

PGY Committee Meeting Assessment Rubric

Learning Outcomes	4 – Excellent	3 – Competent	2 – Marginal	1 - Deficient
<p>Able to critically analyze literature related to the project, think intellectually about the direction of the project, demonstrate intellectual curiosity about the project</p>	<p>Demonstrates a thorough understanding of content and scientific context. Uses appropriate and relevant sources to explore ideas within the discipline and to critically develop a well-articulated scientific theme. Clear demonstration of independent intellectual contribution, creativity, and original thinking.</p>	<p>Demonstrates an adequate understanding of content and scientific context. Uses appropriate and relevant sources to critically develop a scientific theme. Follows and presents literature reasonably well. Demonstrates some insight and creativity</p>	<p>Demonstrates awareness of content and scientific context. Uses appropriate and relevant sources that are applied through most of the work. Organization of ideas not always logical or consistent with composing a scientific argument. Minimal evidence of original thinking.</p>	<p>Demonstrates minimal awareness of content and scientific context. Uses appropriate and relevant sources to develop limited areas of this work. Examples of inappropriate literature citations common. Frequent lapses of logic when composing a scientific argument. Lack of creativity or original thinking.</p>
<p>Able to formulate relevant and testable hypothesis, devise clear experiments for addressing the hypothesis, and analyze and interpret data appropriately</p>	<p>Demonstrates a thorough understanding of the scientific method, clear ability to understand and design complex experimental protocols, analyzes and presents data with a clear and proper interpretation.</p>	<p>Demonstrates good understanding of scientific method, designs experiments appropriate for addressing hypotheses, presents data in an appropriate context.</p>	<p>Demonstrates satisfactory understanding of scientific method, needs some assistance with complex experimental design and analyzing data, can present and interpret data with some guidance from the PI</p>	<p>Demonstrates minimal understanding of scientific method, limited ability to conceive of experimental design to address hypotheses, needs significant faculty input for data analysis and interpretation</p>
<p>Able to effectively communicate data and interpretation with scientific peers, answers questions, communicates ideas</p>	<p>Articulates intimate understanding of the project, is able to orally communicate and defend new ideas, thinks effectively on his/her feet, is able to integrate knowledge from multiple disciplines and experience in solving problems.</p>	<p>Has appropriate understanding of the project, able to articulate ideas but lacks some creativity, can think through basic problems when questioned, has an adequate knowledge base and is able to integrate appropriately to solving problems.</p>	<p>Has a basic understanding of the project but lacks depth, can answer basic questions about the project but has some difficulty thinking on his/her feet, has some gaps in knowledge base and does not effectively use this for problem solving.</p>	<p>Lacks understanding of the project and unable to communicate rationale for interpretation of data or direction of the project, substantial gaps in knowledge base and is unable to draw from different areas or experiences to solve problems.</p>
<p>Able to communicate effectively through scientific writing.</p>	<p>Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose of the scientific work; uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to convey the contribution to the scientific discipline; pays detailed attention to and successful execution of conventions particular to grant writing including organization, content presentation, formatting, and style; uses relevant and credible references appropriately, uses graceful language that skillfully communicates meaning to readers with clarity and fluency, and is nearly error free.</p>	<p>Demonstrates adequate consideration of context, audience and purpose of the scientific work; uses appropriate, relevant and compelling content to convey the contribution to the scientific discipline; consistently uses important conventions particular to writing grants including organization, content, presentation, and style; consistently uses appropriate references to support ideas; uses straightforward language that generally conveys meaning to readers with few errors.</p>	<p>Demonstrates awareness of context, audience, and purpose of the scientific work; uses appropriate and relevant content to explore ideas through most of the work; follows expectations appropriate to grant writing for basic organization, content, and presentation; attempts to use credible and/or relevant references to support ideas; uses language that generally conveys meaning with clarity, though with errors</p>	<p>Demonstrates minimal attention to context, audience, purpose of the scientific work; uses appropriate and relevant content to develop simple ideas in parts of the work; attempts to use a consistent system for basic organization and presentation; attempts to use sources to support ideas; uses language that sometimes impedes meaning because of errors in usage.</p>