**2015-2016 Annual Program Assessment Report**

Please submit report to your department chair or program coordinator, the Associate Dean of your College, and to james.solomon@csun.edu, director of assessment and program review, by September 30, 2015. You may, but are not required to, submit a separate report for each program, including graduate degree programs, which conducted assessment activities, or you may combine programs in a single report. Please identify your department/program in the file name for your report.

**College: Health and Human Development**

**Department: Kinesiology**

**Program: Undergraduate and Graduate**

**Assessment liaison: Teri Todd**

1. **Please check off whichever is applicable:**

**A. \_\_\_X\_\_\_\_\_ Measured student work.**

**B. \_\_\_IP\_\_\_\_ Analyzed results of measurement.**

**C. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Applied results of analysis to program review/curriculum/review/revision.**

1. **Overview of Annual Assessment Project(s).** On a separate sheet,provide a brief overview of this year’s assessment activities, including:
* an explanation for why your department chose the assessment activities (measurement, analysis, and/or application) that it enacted
* if your department implemented assessment **option A**, identify which program P-SLOs were assessed (please identify the P-SLOs in full), in which classes and/or contexts, what assessment instruments were used and the methodology employed, the resulting scores, and the relation between this year’s measure of student work and that of past years: (include as an appendix any and all relevant materials that you wish to include)
* if your department implemented assessment **option B**, identify what conclusions were drawn from the analysis of measured results, what changes to the program were planned in response, and the relation between this year’s analyses and past and future assessment activities
* if your department implemented **option C**, identify the program modifications that were adopted, and the relation between program modifications and past and future assessment activities
* in what way(s) your assessment activities may reflect the university’s commitment to diversity in all its dimensions but especially with respect to underrepresented groups
* any other assessment-related information you wish to include, including P-SLO revision (especially to ensure continuing alignment between program course offerings and both program and university student learning outcomes), and/or the creation and modification of new assessment instruments

**3. Preview of planned assessment activities for next year.** Include a brief description and explanation of how next year’s assessment will contribute to a

continuous program of ongoing assessment.

Overview of Annual Assessment Projects:

The primary assessment project was to assess P-SLO 2, two projects were undertaken in conjunction with the College of HHD to track course alignment to SLO 3 and assess intern skills in cultural competence. The graduate program was also evaluated to assess student growth in breadth of knowledge, writing, and presentation skills.

**P-SLO 2**

i) The Department of Kinesiology’s 5 year assessment plan outlined assessment activities for the current period. P-P-SLO 1 was assessed in 2012-2013 and 2013-2014. Last year, 2014-2015 P-SLO 2 was assessed primarily indirectly with the plan to add additional direct assessment in 2015-2016. Kinesiology took part in the pilot of CSUN’s Electronic Assessment System for the P-SLO 2 assessment.

ii) Kinesiology has four options and one major (Athletic Training). Each option aligned their required undergraduate courses with the Program Student Learning Outcomes (P-SLOs). This year we measured P-SLO 2: Apply evidence-based practices to enhance the study of human movement.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Program** | **Student Learning Outcomes (P-SLOs)** |
| **Undergraduate** | 1. Apply an integrated kinesiological approach to encourage the adoption of healthy and physically active lifestyles, across diverse populations.**2. Apply evidence based practices to enhance the study of human movement.**3. Demonstrate competent problem solving strategies through intentional practices.4. Demonstrate knowledge of kinesthetic forms, processes and structures as they apply to the personal expression and culture of human movement. |

P-SLO 2 was assessed indirectly in 2014-2015. To begin the assessment we wanted to understand how P-SLO 2 was addressed in Kinesiology courses. A convenience sample of classes from all undergraduate levels showed that P-SLO2 was presented and evaluated with a variety of methods including direct instruction, reading, practical application, case studies, written exams and papers.

This P-SLO was then directly assessed though the evaluation of a short essay written by students in an upper division Kinesiology class KIN 477/478, however this was not a graded assignment. The rubric used to assess P-SLO2 was a general rubric with the following criteria: 1) synthesis of information pertaining to the question, 2) validity of the information provided, 3) completeness of the answer, 4) quality of writing, and 5) flow within the essay. Direct assessment of P-SLO2 was continued in 2015-2016 but focused on assignments that were graded and contributed to the final grade of the class. A new rubric, specific to P-SLO2, was designed to better evaluate student knowledge and performance.

Several steps were involved in the assessment. First the Electronic Assessment System (EAS) was introduced to the faculty. The system is designed to be a repository of documents that will be kept indefinitely. The documents are uploaded by students, at the request of the instructor, and should have all personal identification removed. The faculty were concerned about student privacy and potential use of the documents in the future. Even though the documents should not contain name, student number, or other identification they are uploaded under the student’s name and for a specific class so it is possible to identify the source of the work. The Assessment Liaison explained that this system is not designed to compare performance of classes or sections but to look at student performance overall, however there was low buy-in from the faculty. Five faculty agreed to participate in the assessment. This was a challenge, moving forward a discussion should occur if the EAS is a suitable assessment tool for this department.

The first step was to design a rubric to assess the application of evidence-based practices in the study of human movement. The Assessment Liaison met with the Curriculum Committee and together identified important elements and criteria for the rubric. Two rubrics were created and sent out to the committee members. Members were asked to identify the rubric they felt was most appropriate for this application and there was consensus on one rubric which was adopted for this assessment and uploaded to the EAS (Appendix A). The five criteria included in the rubric are: 1) identify critical issues of relevant practice, 2) access and assess relevant evidence, 3) critically analyze practices as supported by evidence, 4) communicate effectively, 5) apply evidence based practices.

The next step in designing a study in the EAS system is to identify classes and give instructors permission to access the system. Four faculty members identified graded assignments that related to P-SLO2 and were willing to ask students to upload the assignments to the EAS. The assignments were from four courses, one 200 level course and three 400 level courses, they included group term papers, lab reports, exam questions, and short extra credit essays. In total 106 assignments were uploaded to the EAS.

Four faculty members agreed to assess the documents. All assessors practiced rating a norming document using the rubric until 80% agreement was reached. Each document was assessed twice. If the difference was greater than 80% the document was assessed a third time, 80% agreement was reached in each case.

All criteria and one overall dimension (understanding of concept) were assessed using the rubric with four categories: not started (1), emerging (2), developing (3), and mastering (4). The results were organized by class level and assignment type. It was reasoned that student responses would vary between an exam or lab question and term paper. One assignment, answering an exam or laboratory question, requires thinking through the problem and formulating a response quickly, while writing a term paper is a much longer project with numerous edits.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|   | Average Score (out of 4) |
|   | 200 level exam question | 400 level lab and exam question | 400 level Term Paper |
| 1. Dimension 1: Understanding of concept | 2.33 | 2.8 | 3.83 |
| 2. Identify critical issues of relevant practices | 2.33 | 2.94 | 3.67 |
| 3. Access and assess relevant evidence.  | 1.67 | 2.57 | 3.83 |
| 4. Critically analyze practices as supported by evidence | 1.75 | 2.54 | 3.17 |
| 5. Communicates effectively | 2.41 | 2.75 | 3.83 |
| 6. Apply evidence based practices (scenario and actual practice) | 2.17 | 2.74 | 3.67 |

Table 1: Average results for the assessment of P-SLO2

The results show that students’ ability to apply evidence-based practices to the study of human movement improves from 200 to 400 level courses. When students are provided with thorough instructions and have time to research a topic they perform very well on the criteria outlined by the assessment rubric. Indeed as seen in Figure 1 there is no overlap between the three conditions.

Figure 1: P-SLO2 Average scores on each assessment criteria.

Steady growth in the ability to apply evidence-based practices is a positive finding. It should be noted that the scores for students in a 400 level courses answering exam or lab questions are only slightly higher than students in a 200 level class and on some criteria only slightly higher than a score of 60%. It appears students struggle when asked to assess, analyze, and communicate findings when expected to formulate a response within a short time frame.

For all students, all levels and type of assignments, students scored highest on understanding the concept, identifying critical issues of relevant practice, and communicating effectively. All students experience the most difficulty in critically analyzing practices as supported by evidence. This may be a reflection of the curriculum and expectations of undergraduate studies, searching for and analyzing research is covered in more depth in the graduate program.

Results were presented to the faculty during a department meeting. Faculty engaged in several hours of discussion over multiple meetings on the meaning of P-SLO2 and if our Kinesiology courses are adequately addressing the learning outcome. The first topic was clarifying the meaning of the P-SLO. Faculty adopted the general evidence based framework of: STEP 1: Developing a Question, STEP 2: Searching for Evidence STEP 3: Evaluating the Evidence STEP 4: Incorporating the Evidence into Practice STEP 5: Confirming the Evidence in the Individual STEP 6: Re-evaluating the Evidence. Further discussion focused on where and how the P-SLO was covered and ways to include evidence-based practices in different classes. To this end a syllabus committee was formed to create guidelines for course syllabi that will include how P-SLOs are taught, activities in which they are practiced, and how they are evaluated in each class. This will aid instructors in clearly laying out how they intend to meet P-SLOs, including P-SLO2.

**College of Health and Human Development: Cultural Competency Assessment and SLO3 Alignment**

The CHHD assessment committee participated in two college wide assessment activities. Building on past assessments of comportment, ethics, and cultural competence the area of cultural competence was assessed for a second year. A survey to assess cultural competencies was refined by the college assessment committee after being piloted in the spring of 2015. The surveys were to be completed for students completing internships in their junior or senior years. Supervising precepts completed the surveys. Eighty-eight surveys were completed for students in Kinesiology. The completed surveys were forwarded to the HHD College assessment coordinators.

The survey included 12 statements related to HHD SLO 2 Cultural Competencies. The survey can be found in the Appendix B. Precepts were asked to rate the degree to which the student intern met that statement using a 5-point scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5).

The majority of responses were in the strongly agree and agree categories. Precepts rated the interns favorably for cultural competency. Sixty-five percent of surveys were completed with strongly agree (5) for all cultural competency items. An additional 21% of surveys were completed with strongly agree and agree (4-5). Five percent of the items received a rating of 3 (somewhat agree). Only seven percent of the surveys indicated some difficulty in the cultural competence area (disagree to strongly disagree). There was a decrease in the number of items marked as strongly agree and agree by precepts when compared to the previous year, additionally the number of items marked Not Applicable increased to seven percent. The survey was first administered in the spring of 2015 and repeated in spring 2016, it is possible that precepts may have been more attuned to observing cultural competencies after the first survey and perceived student interactions more critically.

Overall the survey results are favorable. However one area, competency 7: Demonstrates knowledge of evidence based literature regarding potential cultural disparities in the health and well-being of culturally diverse individuals and families was rated rather poorly with20/88 responses rated as ‘disagree’. Faculty members, specifically the internship coordinators, were made aware of this problem area so it may be addressed prior to the start of an internship. The internship coordinator holds mandatory internship meetings during the semester. This strategy created improvements in the first two competencies, ethical and professional standards, assessed in 2013 and 2014. Though the improvements were slight they are meaningful, as the majority of the intern sites are consistent over the years, so the change can be attributed to intern performance.

The CHHD assessment committee also decided to begin indirect assessment of SLO3 by gathering information on the courses that align with this SLO in each department.

**SLO3 Evidence-Based Practices**: Students will engage in evidence-based practice when making open and thoughtful professional decisions, incorporating current, high-quality research evidence with professional experience and client preferences and values.

The SLO was broken down into three components at the undergraduate level and six at the graduate level

Undergraduate

Identify critical issues of relevant practice

Access and assess relevant evidence

Critically analyze practices as supported by evidence

Graduate (above 3 plus the following)

Design evidence based project (e.g. review of literature)

Apply evidence based practice (e.g. scenario or actual practice)

Evaluate practice and make recommendations.

Instructors in the Department of Kinesiology were asked to identify which courses address SLO3, how it is taught, and the type of assessment administered. Seventeen undergraduate classes, ranging from 100 to 400 level, were identified. Three graduate course instructors provided information on how SLO3 was addressed in their classes. Instructors identified a variety of techniques to present and assess the content including lecture, hands on experience, readings, case-studies, exams, papers, and presentations.

**KINESIOLOGY GRADUATE PROGRAM**

The Department of Kinesiology has a vibrant graduate program with an increasing number of students each academic year. An assessment tool was implemented five years ago to assess progress throughout the program. The assessment tool (Appendix C) is used to assess student work during a required course, KIN 605 Research Methods, and assess the written thesis and oral defense presentation. Sixty-five students have participated in the project with 16 completing all components of the assessment to date.

The assessment tool consists of two rubrics, one for written projects and one for oral presentations. There are six components for each rubric. Each component is evaluated on a scale from one to six with one being needs improvement and six outstanding. Average scores for each component are presented.



Graduate students typically take KIN 605 in their second or third semester as they are developing their thesis or project ideas. There seems to be little change in the written quality of the work and development of the idea through the process of presenting the proposal at colloquium and defending the thesis or project. Overall the average scores range from 4.5 to 5.2 out of 6 which reflects good quality work. It should be noted that the KIN 605 instructor rates the written and class projects while thesis/project committee members rate the colloquium and defense presentations and written work. In the components of research question and methodology there is a slight improvement from colloquium to defense, which would be expected as students incorporate feedback and refine their question and methodology. Interestingly the scores for supporting evidence and writing decrease slightly and conclusion and implications remain the same.

Oral presentations improve systematically throughout the students’ journey from idea conception (KIN 605) through the process of developing and presenting the idea (Colloquium), implementing the research, analyzing the data, and presenting the results (Defense). We are confident that students gain knowledge and skills in the area of research presentation.

Scores on graduate presentations will be continue to be collected and presented to faculty for discussion.

**Planned Assessment Activities for 2016-2017**

Kinesiology is presently undergoing the 6th year review, part of this process is to create a multi year assessment plan. At the moment this topic is under discussion.

Appendix A: Kinesiology P-SLO 2 Assessment Rubric

|  | **Not started [1.0]** | **Emerging [2.0]** | **Developing [3.0]** | **Mastering [4.0]** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Dimension 1** | Does not have understanding of main concepts | Has an idea of some main concepts | Exceeds expectations and understands main concepts | Highly proficient in all concepts |
| **1. Identify critical issues of relevant practices** | Issue to be considered stated clearly and described. Issue to be considered is not fully stated. Little to no information about the issue is presented. Issue is described comprehensively. All information relevant for a full understanding of the issue is present. | Issue to be considered is stated, minimal information about the issue is presented. | Issue to be considered is stated clearly. Some relevant information for a full understanding of the issue is missing. | Issue to be considered stated clearly and described comprehensively. All information relevant for a full understanding of the issue is present. |
| **2. Access and assess relevant evidence.** | Limited evidence of search, sources may be of poor quality or not on topic. Repeats information without interpretation or evaluation. Viewpoints of experts are taken as fact, without evaluation. | Information is taken from limited sources, may include poor source evaluation. Not enough information presented to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Some sources are not on topic. Conclusions may not be warranted based on evidence provided. | Demonstrates adequate source searching skills. Is able to summarize source accurately, discerns fact from opinion. Enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Quality and relevant sources are used but may not be enough to completely cover the topic. Draws warranted conclusions. | Uses information from a wide variety of current, quality sources as well as foundational and classic sources. Summarizes sources with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis. Reported data and information is clearly connected to the issue or question. |
| **3. Critically analyze practices as supported by evidence** | Limited evidence of search, sources may be of poor quality or not on topic. Repeats information without interpretation or evaluation. Viewpoints of experts are taken as fact, without evaluation. | Information is taken from limited sources, may include poor source evaluation. Not enough information presented to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Some sources are not on topic. Conclusions may not be warranted based on evidence provided. | Demonstrates adequate source searching skills. Is able to summarize source accurately, discerns fact from opinion. Enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Quality and relevant sources are used but may not be enough to completely cover the topic. Draws warranted conclusions. | Uses information from a wide variety of current, quality sources as well as foundational and classic sources. Summarizes sources with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis. Reported data and information is clearly connected to the issue or question. |
| **4. Communicates effectively** | Summary of scenario or practical situation is missing or so minimal that reader can not understand the problem. Only one practice is presented and reason for chosen practice is not clear. Conclusion is not logical. | Scenario or practical situation summary is not clear enough to understand the importance of the issue. Relevant practices are presented but outcome differences are not discussed. Conclusion is stated but not discussed. | Scenario or practical situation is summarized with enough detail to fully understand issue. Relevant practices are presented and outcomes discussed. Conclusions are based on logic. | Scenario or practice situation is summarized with enough detail to fully understand issue. Relevant practices and outcomes are presented, reason to use each practice based on evidence is discussed. Conclusions are based on logic. |
| **5. Apply evidence based practices (scenario and actual practice)** | Summary of scenario or practical situation is missing or so minimal that reader can not understand the problem. Only one practice is presented and reason for chosen practice is not clear. Conclusion is not logical. | Scenario or practical situation summary is not clear enough to understand the importance of the issue. Relevant practices are presented but outcome differences are not discussed. Conclusion is stated but not discussed. | Scenario or practical situation is summarized with enough detail to fully understand issue. Relevant practices are presented and outcomes discussed. Conclusions are based on logic. | Scenario or practice situation is summarized with enough detail to fully understand issue. Relevant practices and outcomes are presented, reason to use each practice based on evidence is discussed. Conclusions are based on logic. |

Appendix B: HHD Assessment of Cultural Competence Frequencies, Spring 2016

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **P-SLO 2: Cultural Competencies** | **1****Strongly disagree** | **2****disagree** | **3****Somewhat Agree** | **4****Agree** | **5****Strongly Agree** | **N/A****Not Applicable** |
| 1. Does not discriminate against others.
 |  |  |  |  | 88 |  |
| 1. Treats others with dignity and respect.
 |  |  |  |  | 88 |  |
| 1. Recognizes and acts upon cultural factors that affect health and well-being of others.
 |  |  | 5 | 11 | 51 | 21 |
| 1. Demonstrates ability to interact effectively with people of different cultures.
 |  | 1 | 3 | 28 | 53 | 3 |
| 1. Engages with community partners to promote a healthy environment and healthy behaviors for all cultural contexts.
 |  |  | 5 | 18 | 47 | 18 |
| 1. Demonstrates ability to assess one’s cultural biases and assumptions for all cultural contexts.
 |  |  | 21 | 30 | 35 | 2 |
| 1. Demonstrates knowledge of evidence based literature regarding the potential cultural disparities in the health and well-being of culturally diverse individuals and families.
 |  | 20 | 6 | 20 | 24 | 18 |
| 1. Exhibits caring, compassion and empathy.
 |  |  |  | 6 | 82 |  |
| 1. Ensures other feel heard and understood
 |  |  | 1 | 25 | 61 | 1 |
|  10. Responds appropriately to nonverbal cues. |  |  | 3 | 32 | 53 |  |
|  11. Is aware if others understand what they need to know. |  |  | 3 | 37 | 48 |  |
|  12. Uses correct grammar in all verbal and non-verbal correspondence.  |  |  | 1 | 16 | 55 | 16 |

Appendix C Graduate Assessment Tool

California State University, Northridge

Department of Kinesiology Thesis Rubric

Student Name: Evaluator:

**Written Presentation Rubric for Colloquium and Thesis Presentations**

For each criterion below, please *circle* key phrases that describe the work a whole number or increment of 0.5 .

**1. Abstract**

**Needs improvement Developing Satisfactory Outstanding**

**1 2 3 4 5 6**

Abstract written in technical language/jargon Abstract easily understood by general university audience

Description of project/written work is incomplete Description of research, context, approach, process, and conclusions is clear and concise

Link to larger context is missing/unclear Link to larger context is clear

**2. Research question/issue/creative challenge presented within academic framework**

**Needs improvement Developing Satisfactory Outstanding**

**1 2 3 4 5 6**

Research question/issue/creative challenge not

Research question/issue/creative challenge identified

and summarized

Goals/objectives/hypothesis is clear

Historical context, assumptions/biases, and/or ethical considerations are present/developed

Thesis presented within academic framework

Thesis connection to appropriate local, national, global or civic issue(s) is present/developed

identified, or inaccurately/inadequately represented

Goals/objectives/hypothesis is vague or incomplete

Historical context, assumptions/biases, and/or ethical

considerations are lacking or underdeveloped

Thesis not presented/inadequately presented within

academic framework

Thesis connection to appropriate local, national, global or

civic issue(s) is lacking or underdeveloped

1. **Methodology/approach appropriate to disciplinary/interdisciplinary focus**

**Needs improvement Developing Satisfactory Outstanding**

**1 2 3 4 5 6**

Methodology/approach is appropriate and delineated

Procedures of the discipline, and relevant inter- disciplinary considerations, are presented

Topic clearly contextualized among sources and materials cited

Methodology/approach missing, incomplete,

insufficiently detailed, or inappropriate

Relevant interdisciplinary considerations are

under- developed or missing

Topic minimally situated among sources and materials cited

1. **Supporting evidence and body of knowledge; findings**

**Needs improvement Developing Satisfactory Outstanding**

**1 2 3 4 5 6**

Evidence/body of knowledge inadequately discussed

Body of knowledge thoroughly discussed

Evidence is sufficient and well utilized

Accuracy and relevance of evidence appropriately questioned; bias(es) identified

Multiple perspectives considered

Appropriate quantitative and/or symbolic tools are utilized

Evaluates, analyzes, and synthesizes information

Evidential support for argument, or use of evidence,

 is selective or inadequate

Fact vs opinion not well distinguished; bias(s)

recognition is lacking

Perspectives are limited

Quantitative and/or qualitative and/or symbolic tools

 used inappropriately

Evaluation, analysis, synthesis are limited

1. **Conclusions, implications, and consequences**

**Needs improvement Developing Satisfactory Outstanding**

**1 2 3 4 5 6**

Conclusions, implications, and/or consequences

Conclusions, qualifications, and consequences,

including value of thesis, are presented and well developed

Significance of what was discovered, learned or created is clear

Assertions are qualified and well supported

Connections to local, national, global, or civic

issue(s) discussed; ramifications of work presented and discussed

lacking, or conclusions are loosely related to

consequences or implications

Significance of what was discovered, learned, or created

is unclear

Assertions are unqualified or unwarranted

Appropriate connections to local, national, global or civic

 issue(s) are lacking; ramifications of work not discussed

1. **Writing**

**Needs improvement Developing Satisfactory Outstanding**

**1 2 3 4 5 6**

Language obscures meaning/unclear in places

Language clearly and effectively communicates ideas

Language is appropriately nuanced and eloquent

Errors are minimal

Organization is clear and effective

Sources and citations used correctly

Grammatical, spelling, or punctuation errors are distracting

or repeated

Work is unfocused

Organization is clumsy or mechanical

Sources not cited or not used correctly

Please add brief comments for additional feedback to student.

**TOTAL SCORE** **FOR WRITTEN PRESENTATION** (for 6 criteria) =

Thesis is of publishable quality with minor / major revision (circle one)

Brief comments on written presentation:

**Oral Presentation Rubric for Colloquium and Thesis Presentations**

Student Name: Evaluator: Evaluator’s Dept:

For each criterion below, please *circle* key phrases that describe the work a whole number or increment of 0.5 .

**1. Introduction**

**Needs improvement Developing Satisfactory Outstanding**

**1 2 3 4 5 6**

Introduction interesting and engaging

Introduction prepared audience for thesis topic

Introduction inadequate

Audience was left poorly prepared for thesis topic

**2. Organization**

**Needs improvement Developing Satisfactory Outstanding**

**1 2 3 4 5 6**

Well-organized, easy to follow

Smooth transitions and periodic summaries

Speaker disorganized/poorly organized

Jumped between topics, and/or lacked periodic summaries

**3. Delivery**

**Needs improvement Developing Satisfactory Outstanding**

**1 2 3 4 5 6**

Speech smooth, clear, and articulate

Voice projection and pacing effective

Eye contact appropriate, helped connection to audience

Delivery comfortable, poised, prepared

Paper was read or seemed memorized

Speech was too slow / too fast / too soft

Eye contact with audience lacking or absent

Delivery uncomfortable, stiff, unsure, unprepared

**4. Content**

**Needs improvement Developing Satisfactory Outstanding**

**1 2 3 4 5 6**

Paper and presentation highly technical; for specialized

A general audience could understand the presentation

Key terms defined and necessary background information provided

Assumptions surfaced.

Research information evaluated and well synthesized

audience

Terms undefined or minimally defined; background

 information and/or assumptions lacking

Research deficient in evaluation or synthesis

**5. Media and Resources**

**Needs improvement Developing Satisfactory Outstanding**

**1 2 3 4 5 6**

Media and format poor choice for content

Appropriate media and format for content

All materials lucid, with pertinent information

Materials sometimes confusing or distracting, or served as filler

**6. Response to Questions**

**Needs improvement Developing Satisfactory Outstanding**

**1 2 3 4 5 6**

Answers questions well and with reference to own work

Shows knowledge of subject

Misunderstands questions or cannot answer some

questions

Brief comments on oral presentation:

**TOTAL SCORE** **FOR ORAL PRESENTATION** (for 6 criteria) =

**TOTAL SCORE**

Written Presentation:\_\_\_\_\_\_ + Oral Presentation:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ = \_\_\_\_\_\_\_/72

Overall evaluation (written and oral *combined*):

\_\_\_\_\_Nominate for Pass with Distinction

\_\_\_\_\_Excellent

\_\_\_\_\_Satisfactory / Pass

\_\_\_\_\_Thesis needs minor revision to pass

\_\_\_\_\_Thesis needs significant revision to pass

\_\_\_\_\_Fail