**Seton Hall University**
## eRepository @ Seton Hall

Health and Medical Sciences (OER)                    Open Educational Resources

2017

# HCAD 6002: Policy Map Project Rubrics for Report and Presentation

Anne Hewitt

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarship.shu.edu/health-administration-oer

Part of the Medicine and Health Sciences Commons

# HCAD 6002:   Policy Map Project
## Rubrics for Report and Presentation

| Category & Weight | Competency Level | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | **Highly Competent** | **Adequately Proficient** | **Acceptable, needs improvement** |
| | **9-10** | **8** | **7** |
| Introduction And Research Foundation<br><br>15% of 100 | Assignment submitted on-time in professional manner<br><br>Clearly articulated choice of variables or measures for mapping (at least two variables). Descriptive statistics for variables are included.<br><br>Clearly articulated geographic boundaries for mapping (two for comparative purposes).  Brief rationale for choosing these locales. | Assignment submitted on-time in professional manner<br><br>Articulated choice of variables or measures for mapping (at least two variables).<br><br>Articulated geographic boundaries for mapping (two for comparative purposes). | Assignment not submitted on time or missing sections<br><br>Variables are present but without a clear articulation of the causal relationships.<br><br>Geograhic boundaries and geographic comparisons are hard to follow and not well explained. |
| Policy Map Application and Presentation<br><br>40% of 100 | Evidence of critical thinking reflecting either preliminary analysis data or citations motivating an investigation into an associative relationship among the variables.<br><br>Written introductions to each map explaining its constituent components (e.g. communities, disease prevalence, location of health care centers). | A written rationale for variable choices going beyond their availability in the Policy Maps data base.<br><br>Clear titling and labeling in the policy maps.<br><br>Adequate Visual presentation that notes reasons why some maps are more informative than others, and that articulates "take-away" points from maps even if those | Missing rationale for variable choice<br><br>Maps may have labels but discerning relevant messages is difficult.<br><br>Visual presentations lack predicates and explanation.  Leaving the reader without a clear understanding of what the investigation attempted, let alone found. |

| | Maps are titled and labeled.<br><br>Visual presentation included exceptional level of detail<br>With clear relevance to topic (i.e the maps themselves) | points are that refined data or further investigation are necessary to make inferences about causal relationships. | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Policy Map Analysis, Evaluation<br><br>35% of 100 | Written explanation of each individual map highlighting a) overall patterns among causal and response variables, b) striking or unexpected highlights, c) connection between the map and preliminary analysis or citations relied upon to motivate the investigation.<br><br>Written comparison of two or more "map pairs." The first map pair may analyze two locations revealing the distribution of the causal variable. The second map pair may evaluate the distribution of the response variables in two or more locations. These are possible comparisons. Your individual comparisons may be more elaborately articulated based upon your queries.<br><br>proposing further research. | Written explanation of each individual map highlighting a) overall patterns among causal and response variables, b) connection between the map and preliminary analysis or citations relied upon to motivate the investigation.<br><br>Written comparison of two or more "map pairs." | Some description of each individual map but without consistent attention to the variable being mapped, their geographic distribution and relationships among the variables.<br><br>Some comparison of maps, but not a systematic analysis of how differences in the distribution of cause and effect. |

| Conclusion and Recommendations 10% of 100 | Concluding paragraphs (or brief section) reinforcing findings, highlighting what policy maps reveal, identifying limits in this pilot investigation, and | Concluding paragraph about findings, & learning from maps. | No clear finding or "bottom line," and failure to suggest further research |
|---|---|---|---|