

BIMD 480 – Senior Seminar
Rubric for Medical Humanities Presentation

	Exemplary (4 pts)	Accomplished (3 pts)	Developing (2 pts)	Beginning or Incomplete (1-0 pts)	Score	Weight	Total Score
Clarity and Quality of Introduction and Thesis Statement	Arguable thesis: presents a coherent, persuasive, original, thesis that is clearly articulated, specific and focused enough to be manageable. Introduction of argument: argument makes clear the connection with experiential learning, defines necessary terms, and shows a clear contribution to medical humanities scholarship.	Presents a coherent, thesis-driven argument, though may not be entirely persuasive. Central thesis is clearly articulated and focused, though may lack some specificity. Argument is appropriate for the intended audience. Defines necessary terms.	Presents a thesis-driven argument, though thesis may lack coherency or may not be entirely persuasive. Central thesis is present, though articulation may be unfocused or lack specificity. Argument may not consider its intended audience. May not define necessary terms.	Central thesis is not apparent, or is too non-specific or unfocused to be coherent. Argument may be inappropriate for its intended audience. Does not define necessary terms.		x 4	
Quality of Argument	Demonstrates depth of critical inquiry. Acknowledges contradictions, qualifications or limits of argument—particularly as these might differ based on stakeholder perspectives—and thoroughly addresses counter arguments. Analysis reveals deep and careful reflection on the connections between experiential learning and research.	Demonstrates some depth of critical inquiry on the chosen topic. Argument shows some complexity through attempts to acknowledge the contradictions, qualifications or limits of the thesis. Anticipates audience questions by exploring counter arguments. Analysis reveals careful reflection.	Level of critical inquiry on the chosen topic may seem shallow at times. Occasional but not consistent recognition of the contradictions, qualifications or limits of the thesis. May fail to anticipate audience questions by exploring counter arguments. Analysis reveals uneven reflection, and places in need of more critical reflection.	Level of critical inquiry is consistently shallow. Failure to recognize the contradictions, qualifications or limits of the thesis. Argument consistently raises audience questions and fails to anticipate potential counter arguments. Analysis reveals a consistent lack of careful reflection.		x 5	
Evidentiary Support for Argument	Offers authoritative (peer-reviewed or other credible secondary and tertiary sources) evidence in support of claims, and thoroughly explains connection between evidence and main ideas. Avoids generalizations. Verbally credits these sources within the presentation.	Offers appropriate evidence in support of claims, and effectively explains connection between evidence and main ideas. Avoids generalizations. Uses only credible and authoritative evidentiary sources, and makes these sources clear within the presentation.	Offers evidence in support of claims, but some claims may be unsupported. Connection between evidence and main ideas is not always clear. May make some generalizations. Authority of evidentiary sources may be questionable, or sources may not be made clear within the presentation.	Multiple claims are unsupported, or the connection between evidence and main ideas is not clear. Makes frequent generalizations. Relies on questionable evidentiary sources, or sources are not made clear within the presentation.		x 4	
Organization of Argument	Delivers claims in a logical order, where each claim clearly develops the central thesis. Uses transitional devices to move from each idea to the next, securely guiding the audience through the progression of ideas.	An identifiable logic orders the supporting sub-claims, and each sub-claim relates to the central thesis. Transitional devices help move between ideas, and the audience is guided through the progression of ideas.	The order of supporting sub-claims may not be wholly logical or effective. Some sub-claims may not clearly relate to the central thesis. Presentation may need more transitional devices to help move between ideas. Audience may occasionally feel lost or confused.	No clear logic to the ordering of supporting sub-claims. Not evident how or if all sub-claims relate to the central thesis. Presentation lacks transitional devices. Audience often feels lost or confused.		x 3	

	Exemplary (4 pts)	Accomplished (3 pts)	Developing (2 pts)	Beginning or Incomplete (1-0 pts)	Score	Weight	Total Score
Incorporation of Experiential Learning	Clearly draws on experiential learning, particularly shadowing experiences, in the argument. Makes explicit the connection between these experiences and the focus of the analytical argument.	Clearly mentions experiential learning, and the connection between these experiences and the focus of the analytical argument can be inferred.	The connection between the presenter's experiential learning and the argument can be inferred, but is never made explicit.	Argument does not clearly relate to experiential learning.		x 2	
Presentation Skills	Confident and well-paced delivery. Connects with the audience via eye contact, humor, emotiveness, etc. Presentation is interactive and dramatic. Responds confidently, precisely and appropriately to all audience questions.	Reasonably confident and well-paced delivery, though may occasionally stumble or rush. Connects with the audience, though presentation may be somewhat flat affectively or eye contact may be limited. Responds appropriately to all audience questions.	May lack confidence, rush, mumble or consistently mispronounce words. Limited connection with the audience, whether through lack of eye contact or affect. Presentation consists of little more than reading from the written paper. Responds reluctantly to audience questions or fails to answer questions adequately.	Lacks confidence. Has poor pacing. Fails to connect with the audience. Presentation consists of simply reading awkwardly from the written paper. Responds inappropriately to audience questions.		x 2	
Length of Presentation	Presentation was 14-15 minutes long	Within 1 minute of allotted time +/-	Within 2 minutes of allotted time +/-	Too long or too short by 3 or more minutes		x 1	
<i>Criteria below apply to written version of the essay & the abstract</i>							
Writing Style & Mechanics	Chooses words for their precise meaning and uses an appropriate level of specificity. Tone of essay is appropriate for the intended audience. Sentences are varied, well-structured and focused. Free of all spelling, punctuation and grammatical errors.	Appropriate level of specificity to language. Tone of essay is appropriate for the intended audience. Sentences are varied, well-structured and focused. Few if any spelling, punctuation and grammatical errors.	Language may lack specificity at times. Tone of essay may not be wholly appropriate for the intended audience. Some sentences may be repetitive, poorly structured or unfocused. Multiple spelling, punctuation and grammatical errors.	Language lacks specificity. Tone may be inappropriate for the intended audience. Sentences are repetitive, poorly structured or unfocused. Spelling, punctuation and grammatical errors confuse the reader or block his or her ability to understand the argument.		x 2	
Responsible Citation & Bibliography	Uses only authoritative (peer-reviewed or other credible secondary and tertiary) evidentiary sources. Appropriately quotes or paraphrases and cites all non-obvious information. Relies on a consistent method of citation, both in the essay and in the works cited. Citations are accurately formatted and complete.	Uses appropriate evidentiary sources. Appropriately quotes or paraphrases and cites all non-obvious information. Relies on a consistent method of citation, both in the essay and in the works cited. Citations are accurately formatted and complete.	Some evidentiary sources may be questionably credible. The source for some non-obvious information may not be clearly identified. Citation method may not be entirely consistent, and citations may reveal some formatting errors or omissions.	Evidentiary sources may be questionably credible. The sources for non-obvious information within the essay are not clearly identified. No clear or consistent citation method. Multiple formatting errors or omissions within the citations.		x 2	