|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Max. mark | Your mark | Grade | **Not yet Competent** | **Competent** | **Proficient** | **Exemplary** |
|  |  |  |  | 54% to 65% | 66% to 73% | 74% to 89% | 90% to 100% |
| **Formulation & scope of informatics problem** | 20 | 19 | Exemplary  | Your problem description is unclear with little to no integration of prior knowledge and competencies. The reader is left wondering about the nature and scope of the problem. | Your problem description is unclear in some respects and not well thought-out. There is little evidence that you have integrated prior knowledge and competencies. | Your problem description is clear and demonstrates some integration of your prior clinical knowledge and competencies as well as some information gained in other areas of the program, but the scope is not well defined. | Your problem description is clear and well thought out, demonstrating effective integration of your prior clinical knowledge and competencies and information gained in other areas of the graduate program, and the problem scope is well defined. |
| **Significance of informatics problem** | 20 | 19 | Excellent  | Your problem does not represent a current significant challenge in health care. The reader is left wondering who would be interested in a solution. | Your problem does not represent a current significant challenge in health care. Therefore, the potential benefits of solution are small or unclear. | Your problem represents a current significant challenge in health care, but the potential benefits of solution are small, or not clearly identified. | Your problem represents a current significant challenge in health care, and potential benefits from the solution are clearly identified.  |
| **Environmental risk analysis** | 20 | 19 | Excellent  | Your environmental description is unclear, and aspects of the environment that present sources of risks for the problem/solution are not identified. Readers who have some understanding of the risks themselves might be concerned that you are either naïve or trying to “put one over on them.” | Your environmental description is clear, but aspects of the environment that present sources of risks for the problem/solution are not identified. | Your environmental description is clear, but aspects of the environment that present sources of risks for the problem/solution are not always identified. | Your environmental description is clear, and aspects of the environment that present sources of risks for the problem/solution are identified at all stages of the process.  |
| **System analysis** | 20 | 18 | Excellent (--) | Your analysis of the problem is sporadic or missing; there is no evidence of the accurate, appropriate use of systems analysis tools. | You provide some analysis of the problem, but it is not detailed and not supported by the accurate, appropriate use of systems analysis tools. | Your analysis of the problem is detailed, but not all steps are supported by the accurate, appropriate use of systems analysis tools. | Your analysis of the problem is systematic and detailed, demonstrating the accurate, appropriate use of systems analysis tools at all steps of the process. |
| **Feasibility of solution** | 20 | 18 | Excellent (--) | Your proposed solution is not realistic, either because it does not conform to actual environmental or economic constraints or because it is too vaguely defined to allow the reader to understand its impact. | Your proposed solution is not unrealistic, but more consideration of economic and environmental conditions would require modification of the solution. As it stands, solution may not accomplish your goals. | Your proposed solution is realistic and workable for the most part. Takes into account economic and environmental conditions, but lacks attention to the constraints these place on design and implementation. | Your proposed solution is realistic and workable. Takes into account economic and environmental conditions and the constraints these place on design and implementation. |
| **Hardware/ software selection** | 20 | 19 | Excellent  | Your informatics solution is not clearly defined; rationales for choices are unclear or missing. | Your informatics solution is clearly defined but rationale for choices is not clearly defined. | Your informatics solution is clearly defined and rationale for choice of software and hardware is clearly defined but not supported by existing literature. | Your informatics solution is clearly defined and rationale for choice of software and hardware is clearly defined and supported by existing literature. |
| **Implementation plan** | 20 | 19 | Excellent  | Your implementation plan is not clearly defined. Readers are not certain what will actually happen. | Your implementation plan is clearly defined but rationale is not supported by existing literature. | Your implementation plan is clearly defined but rationale is not always supported by existing literature. | Your implementation plan is clearly defined and rationale supported by existing literature. |
| **Education plan** | 20 | 19 | Excellent  | Your education plan is not clearly defined, making implementation success less likely. | Your education plan is clearly defined but rationale is not supported by existing literature. | Your education plan is clearly defined but rationale is not always supported by existing literature. | Your education plan is clearly defined and rationale supported by existing literature. |
| **Evaluation plan** | 20 | 19 | Excellent  | Your evaluation plan is not clearly defined; making it unlikely that the success of the innovation will be measured.  | Your evaluation plan is clearly defined but rationale is not supported by existing literature. | Your evaluation plan is clearly defined but rationale is not always supported by existing literature. | Your evaluation plan is clearly defined and rationale supported by existing literature. |
| **Potential issues (privacy, security, ethical, legal, social, ergonomics, economic impact) are identified and solutions proposed** | 20 | 19 | Exemplary  | Your proposal fails to identify many relevant issues and/or propose appropriate solutions based on existing literature, making successful implementation highly unlikely. | Your proposal fails to identify some significant relevant issues; but does propose appropriate solutions for those issues identified, based on existing literature. | Your proposal identifies most relevant issues and some appropriate solutions proposed, based on existing literature. | Your proposal identifies all relevant issues and you propose appropriate solutions, based on existing literature. |
| **Organization** | 10 | 9.5 | Exemplary  | Your proposal is disorganized to the extent that it prevents understanding of its contents. The style is inappropriate for the audience (e.g., use of jargon, level of formality). There is no executive summary and no conclusion. Figures, tables and appendices have errors, are redundant with text, or are missing. | Your proposal has some interesting points, but is hard to follow. The style of the proposal is frequently inappropriate for the audience (e.g., use of jargon, level of formality). Some of the figures, tables and appendices detract from the proposal or are difficult to follow.  | Your proposal is interesting, but some points are unclear, or some parts seem out of place or inappropriate for the audience (e.g., use of jargon, level of formality). The introduction and/or conclusion are weak. Figures, tables and appendices are not always used effectively.  | Your proposal is well organized, easy to understand, and written in a style appropriate for the target audience. Figures, tables, and appendices enhance the presentation.  |
| **Use of appendices, tables, figures** | 10 | 10 | Excellent (++) | Considerable information in your proposal is somewhat misplaced (text vs. appendix, table or figure). Appendices, tables, and figures are not documented or referenced in the text. | Some information in your proposal is somewhat misplaced (text vs. appendix, table or figure). Appendices, tables, and figures are poorly documented and referenced in the text. | Information in your proposal is appropriately placed in the main text or an appendix, table or figure, but documentation and referencing in the text are somewhat incomplete. | Information in your proposal is appropriately placed in the main text or an appendix, table or figure. Appendices, tables and figures are documented and referenced in the text. |
| **Grammar** | 10 | 9.17 | Excellent (-) | Your proposal has frequent misspelled words and serious grammatical errors. | Your proposal has more than one spelling or grammatical error per page. | Your proposal has a few spelling and grammatical errors. | There is evidence that your proposal has been spell-checked and proof read.  |
| **Teamwork** | 20 | 20 | Excellent (++) | There is little evidence of effective teamwork; no work plan is included. | There is some evidence of effective teamwork; but no work plan where task assignments, due dates and responsible parties are included, but not followed. | There is mostly evidence of effective teamwork: a work plan with tasks assignments, due dates and responsible parties is included and generally followed or modified as needed. | There is evidence of effective teamwork: a work plan with tasks assignments, due dates and responsible parties is included and has been followed or modified as needed. |
| Penalties or bonuses  | 5 | 4.58 | Presentation |
| Totals | 255 | 241.3 |  |
| Percentages | 100% | 94.6% |  |
| Mark for this assignment | 35 | 33.1 |  |
| Grade for this assignment |  |  | Exemplary |

|  |
| --- |
| **Grading Rubric for Project 3 (PowerPoint Presentation)** |
|  | **Levels of Achievement** |
| **Criteria** | **Sophisticated** **3**  | **Competent** **2**  | **Not yet Competent**  **1**  |
| **Presentation level** | Appropriate for target audience. Presentation is a well-planned conversation (not just reading the poster) and paced to maximize audience understanding.  | Generally appropriate for target audience. Pacing at times may be too fast or slow. | Inappropriate for audience; aspects too elementary, too sophisticated, or too much jargon. Much information is read.  |
| **Content** | Presentation is clear, logical and organized. Relevant theory or literature used to illuminate proposed solution. Participants gain insights.  | Presentation generally clear and well organized; a few minor points may be confusing. Some attempt to use relevant literature to support proposed solution. | Presentation is difficult to follow; some arguments are not clear. No attempt to link relevant literature to proposed solution. Not well organized. |
| **Communication aids** | Communication aids enhance presentation. Fonts on visuals large enough; information organized to maximize understanding; details minimized. | Communication aids generally enhance presentation; Font size appropriate and appropriate information included, but some material not supported by visual aids. | Communication aids detract from presentation either because poorly prepared, small fonts, too much information, or unimportant information highlighted. |
| **Response to questions during online discussion session** | Responsive to audience comments, questions and needs. | Generally responsive to audience comments, questions and needs. | Inadequate response to audience questions or comments. |