

MPH Master's Exam Rubric						
Areas of Competence	Type of Paper	Exemplary (3 points)	Meets Expectations (2 points)	Does Not Meet Expectations (1 point)	Score	Comments
1. Knowledge of methods appropriate to the type of project or approach to the problem.	<b><u>For those students collecting or analyzing primary or secondary data: Application of appropriate research design and methods (qualitative, quantitative, or mixed), either based on secondary or primary data</u></b>	The student comprehensively explains selection of study design, methods for data collection and reasons for selection of analysis techniques. Analyzes and interprets data and results thoroughly and comprehensively.	The student can adequately explain selection of study design, methods for data collection, and reasons for selection of analysis techniques. Is able to explain analysis and results but not comprehensively.	The student is unable to explain selection of study design, methods and/or analysis techniques.		
	<b><u>For those students developing program evaluation or intervention studies</u></b>	The student demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of etiologic and program theory in designing interventions (including training or curriculum development) or evaluation studies (including use of logic models); demonstrates a systematic approach to program design, methods, and development of a solid evaluation design.	The student is able to apply etiologic and program theory but does not fully integrate them into comprehensive program design or methods. Theoretical underpinnings are unclear, or there is limited support from the literature and little or no evaluation design.	The student is unable to present a clear understanding of program planning or evaluation processes; unable to use terminology; unable to integrate concepts, practices or principles, no evaluation design.		
	<b><u>For those students developing theoretical, conceptual or critical analysis paper</u></b>	The student presents clear and consistent arguments that are supported by literature, and properly applies theory. The paper makes a clear contribution to the literature and to public health research and practice.	The student presents clear and consistent arguments, but with limited support from the literature and limited application of theory. The paper is acceptable but not innovative enough to make a contribution to the literature or the field.	The student presents arguments that are not supported by the literature or by theory. The paper needs further development both conceptually and for its application to the field.		

<p><b>2. Ability to search and integrate relevant literature</b></p>		<p>The student searches relevant databases using appropriate key words. He/she demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of the relevant literature. He/she is able to explain how the IE or the professional paper fills a gap in current knowledge or adds to the field.</p>	<p>The student searches few relevant databases and/or the key words utilized are appropriate but limited. He/she demonstrates good understanding of the relevant literature, with a few small gaps in knowledge. He/she is able to clearly explain how the IE or the professional paper fills a gap in current knowledge with minor prompting.</p>	<p>The student demonstrates limited utilization of appropriate databases and key words and limited understanding of the relevant literature, with large gaps in knowledge. He/she is unable to explain how the IE or the professional paper fills a gap in current knowledge without significant prompting.</p>		
<p><b>3. Ability to present results, connect them to the literature reviewed and discuss the implication of the study for public health practice, research and policy</b></p>		<p>The student comprehensively explains study results and their connection to the literature reviewed, its implications for public health practice and can independently conceptualize future research that would improve upon the current project/current literature.</p>	<p>The student adequately explains study results and their connection to the literature reviewed, its implications for public health practice and can adequately conceptualize future research that would improve upon the current project/current literature.</p>	<p>The student is unable to explain study results and their connection to the literature reviewed, its implications for public health practice and is unable to independently conceptualize future research that would improve upon the current project/current literature.</p>		
<p><b>4. Ability to answer questions about presentation content</b></p>		<p>The student needs no prompting to respond to questions. He/she exhibits superior knowledge in the subject area, skillfully presenting information and well-reasoned arguments. The student demonstrates the critical thinking skills of a MPH professional and is able to interconnect knowledge from multiple disciplines.</p>	<p>The student needs minimal prompting to respond to questions. He/she exhibits adequate knowledge in the subject area, responding adequately to questions. The student demonstrates the critical thinking skills of a MPH graduate student and is able to partially interconnect knowledge from multiple disciplines.</p>	<p>The student is unable to respond to questions without significant prompting/help. He/she exhibits minimal knowledge in the subject area and minimal critical thinking skills and capacity to interconnect knowledge from multiple disciplines.</p>		
<p><b>5. Presentation skills</b></p>		<p>The student speaks clearly at a moderate pace, and demonstrates excellent presentation skills.</p>	<p>The student generally speaks clearly and at a moderate pace, with some minor, occasional issues, and demonstrates good</p>	<p>The student is difficult to follow (does not speak clearly, speaks too quickly, appears unprepared and/or disorganized, etc.),</p>		

			presentation skills.	and demonstrates poor presentation skills.		
<b>6. Quality of presentation materials</b>		Slides and handouts are well-organized, easy to read, and attractive. Materials are of professional quality.	Most slides and handouts are well-organized, with a few minor issues (e.g. a few slides are overcrowded). Some clarification is needed to understand some slides/handouts.	The majority of the slides and handouts are poorly organized and overcrowded, with major clarifications needed to understand the slides/handouts.		
<b>7. Knowledge of MPH core and student concentration competencies</b>		The student needs no prompting to respond to questions. He/she exhibits superior knowledge in the core and concentration competencies. The student demonstrates the critical thinking skills of a MPH professional and is able to integrate the three concentrations.	The student needs minimal prompting to respond to questions. He/she exhibits adequate knowledge in the core and concentration competencies. The student demonstrates expected level of critical thinking skills of a MPH professional and is reasonably able to integrate the three concentrations.	The student is unable to respond to questions without significant prompting/help. He/she exhibits minimal knowledge in the core and concentration competencies. The student demonstrates minimal critical thinking skills of a MPH professional and is unable to integrate the three concentrations.		

**Additional comments:**

**TOTAL SCORE:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Score Guidelines:**

≥18 = Pass with Distinction

14-17 = Pass

8-13 = Conditional Pass

<7 = Does not Pass; needs to improve the presentation and give the oral defense a second time; if this is the student's second time presenting: fail.

**Final decision to pass with distinction, pass, conditionally pass or not pass the oral presentation/fail will be based on the average scores of all voting committee members.**