**Doctoral Student Assessment Rubric**

Objective 1: Students will demonstrate clarity of scientific writing skills

* Emerging- student receives B+ or better on all course related papers
* Intentional – student has abstract accepted to national conference
* Professional – student submits first authored manuscript for review
* Mastered – student has first authored manuscript accepted

Objective 2: Students will demonstrate clarity of verbal expression and the ability to respond to scientific questions in a clear an accurate manner

* Emerging- student expresses point of view clearly and professionally in brown bag and other times of observation
* Intentional – student is able to respond to public questions about their research efforts within the department
* Professional – student successfully presents at a national conference as first author (80% or better on the presentation rubric)
* Mastered – student presents at a national conference as first author and is able to accurately respond to questions of the audience (90% or better on the presentation rubric)

Objective 3: Students will demonstrate mastery of complex scientific and technical issues relevant to the student’s area of research

* Emerging- student receives B+ or better on all course related papers
* Intentional – student has abstract accepted to national conference
* Professional – student submits first authored manuscript for review
* Mastered – student has first authored manuscript accepted

Objective 4: Students will demonstrate mastery of complex scientific and technical skills relevant to the student’s broader foundation in health behavior and health education

* Emerging- student receives B+ or better on all course related papers
* Intentional – student has abstract accepted to national conference
* Professional – student submits first authored manuscript for review (80% or better on scientific writing rubric)
* Mastered – student has first authored manuscript accepted

**Doctoral Student Presentation Rubric**

**Organization** (10 points**)**

Did the sequence of the presentation sections flow and promote understanding?

Did the presentation end in a timely fashion?

Was the presenter rushed or having difficulty filling his or her time?

**Clarity of visual aid** (10 points)

Did the visual aid help clarify or support the presentation?

Was the intention or meaning of the visual aid clear?

Was the visual aid legible?

**Knowledge of material** (10 points)

Did the presenter use the research terminology correctly?

Do you consider the presenter an expert regarding the material?

Did the presenter rely heavily on the slides (mostly reading)?

Did the presenter convey a sense of expertise when answering the question?

**Logic of research explanation** (10 points)

Did the study make sense to you?

Did the presenter avoid unnecessary jargon?

Were you convinced that the research topic was important?

Did the research design address the questions or hypotheses of interest?

Did the background research justify the action proposed by the presenter?

Was the study grounded in theory?

Did the presenter appreciate and identify the limitations of the study?

**Presentation skills** (10 points)

Could you understand the presenter (tone and clarity of voice)?

How confident was the presenter?

Did the presenter make eye contact with the audience members?

Was the presentation interesting to the audience?

Did the presenter use vocal variety (not monotone)?

Did the presenter sound conversational?

Were vocal fillers (e.g., um, uh, like) under control?

Did the presenter avoid reading?

**Doctoral Student Scientific Writing Rubric**

**Problem Statement and Purpose** (10 points)

Problem statement and/or purpose of study is clearly and succinctly articulated

Problem statement identifies a testable relation between two or more variables (quantitative)

Problem statement identifies the importance of further understanding a phenomenon (qualitative).

The significance of the problem is convincing.

**Literature review and theoretical framework** (10 points)

The variables or phenomenon of interest are/is conceptually defined.

The importance of examining the variables or phenomenon of interest is compelling.

The relation between the variables is supported by the included literature (quantitative only)

Gaps or conflicts in knowledge of the problem are identified.

References cited by the author are mostly primary sources.

Length of the paper is effective not simply filling pages.

Literature well integrated and flowed thoughtfully.

**Hypotheses or research question** (10 points)

Hypotheses or research questions are stated.

Variables or phenomenon of interest are clearly identified in the hypotheses or questions (e.g., consistency of language and direction of relation as applicable)

Are the hypotheses or research questions testable (quantitative) or explorable (qualitative)?

**Sample** (10 points)

Sample criteria and selection process presented clearly

Sampling method is identified and described.

Sample reflects the population associated with the problem or purpose statement.

Sample size is appropriate.

**Research Design** (10 points)

Type of research design identified.

Design is applicable and flows from the research problem theoretical framework, literature review, and/or hypotheses.

Data collection method articulated and accurately described.

Procedures consistent across all participants as suitable for the research design.

Rights of participants clearly protected.

**Methodology and Results**(focus as applicable, 10 points)

Rational for particular quantitative instrument or method

Clear qualitative methodology

Describe persons responsible for data collection and their training.

Clear and appropriate plan of analysis

Findings presented in a clear and accurate manner

Tables and Figures supplement the text

**Conclusions** (10 points)

Provides accurate summary of the results

Accurately discusses findings in relation to previous research and hypothesized outcomes

Compelling arguments provided if findings differed from previous research

Implications of the findings discussed in relation to future research and/or application

Limitations of the research clearly articulated

**Doctoral Student Teaching Observation**

**Session Organization** (10 points)

The material was clearly organized.

The instructor provides goals or purpose of the session.

The instructor has well-organized learning activities that reinforce active engaged learning.

The instructor explains transitions between class or lecture segments.

**Instruction Style** (10 points)

The instructor is well-prepared for the session.

The instructor varies the pace of activities.

The instructor encourages and responds to questions from the students.

The instructor appropriately facilitates classroom discussion.

The instructor provides appropriate directions for the instructional strategies and/or assignments.

The instructor’s voice has good clarity, pace, volume, tone and pitch.

The instructor employs good eye contact with all students.

The instructor shows respect for all students.

The instructor addresses students directly and in a constructive manner.

The instructor recognizes students’ confusion.

The instructor provides appropriate guidance, feedback and positive reinforcement.

The instructor encourages creative though.

**Student Engagement** (10 points)

Students appear to be actively engaged in the class.

Students frequently ask questions in class to clarify learning.

Students stay on task.

**Session Content** (10 points)

The content is appropriate, accurate, and current.

Examples are used effectively.

Strategies are employed to keep the students engaged in the learning process.

**Doctoral Student General Writing Rubric**

**Organization** (10 points**)**

Did the sequence of the paper sections flow and promote understanding?

Was the length of the paper effective or simply filling pages?

Was the literature well integrated and flowed thoughtfully?

**Supporting items** (10 points)

Did the tables and figures help clarify or support the paper content?

Was the writing style (e.g., APA or AMA) executed accurately or did errors distract from the content?

**Knowledge of material** (10 points)

Did the author use the research terminology correctly?

Do you consider the author an expert regarding the material?

Did the presenter convey a sense of expertise in relation to the conclusion drawn from the study?

**Logic of paper** (10 points)

Did the study make sense to you?

Were you convinced that the research topic was important?

Did the research design address the questions or hypotheses of interest?

Did the background research justify the action proposed by the author?

Was the study grounded in theory?

Did the author appreciate and identify the limitations of the study?