

**Professional Paper Learning Objectives Rubric**

Each Primary Professor for Professional Paper should complete this rubric at the end of MPH 6992 for each of their professional paper students and submit to Rashmita Basu electronically (basur19@ecu.edu). These data will be used as part of IPAR reporting for the ECU MPH program.

MPH 6992 Section Number: \_\_\_\_\_ Semester/Year: \_\_\_\_\_

Total number of MPH 6992 students completing this semester in your section: \_\_\_\_\_

Student number within your section (Number your students from 1 to number of completing students in your section): \_\_\_\_\_

Please score each learning objective as Poor (=1), Acceptable (=2), Good (=3), Excellent (=4) or Not Applicable (NA). For each learning objective, please comment on the quality of the student’s performance, difficulties they had, and what you think might have helped this student perform better.

The criteria for success for each of the learning objective is for 80% of all MPH 6992 students to score 3 or higher.

**Learning objective: CEPH Foundational Competency #7, Assess population needs, assets and capacities that affect communities’ health.**

**Section of professional paper being evaluated: Introduction**

Poor (score=1)	Acceptable (score=2)	Good (score=3)	Excellent (score=4)	Score
Literature review not adequately comprehensive with at least 10 peer-reviewed references.	Adequate literature review and information is summarized adequately.	Literature review is complete, no use of secondary references, and background information is well summarized.	Professional quality introduction which demonstrates knowledge and understanding of the published literature on the topic and how it relates to a public health problem, including population needs, assets, and capacities.	
Comments about areas in which the student had difficulties and what might have helped them:				

**Learning objective: CEPH Foundational Competency #3, Analyze quantitative and/or qualitative data using biostatistics, informatics, computer-based programming and software, as appropriate.**

**Sections of professional paper being evaluated: Methods and Results**

Poor (score=1)	Acceptable (score=2)	Good (score=3)	Excellent (score=4)	Score
Inappropriate methods selected.	Appropriate methods selected but not implemented in a thorough and complete manner.	Appropriate methods selected and implemented correctly; results presented in text, tables and/or charts are generally clear.	Professional quality methods and results, which demonstrate a clear understanding, implementation, and linkage throughout the research process.	
<p>Comments about areas in which the student had difficulties and what might have helped them:</p>				

**Learning objective: CEPH Foundational Competency #4, Interpret results of data analysis for public health research, policy or practice**  
**Sections of professional paper being evaluated: Discussion**

Poor (score=1)	Acceptable (score=2)	Good (score=3)	Excellent (score=4)	Score
Interpretation of results inadequate or under-developed.	Acceptable interpretation of results with limited comparisons to previously published results and/or inadequate discussion of public health implications.	Good interpretation of results with comparisons to some previously published results, presents some of the study limitations, and adequate interpretation of public health implications.	Professional quality discussion section, which demonstrates an excellent grasp and understanding of results and their limitations, how the results add to the current body of scientific knowledge, and how the results can be used to further public health research, policy, or practice.	
Comments about areas in which the student had difficulties and what might have helped them:				

**Learning objective: CEPH Foundational Competency #19: Communicate audience-appropriate public health content, both in writing and through oral presentation**

**Product being evaluated: Writing quality of the professional paper, and Oral presentation of the professional paper project at the poster presentation session**

Product	Poor (score=1)	Acceptable (score=2)	Good (score=3)	Excellent (score=4)	Score
Writing quality of the professional paper	Poor writing style with grammatical and/or typographical errors, poor organization of the sections, many sentences unclear.	Acceptable writing, clarity, and organization but not written in a succinct scientific style and/or had unacceptable grammatical or typographical errors.	Overall well written but had some problems with organization, clarity, grammar, or persuasion.	Professional quality paper, well-written and in appropriate scientific style, ready for submission to peer-reviewed journal.	
Oral presentation at poster session (2 minute summary of project told to guests)	Had difficulty clearly stating the purpose of the professional paper project and describing how it was implemented.	Able to provide complete description of the study but in a manner that was difficult for guests to understand.	Able to provide complete description of the study that was easy for guests to understand but lacked command of the topic and/or enthusiasm.	Clearly articulated all of the following in a manner that was understood by guests and demonstrated command of and enthusiasm for the subject: purpose of the project, methods used, results found and their limitations, and implications for public health.	
Comments about areas in which the student had difficulties and what might have helped them:					