

Center for Health Equity Rubric for Master's and Doctoral Student Application

- Use the rubric below as guidance for completing the application. All sections are important.
- Reviewers will use this rubric as well.
- If you have any questions, contact Dr. Patricia Documet at pdocumet@pitt.edu

Rubric					
	1 Poor	2 Fair	3 Good	4 Excellent	Mark box
Description of thesis or dissertation					
1. Background	Identifies the public health problem with little description. Inadequate or no use of epidemiological data. Does not mention prior work in the field.	Identifies and describes the public health problem. Inadequate use of epidemiological data. Does not mention prior work in the field.	Identifies and describes the public health problem. References to epidemiological data are insufficient. Refers vaguely to prior work in the field.	Identifies and describes the public health problem. Refers to epidemiological data. Refers to prior work on the field.	
2. Goals and objectives	Research question or goal is unclear. No hypotheses or measurable objectives. Does not identify clearly target population.	States clear research question or goal. Hypotheses or objectives are unclear. Identifies vaguely the target population (e.g., age, race, gender, place)	States clear research question or goal. States hypotheses or measurable objectives. Identifies vaguely the target population (e.g., age, race, gender, place)	States clear research question or goal. States clear hypotheses or measurable objectives. Identifies clearly the target population (e.g., age, race, gender, place)	
3. Methods	No research design or justification. Methods of data collection, literature review and/or data analysis are not adequate and not justified. Methods do not relate to goals/objectives or hypotheses.	Outlines a research design. Justification of design is unclear. Methods of data collection, literature review and/or data analysis are not clear or not adequate for the question/objectives. Justification of methods is unclear.	Outlines a research design. Justification of design is unclear. Identifies at least some appropriate methods to answer research questions: data collection, literature review and/or data analysis. Justification of methods is unclear.	Outlines a research design. Argues how this design will answer research question/address goals. Identifies appropriate methods to answer research questions: data collection, literature review and/or data analysis. Justifies use of methods.	
4. Relevance to public health	Poor description of the importance of addressing this problem for public health. Does not refer to population affected, severity of the problem and/or potential benefits.	Describes the importance of addressing this problem for public health, but fails to connect it with population affected, severity of the problem and/or potential benefits.	Describes the importance of addressing this problem for public health referring partially to population affected, severity of the problem and/or potential benefits.	Describes the importance of addressing this problem for public health referring to population affected, severity of the problem and/or potential benefits.	

	1 Poor	2 Fair	3 Good	4 Excellent	Mark box
Financial information					
5. Attached budget	Budget is attached but gives no details about the cost of the project. Line items are inappropriate for the study.	Budget is attached and details the cost of the project. Line items are inappropriate for the study.	Budget is attached and details the cost of the project. Line items are not clearly appropriate for the study.	Budget is attached and details the cost of the project. Line items are appropriate for the study.	
6. Detailed explanation of use of funds	No justification for use of funds.	Justification for use of funds in the context of the project is confusing. (Direct research costs, tuition and self-support are all allowed).	Justifies use of funds in the context of the project with some clarity. (Direct research costs, tuition and self-support are all allowed).	Justifies use of funds in the context of the project with clarity. (Direct research costs, tuition and self-support are all allowed).	
Health equity relevance					
7. How does the thesis or dissertation advance the case of health equity?	No clear identification of the population affected by the problem and no clear explanation of why this is a disparity or inequity. Does not explain clearly how the thesis or dissertation can aid in decreasing the disparity/inequity.	Identifies the population affected by the problem and states why it is a disparity or inequity. Does not explain clearly how the thesis or dissertation can aid in decreasing the disparity/inequity.	Identifies the population affected by the problem and states why it is a disparity or inequity. Explains to some extent how the thesis or dissertation can aid in decreasing the disparity/inequity.	Identifies clearly the population affected by the problem and states why it is a disparity or inequity. Explains how the thesis or dissertation can aid in decreasing the disparity/inequity.	
Advisor's appraisal					
8. Advisor's paragraph	Advisor's statement does not explain why the student should receive award. No comments on commitment to work on health equity or disparities, academic ability, and ability to complete initiatives.	Advisor explains why the student should receive award, including to a small extent commitment to work on health equity/disparities, academic ability, and ability to complete initiatives.	Advisor explains why the student should receive award, including to a good extent commitment to work on health equity/disparities, academic ability, and ability to complete initiatives.	Advisor explains why the student should receive award, including commitment to work on health equity/disparities, academic ability, and ability to complete initiatives.	
TOTAL POINTS FOR ALL DOMAINS (range 8-32)					