

CAPSTONE REPORT RUBRIC

Student Name: _____

Capstone Report Rubric – Completed by: _____ Date: _____

REPORT SECTION	Does Not Meet Expectations (C or below)	Meets Expectations (B)	Exceeds Expectations (A)
Literature Review	<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 <input type="checkbox"/> [if applicable] Demonstrates poor understanding of theoretical concepts	<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 <input type="checkbox"/> [if applicable] Demonstrates understanding of theoretical concepts	<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 <input type="checkbox"/> [if applicable] Demonstrates mastery of theoretical concepts
Methods/Process/Strategies, Planning & Implementation	<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"/> 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,	<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

	<input type="checkbox"/> [if applicable] Conceptual framework not identified	<p>objective, correct</p> <input type="checkbox"/> [if applicable] Conceptual framework is clear and adequately linked to project	<p>sophisticated, robust, precise</p> <input type="checkbox"/> [if applicable] Conceptual framework is exceptional with superior links to project
Results/Product/Outcomes	<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, programmatic, or clinical utility <input type="checkbox"/> Interpretation of data (e.g., quantitative or qualitative) or outcomes is wrong, inappropriate	<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, programmatic, or clinical utility <input type="checkbox"/> Interpretation of data (e.g., quantitative or qualitative) or outcomes is routine, objective, correct	<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, programmatic, or clinical utility <input type="checkbox"/> Interpretation of data (e.g., quantitative or qualitative) or outcomes is sophisticated, robust, precise
Discussion/Conclusion/Evaluation & Reflection	<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 short-term impact on community setting/practice/end-users in public health <input type="checkbox"/> Poor discussion of potential long-term	<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 short-term impact on community setting/practice/end-users in public health <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate discussion of potential long-term	<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 short-term impact on community setting/practice/end-users in public health <input type="checkbox"/> Superior discussion of potential long-term

	<p>implications and future directions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Weak recommendations are made to community settings/practices/end-users; recommendations are poorly linked to results/products/outcomes <input type="checkbox"/> Simple identification of which competencies were addressed with no discussion of how they were met 	<p>implications and future directions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate recommendations are made to community settings/practices/end-users; recommendations are linked to results/products/outcomes <input type="checkbox"/> The competencies addressed were identified; some discussion of how the specified competencies were addressed 	<p>implications and future directions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Superior recommendations are made to community settings/practices/end-users; recommendations are very clearly linked to results/products/outcomes <input type="checkbox"/> The competencies addressed were identified; thoughtful and extensive discussion of how the competencies were addressed
OVERALL			
Significance/Scope	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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,

	improperly cited, etc.)	cited, etc.)	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 a exceptional balance between working independently but asking for necessary feedback/help <input type="checkbox"/> Exceptionally responsive to written/verbal feedback
FINAL RATING	<input type="checkbox"/> DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS (EQUIVALENT TO C OR BELOW)	<input type="checkbox"/> MEETS EXPECTATIONS (EQUIVALENT TO B)	<input type="checkbox"/> EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS (EQUIVALENT TO A)

Student Name: _____

Chair of Committee: _____

Date: _____

Summary of written comments from ALL committee members for student concerning performance on Capstone Report and Oral Defense

Chair of Committee Signature _____

Date: _____