



APPENDIX VII: WRITTEN RESEARCH PROJECT RUBRIC

Student Name: _

Date: _

CHAPTER	Needs Improvement 1	Acceptable 2	Exemplary 3	Score
Literature Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Background/rationale for the project are incorrect, incoherent, or flawed <input type="checkbox"/> Does not reflect understanding of subject matter and associated literature <input type="checkbox"/> Poor critical assessment of the literature and identification of gaps <input type="checkbox"/> Objectives are poorly supported by background literature 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Background/rationale for the project coherent and clear <input type="checkbox"/> Reflects understanding of subject matter and associated literature <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate critical assessment of the literature and identification of gaps <input type="checkbox"/> Objectives are adequately supported by background literature 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Background/rationale for the project are superior <input type="checkbox"/> Exhibits mastery of subject matter and associated literature <input type="checkbox"/> Superior critical assessment of the literature and identification of gaps <input type="checkbox"/> Objectives are superiorly supported by background literature 	
Research Methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Methods are partially aligned with objectives <input type="checkbox"/> Methods are poorly described (e.g., process, setting, participants, measures) <input type="checkbox"/> Variables, targets, measures, and implementation process is unclear and poorly developed <input type="checkbox"/> Methods do not include an evaluation component (e.g., preliminary implementation and quantitative evaluation, qualitative feedback, review by experts or end-users) <input type="checkbox"/> [if applicable] Proposed analyses are wrong, inappropriate, or missing <input type="checkbox"/> [if applicable] Conceptual framework not identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Methods are adequately aligned with objectives <input type="checkbox"/> Methods are adequately described (e.g., process, setting, participants, measures) <input type="checkbox"/> Variables, targets, measures, and implementation process is clear and adequately developed <input type="checkbox"/> Methods include an evaluation component; the evaluation is adequate (e.g., preliminary implementation and quantitative evaluation, qualitative feedback, review by experts or end-users) <input type="checkbox"/> [if applicable] Proposed analyses are routine, objective, correct <input type="checkbox"/> [if applicable] Conceptual framework is clear and adequately linked to project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Methods are fully aligned with objectives <input type="checkbox"/> Methods are superiorly described (e.g., process, setting, participants, measures) <input type="checkbox"/> Variables, targets, measures, and implementation process is clear, fully developed, and imaginative <input type="checkbox"/> Methods include an evaluation component; the evaluation is robust (e.g., preliminary implementation and quantitative evaluation, qualitative feedback, review by experts or end-users) <input type="checkbox"/> [if applicable] Proposed analyses are sophisticated, robust, precise <input type="checkbox"/> [if applicable] Conceptual framework is exceptional with superior links to project 	



<p>Results / Product / Outcomes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Results/products/outcomes are partially aligned with objectives <input type="checkbox"/> Results/products/outcomes are poorly described and do not align with description of methods <input type="checkbox"/> Tables/figures/products/outcomes are missing or do not clearly present the project findings (e.g., formatting, appropriate # of tables/figures to display the range of results) <input type="checkbox"/> Results/products/outcomes have limited practical or programmatic utility <input type="checkbox"/> Interpretation of data (e.g., quantitative or qualitative) or outcomes is wrong, inappropriate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Results/products/outcomes are adequately aligned with objectives <input type="checkbox"/> Results/products/outcomes are adequately described and aligned with description of methods <input type="checkbox"/> Tables/figures/products/outcomes are present and adequately present the project findings <input type="checkbox"/> Results/products/outcomes have marginal practical or programmatic utility <input type="checkbox"/> Interpretation of data (e.g., quantitative or qualitative) or outcomes is routine, objective, correct 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Results/products/outcomes are fully aligned with objectives <input type="checkbox"/> Results/products/outcomes are superiorly described and aligned with description of methods <input type="checkbox"/> Tables/figures/products/outcomes are present and superiorly present the project findings <input type="checkbox"/> Results/products/outcomes have superior practical or programmatic utility <input type="checkbox"/> Interpretation of data (e.g., quantitative or qualitative) or outcomes is sophisticated, robust, precise
<p>Discussion / Conclusion / Evaluation & Reflection</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Key findings are poorly summarized with reference to objectives <input type="checkbox"/> Poor integration and interpretation of results across findings (e.g. simply repeats results or describes no results in discussion) <input type="checkbox"/> Findings poorly evaluated within the context of the literature (e.g., restatement of background, no or very limited discussion of new literature) <input type="checkbox"/> Does not identify or poorly describes project limitations <input type="checkbox"/> Poor discussion of potential long-term implications and future directions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Key findings are adequately summarized with reference to objectives <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate integration and interpretation of results across findings <input type="checkbox"/> Findings adequately evaluated within the context of the literature <input type="checkbox"/> Project limitations are adequately identified and described <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate discussion of potential long-term implications and future directions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Key findings are fully summarized with reference to objectives <input type="checkbox"/> Superior integration and interpretation of results across findings <input type="checkbox"/> Findings fully evaluated within the context of the literature <input type="checkbox"/> Project limitations are superiorly identified and described <input type="checkbox"/> Superior discussion of potential long-term implications and future directions



OVERALL	Needs Improvement 1	Acceptable 2	Exemplary 3	Score
Significance / Scope	<input type="checkbox"/> Project represents limited expansion upon previous research/work and has limited evidence of public health significance <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates rudimentary critical thinking skills	<input type="checkbox"/> Project builds upon previous research/work and show some evidence of public health significance <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates average critical thinking skills	<input type="checkbox"/> Project greatly extends previous research/work and shows exceptional evidence of public health significance <input type="checkbox"/> Exhibits mature, critical thinking skills	
Quality of writing and formatting	<input type="checkbox"/> Writing is weak <input type="checkbox"/> Numerous grammatical and spelling errors apparent <input type="checkbox"/> Organization is poor <input type="checkbox"/> Formatting is poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Writing is adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Some grammatical and spelling errors apparent <input type="checkbox"/> Organization is logical <input type="checkbox"/> Formatting is adequate	<input type="checkbox"/> Writing is publication quality <input type="checkbox"/> No grammatical and spelling errors apparent <input type="checkbox"/> Organization is excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Formatting is exceptional	
References	<input type="checkbox"/> Few references (25%) are timely and appropriate to the subject matter <input type="checkbox"/> References selected below average or poor for the chosen subject (relies on websites or non-peer reviewed sources; outdated; missing key works) <input type="checkbox"/> Statements consistently not supported by references when references are clearly needed <input type="checkbox"/> In-text and reference list citations are formatted incorrectly or inconsistently (e.g., switching between formatting styles, websites improperly cited, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/> Many references (50%) are timely and appropriate to the subject matter <input type="checkbox"/> References selected are adequate for the chosen subject <input type="checkbox"/> Statements generally supported by references when references are clearly needed <input type="checkbox"/> The majority of in-text and reference list citations are properly cited (e.g., switching between formatting styles, websites improperly cited, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/> Most references (75%) are timely and appropriate to the subject matter <input type="checkbox"/> References selected are the best available for the chosen subject <input type="checkbox"/> Statements always supported by references when references are clearly needed <input type="checkbox"/> All in-text and reference list citations are properly cited (e.g., switching between formatting styles, websites improperly cited, etc.)	
Professionalism	<input type="checkbox"/> Project timeline poorly managed by student; consistently missed deadlines; consistently required prompting by committee and/or MPH office <input type="checkbox"/> Student rarely sought feedback; feedback was clearly needed <input type="checkbox"/> Minimally responsive to written/verbal feedback	<input type="checkbox"/> Project timeline mostly managed by student with some oversight from committee/MPH office; some deadlines missed <input type="checkbox"/> Student sought some feedback and occasionally asked for help when it was needed <input type="checkbox"/> Adequately responsive to written/verbal feedback	<input type="checkbox"/> Project timeline completely managed by student; student worked independently and met all project deadlines <input type="checkbox"/> Student struck an exceptional balance between working independently but asking for necessary feedback/help <input type="checkbox"/> Exceptionally responsive to written/verbal feedback	