) and support the topic of the poster. | A few graphics/tables are not attractive but all support the topic of the poster. | All graphics/tables are attractive but a few do not support the topic of the poster. | Several graphics/tables are unattractive AND detract from the content of the poster. |  | **x2.0** | **=** |
| ***Text - Font Choice & Format-ting******(1.0)*** | Font formats (color, bold, italic) have been carefully planned to enhance readability and content. | Font formats have been carefully planned to enhance readability. | Font formatting has been carefully planned to complement the content. It may be a little hard to read. | Font formatting makes it very difficult to read the material. |  | **x1.0** | **=** |
| ***Spelling and Grammar******(1.0)*** | Poster has no misspellings or grammatical errors. | Poster has 1-2 misspellings, but no grammatical errors. | Poster has 1-2 grammatical errors but no misspellings. | Poster has more than 2 grammatical and/or spelling errors. |  | **x1.0** | **=** |
| ***Sequenc-ing of Informa-tion******(1.0)*** | Information is organized in a clear, logical way. It is easy to anticipate the next panel. | Most information is organized in a clear, logical way. One slide or piece of information seems out of place. | Some information is logically sequenced. An occasional panel or piece of information seems out of place. | There is no clear plan for the organization of information. |  | **x1.0** | **=** |
| ***Referen-ces******(1.0)*** | Reference section complete and comprehensive.Consistent and logical referencing system.All appropriate persons and organizations appropriate acknowledged | Minor inadequacies in references.Consistent referencing system.Some organizations or persons not acknowledged | Inadequate list of references or references in text.Inconsistent or illogical referencing system.Some organizations or persons not acknowledged | No referencing system used.No acknowledgements given |  | **x1.0** | **=** |
| ***Gross points for evaluation component (sum of Topic Points in rightmost column; maximum of 100) ∑*** |  |
| ***Penalty for tardiness (mandatory 10% of gross points) (if any) -*** |  |
| ***Points for evaluation component to use in student evaluation rubric (gross points minus penalty) =*** |  |

| Student Evaluation Rubric(from PHPH-679 Public Health Practicum Experience v2009.07.10) |
| --- |
| ***Component*** | ***Component Description*** | ***Component Evaluation Methodology*** | ***Component Points*** | ***Comp. Wt.*** | ***Net Comp. Score (Comp. Points x Comp. Wt.)*** |
| 1. ***Practicum concept document***
 | Concise, professional document of less than one page describing the proposed primary activity for the practicum, as outlined in the *Practicum Experience Manual*, Appendix 3. | Written communication assessment rubric |  | **x0.05** | **=** |
| 1. ***Practice site profile***
 | Concise, professional document describing the practice site, as outlined in the *Practicum Experience Manual*, Appendix 3. | Written communication assessment rubric |  | **x0.15** | **=** |
| 1. ***Learning agreement***
 | Concise, professional document presenting the conditions and parameters for the practicum experience as outlined in the *Practicum Experience Manual*, Appendix 2. | Written communication assessment rubric |  | **x0.20** | **=** |
| 1. ***Oral presentation***
 | PowerPoint presentation describing the practicum, tasks and projects undertaken or participated in, and results, using guidelines in the *Practicum Experience Manual*, Appendix 7. | Oral communication assessment rubric |  | **x0.20** | **=** |
| 1. ***Electronic poster***
 | PowerPoint poster on the practicum experience, using guidelines in the *Practicum Experience Manual*, Appendix 8. | Poster assessment rubric |  | **x0.15** | **=** |
| 1. ***Written report***
 | Concise, professional document presenting the practicum, tasks and projects undertaken or participated in, and results, using guidelines in the *Practicum Experience Manual*, Appendix 6. | Written communication assessment rubric |  | **x0.20** | **=** |
| 1. ***Practice site evaluation by student***
 | Form in the *Practicum Experience Manual*, Appendix 4 filled out by the student. | Filled out and submitted: 100 points; otherwise, 0 points. | **Circle one:****100****0** | **x0.05** | **=** |
| 1. ***Practice site evaluation of student***
 | Form in the *Practicum Experience Manual*, Appendix 5filled out by the site mentor. | Filled out and submitted: 100 points; otherwise, 0 points. | **Circle one:****100****0** | **x0.03** | **=** |
| ***Total score for practicum experience (sum of Net Comp. Scores in rightmost column) ∑*** |  |