**MPH Capstone Project Grading Rubric**

Student Name: Abbie Tolon

Faculty Assessor: Jenine Harris

Project Type: x Research report

 Program evaluation

 Policy evaluation

 Program plan

 Grant proposal

Capstone projects are assessed with the criteria in the below rubric. In general, each criterion will be assessed using the following guidelines:

1. **High pass:** Similar to a high A (95% or higher). Student included all required elements and demonstrated skill, knowledge, and/or mastery of competency that goes above and beyond what is expected of an MPH student.
2. **Pass:** Similar to a passing grade below an A (80% to < 95%). Student included all requirements and demonstrated skill, knowledge, or mastery of competency that is expected of an MPH student.
3. **No pass:** Similar to a failing grade (< 80%). One or more elements in criteria are not included or are significantly underdeveloped. Student does not demonstrate skill, knowledge, or mastery of competency that is expected of an MPH student.

Note: Criteria for Sections I and II are the same for ALL projects. Section III criteria (Content) will vary based on type of project. Please apply the appropriate Content Criteria based on project type (Research report, Program evaluation, Policy evaluation, Program plan, or Grant proposal).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Criteria for ALL project types*** | |
| **Section I: Writing Style, Organization, and Format: 20%** | No pass High pass  0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| 1. Writing is engaging and professional, and the content is organized in a logical fashion. | 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| 1. Tables and figures appear in appendices, are referred to in the text, and are designed for comprehension, including appropriate titles and footnotes. | 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| 1. Document length is appropriate for the project type and content - typically 25-35 pages excluding appendices and bibliography. Font size and margins adhere to guidelines. | 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| 1. Document is virtually free from grammatical or typographical errors. | 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| Score (sum of scores for 4 criteria): 40  Comments: Great! I made a few minor suggestions in the document, mostly in the abstract. | |
| **Section II: References/Citations: 5%** | No pass High pass  0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| 1. Project incorporates an appropriate number of credible sources to support project content. | 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| 1. All sources including text, tables, figures, photographs, etc. are cited appropriately and consistently using APA or AMA format. | 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| 1. Bibliography is consistently formatted using APA or AMA format. | 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| Score (sum of scores for 3 criteria): 30  Comments: A couple of the tables could be replaced by a sentence in the text, but overall looks great. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***For Research reports, Program evaluations, or Policy evaluations only:*** | |
| **Section III: Content criteria – 75%** | No pass High pass  0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| 1. Public health problem/issue is clearly framed using a transdisciplinary model and/or conceptual framework. Quality evidence related to public health practice, research and/or policy is incorporated. | 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| 1. Objective(s) of the project is/are clearly defined. | 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| 1. Methods are clearly described and are appropriate for the given project. | 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| 1. Results are presented clearly, using tables and figures as appropriate. | 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| 1. Discussion includes relating findings to existing literature and addressing strengths and limitations of the project. | 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| 1. Specific implications and next steps for public health policy, programs, and/or research are thoroughly discussed. | 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| 1. Student selected competencies are appropriately incorporated into the project. A clear connection to selected competencies is made through the project content. | 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| Score (sum of scores for 7 criteria): 68  Comments: Good work revising terminology. I noted a few places still using “run” instead of “use” or “estimate” for models and I’d suggest editing these, but overall good. See attached with comments for some other ideas. I’d think through whether you want to put the race variable (and other controls) in the tables since you discuss race results and mention it in a few places. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***For Program plans only:*** | |
| **Section III: Content criteria – 75%** | No pass High pass  0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| 1. Public health problem/issue is clearly framed using a transdisciplinary model and/or conceptual framework. Quality evidence related to public health practice, research and/or policy is incorporated. | 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| 1. SMART objective(s) of the project is/are clearly defined. | 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| 1. Strategies and activities are clearly described and are appropriate for the given project. | 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| 1. Project-specific evaluation plan is included and described, which may include a needs assessment, formative research, impact evaluation, and/or process evaluation. | 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| 1. Logic model, conceptual framework, and indicator table are presented clearly. | 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| 1. Budget containing key main-line items is included. | 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| 1. Student selected competencies are appropriately incorporated into the project. A clear connection to selected competencies is made through the project content. | 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| Score (sum of scores for 7 criteria):  Comments: | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***For Grant proposals only:*** | |
| **Section III: Content criteria – 75%** | No pass High pass  0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| 1. Scope and magnitude of public health problem/issue is defined and clearly framed. Quality evidence related to public health practice, research and/or policy is incorporated. Conceptual framework is presented clearly. | 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| 1. Objective(s) or aim(s) of the project is/are clearly defined. | 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| 1. Strategies and activities are clearly described and are appropriate for the given project. | 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| 1. Description of the evaluation for proposed grant activities is included and detailed, which may include formative research, impact evaluation, and/or process evaluation methods and measures. | 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| 1. Specific implications and next steps for public health policy, programs, and/or research based on the results of the proposed project are thoroughly discussed. | 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| 1. Budget containing key main-line items, along with a budget justification, is included. | 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| 1. Student selected competencies are appropriately incorporated into the project. A clear connection to selected competencies is made through the project content. | 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| Score (sum of scores for 7 criteria):  Comments: | |

|  |
| --- |
| **Compute and assign final score:**   1. Weight the scores:   Section I: Writing style score: \_\_40\_\_\_\_ \* .5 = 20  Section II: References score: \_\_\_30\_\_\_ \* .167 = 5.01  Section III: Content score: \_\_\_68\_\_\_ \* 1.071 = 72.828   1. Add the three weighted scores together: 97.838 2. Assign final category based on score:   High pass (95+)  Pass (80 – 94.9)   * + No pass (below 80) |