Defense:

Translational Project Oral Presentation
& Translational Project Paper Rubric
Doctorate in Health Informatics (DHI)

UTHealth Houston | McWilliams School of Biomedical Informatics

Student Name: _____   Date of Exam: _____

Advisory Committee members: _____(Chair) _____

_____   _____   _____

This form is to be completed by the Chair with input from the committee. The evaluation should be based on the translational project oral defense and the translational project paper. All boxes must be checked and scored by the Chair & committee members.

	Poor (1)	**Developing (2)**	**Good (3)**	**Outstanding (4)**	**Overall Score**
Knowledge	❑ Poor breadth and depth of understanding of the area of study ❑ Difficulty evaluating background literature ❑ Difficulty understanding implications of current evidence-based practice	❑ Limited breadth or depth (but not both) of the subject ❑ With some help, could synthesize and evaluate background literature ❑ Limited understanding of implications of evidence-based practice	❑ Sufficient breadth and depth of understanding Could identify and discuss key background for the study ❑ Some attempts at discussing implications of most important evidence-based practice	❑ Solid breadth and depth of knowledge ❑ Able to integrate information from multiple sources ❑ Able to describe, discuss, critically evaluate relevant background information Could draw clear conclusions from and discuss implications of most important evidence-based practice	1 2 3 4

	Poor (1)	Developing (2)	Good (3)	Outstanding (4)	Overall Score
Translational Project /Evidence-Based Questions	❏ PICO/SMART Statement are unfocused ❏ No rationale is provided	❏ Able to formulate purposeful PICO/SMART Statement questions, but has difficulty explaining rationale ❏ Significance of project question is unclear	❏ PICO/SMART Statement are well-stated with adequate rationale ❏ Significance of project question is clear and well stated	❏ Very significant and novel PICO/SMART Statement questions ❏ Strong, clear rationale for project questions and validates the project problem	1 2 3 4
Project Design and Methods	❏ Project design not clear; No validated method is specified ❏ Limitations of methods not understood or discussed ❏ Lacked identification of strengths, weaknesses and limitations in project design and methods	❏ Project design is explained, but lacks theoretical support ❏ Rationale for selected project methods is not well established ❏ Identified some strengths, weaknesses and limitations in project design ❏ Some awareness of alternative design and methods	❏ Project design and selected methods are generally sufficient to address the problem but need some modification ❏ Needs development of identification of strengths, weaknesses and limitations of project design and methods ❏ Demonstrates understanding of alternative design and methods	❏ Able to identify and logically discuss strengths, weaknesses and limitations of project design and methods ❏ Understands the theory and practice of the methods ❏ Appropriately compared and discussed alternative project design and methods	1 2 3 4

Final Data Analysis and Discussion of Results	❏ Data not analyzed or not presented in a coherent fashion, no insight in analyzing data at deeper level shown ❏ No ROI and Cost-Benefit Analysis ❏ No interpretation and no causation	❏ Data presentation is unclear and incoherent in some cases, little insight into meaning of data ❏ Limited ROI and Cost-Benefit Analysis ❏ Limited interpretation and limited causation	❏ Data analysis and presentation clear and understandable, some evidence of deeper interpretation and analysis of data ❏ Some ROI and Cost-Benefit Analysis ❏ Some interpretation and some causation.	❏ Data presentation is highly organized and clear, deep analysis and understanding of all the data and their implications ❏ Identified ROI and Cost-Benefit Analysis ❏ Clear explanation of interpretation and causation	1 2 3 4

	Poor (1)	**Developing (2)**	**Good (3)**	**Outstanding (4)**	**Overall Score**
Communication	❏ Disorganized slides and/or write-up with grammatical errors ❏ Arguments are incomplete or poorly organized ❏ Did not understand/address the questions asked ❏ Poor language or articulation skills	❏ Slides or write-up not very clear Oral presentation was clear, but student had to read the slides most of the time ❏ Arguments are logical and organized ❏ Understood most of the questions but provided only partial answers ❏ Language and articulation understandable, for the most part	❏ Write-up and slides largely well written ❏ Some inconsistencies during the oral presentation ❏ Arguments are articulated and well organized ❏ Understood questions and provided adequate answers ❏ Could be readily understood	❏ Slides and write-up clearly written in the appropriate format ❏ Poised and polished in the oral presentation ❏ Understood the questions and provided clear, thorough answers ❏ Took the discussion to a higher level	1 2 3 4

Additional comments:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Please return the complete form to: SBMIAcademics@uth.tmc.edu or SBMI Office of Academic Affairs.

Last Revised: 08.28.2024