

Program-Level Assessment: Annual Report

Program Name (no acronyms): PhD Public Health Studies

Department: NA

Degree or Certificate Level: Doctorate

College/School: CPHSJ

Date (Month/Year): May 2023

Assessment Contact: Travis Loux

In what year was the data upon which this report is based collected?

This report is based on data from AY 2021-2022

In what year was the program's assessment plan most recently reviewed/updated?

2018

Is this program accredited by an external program/disciplinary/specialized accrediting organization or subject to state/licensure requirements?

Yes

If yes, please share how this affects the program's assessment process (e.g., number of learning outcomes assessed, mandated exams or other assessment methods, schedule or timing of assessment, etc.):

We must have a set of doctoral-level competencies/learning outcomes which further develop those from the master's level public health programs.

1. Student Learning Outcomes

Which of the program's student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle? (Please provide the complete list of the program's learning outcome statements and **bold** the SLOs assessed in this cycle.)

1. Critically evaluate, integrate and challenge existing scientific knowledge. Assess gaps in research to develop research questions.
2. **Plan, design and conduct research studies. Interpret the results using inferential statistical methods and methods of qualitative data analysis.**
3. Communicate clearly and effectively about scientific information for diverse audiences through scientific publications, grant applications, teaching/ training, etc. Develop partnerships in community, clinic, academic and/or governmental settings to conduct research projects collaboratively.
4. Work collaboratively to conduct research and provide peer review to colleagues.
5. Adopt and apply ethical principles for public health research and decisions on social justice and equity in the global environment. Conduct research that requires Institutional Review Board approval.
6. Evaluate the impact of cultural, structural, legal, political, and public health and social justice on health outcomes.
7. Use innovative methods to communicate scientific findings and implications to diverse audiences, ensuring appropriate strategies.

2. Assessment Methods: Artifacts of Student Learning

Which artifacts of student learning were used to determine if students achieved the outcome(s)? Please describe the artifacts in detail, identify the course(s) in which they were collected, and if they are from program majors/graduates and/or other students. Clarify if any such courses were offered a) online, b) at the Madrid campus, or c) at any other off-campus location.

PHS 6010.: Research Project. Students conduct a research project and write a formal report including data acquisition, quantitative data analysis, and interpretation of results. This is an in-person class offered only to doctoral students in the PhD Public Health Studies program. The instruction for the research project includes: (1) Clearly write a statement of the research problem to indicate what was investigated. The statement should indicate the variables of interest and the specific relationship that was studied between the variables, (2) Sample: briefly describe where your sample was obtained from and how you selected your subsample, if applicable, (3) Measures: Define the dependent variable, primary independent variable, and other covariates. How was each variable measured, classified, or recoded? Each variable should be associated with a meaningful name (e.g., lung cancer, smoking status, etc.), value label (e.g., 1=smoke, 2=non-smoke, etc.), and corresponding questionnaire question. A table can be used to present the above information, (4) Statistical analysis: Describe which statistical methods are used to examine the relationship between variables. Explain why each statistical model is appropriate for your research question and variables. What statistics are going to be reported? (5) Results: report/describe results from your analysis, and (6) Discussion of the findings and their implications for public health implications.

- Comprehensive Written Exam
- Oral PhD Exam
- Dissertation Defense

3. Assessment Methods: Evaluation Process

What process was used to evaluate the artifacts of student learning, and by whom? Please identify the tools(s) (e.g., a rubric) used in the process and **include them in/with this report document** (please do not just refer to the assessment plan).

- PHS 6010 Research Project is evaluated by the course instructor.
- Comprehensive Written Exam is evaluated by 2-3 Public Health faculty members.
- Oral PhD Exam is evaluated by a committee of 5 Public Health faculty members. Committee members outside CPHSJ are allowed but must be approved by the Program Director and Associate Dean of Academic Affairs.
- Dissertation Defense is evaluated by a committee of at least 3 Public Health faculty members. Committee members outside CPHSJ are allowed but must be approved by the Program Director and Associate Dean of Academic Affairs.

4. Data/Results

What were the results of the assessment of the learning outcome(s)? Please be specific. Does achievement differ by teaching modality (e.g., online vs. face-to-face) or on-ground location (e.g., STL campus, Madrid campus, other off-campus site)?

- PHS 6010 Research Project: The average grade was 94%, with all 8 students receiving 90% or higher.
- Comprehensive Written Exam: 10 of 13 (77%) passed.
- Oral PhD Exam: 6 of 6 (100%) passed.
- Dissertation Defense: 5 of 6 (100%) passed.

5. Findings: Interpretations & Conclusions

What have you learned from these results? What does the data tell you? Address both a) learning gaps and possible curricular or pedagogical remedies, and b) strengths of curriculum and pedagogy.

The comprehensive written exam passing rate was lower than the 80% goal. It should be noted that all three students who did not pass the exam in their first attempt did pass in their second attempt. However, we are

still reviewing how the written exam is assessed and plan to re-evaluate the rubric to clarify some points that have been brought up over the year.

Students are well-prepared for their oral exams and dissertation defenses.

6. Closing the Loop: Dissemination and Use of Current Assessment Findings

A. When and how did your program faculty share and discuss the results and findings from this cycle of assessment?

The venue for sharing these findings is the Doctoral Steering Committee. Due to a professional accreditation site visit this year, these findings were not complete in time for sharing, but will be shared next year.

B. How specifically have you decided to use these findings to improve teaching and learning in your program? For example, perhaps you've initiated one or more of the following:

Changes to the Curriculum or Pedagogies

- Course content
- Teaching techniques
- Improvements in technology
- Prerequisites
- Course sequence
- New courses
- Deletion of courses
- Changes in frequency or scheduling of course offerings

Changes to the Assessment Plan

- Student learning outcomes
- Artifacts of student learning
- Evaluation process
- Evaluation tools (e.g., rubrics)
- Data collection methods
- Frequency of data collection

Please describe the actions you are taking as a result of these findings.

We will continue to evaluate the written exam rubric. We are also considering having a consistent committee of written exam graders and holding meetings with the committee to discuss grading, as opposed to the current approach of ad hoc emails to faculty as grading is needed.

If no changes are being made, please explain why.

7. Closing the Loop: Review of Previous Assessment Findings and Changes

A. What is at least one change your program has implemented in recent years as a result of previous assessment data?

Last year's report showed no major weaknesses. In addition, our CEPH re-accreditation report and site visit took most of the program's efforts this year and more focus was put into modifying the program competencies and curriculum to address concerns raised by a pre-accreditation review. Due to the strong findings of the previous report and other programmatic needs, we did not make changes to the program explicitly addressing this process.

B. How has the change/have these changes identified in 7A been assessed?

N/A

C. What were the findings of the assessment?

N/A

D. How do you plan to (continue to) use this information moving forward?

The written exam has long been a point of contention within the program. While there are no immediate plans for a full-scale revision of the process, we may consider it if additional annual assessments identify this as a concern which smaller changes to not address.

IMPORTANT: Please submit any assessment tools (e.g., artifact prompts, rubrics) with this report as separate attachments or copied and pasted/appended into this Word document. Please do not just refer to the assessment plan; the report should serve as a stand-alone document. Thank you.

**PHD ORAL COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION
STUDENT OUTCOME EVALUATION WORKSHEET**

Approved by Doctoral Committee on 10-6-2016

Student Name: _____ **Date:** _____ **Committee Member Name:** _____

Each committee member completes his/her own worksheet either during the exam or immediately following.

		Fail	Pass	Pass with Distinction	Comments
1	The student has significant breadth and depth of knowledge in the area of emphasis and the dissertation topic.				
2	The student was able to analyze and synthesize information at an appropriate level of a doctoral student.				
3	The research is original and there is potential for publication and dissemination.				
4	The student has adequate knowledge of recent advances in methodological issues relevant to the topic area.				
5	The methodology of the proposed research is rigorous.				
6	The candidate understands the details of the methodological and analytic work related to the dissertation.				
7	The candidate is able to answer additional questions posed by the faculty and adequately participated in a discussion related to the dissertation topic.				
8	The candidate presented in a professional manner with confidence.				

- Committee Members may change their initial votes throughout the process. Members are encouraged to make notes throughout the presentation and Q&A session.
- After the exam, this worksheet will be given to the chair/mentor as a tool to help address problems or deficiencies in the project. The chair/mentor then provides the worksheets to the doctoral program coordinator who keeps them for programmatic quality assessment.

**PHD ORAL COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION
STUDENT OUTCOME EVALUATION WORKSHEET**

Approved by Doctoral Committee on 10-6-2016

Criterion for a Failing Grade: A student receives one or more “Fail” in categories 1-7 from three or more members of the committee.

- For example, if committee members A and B felt category 4 was a fail, committee member C felt category 6 was fail, then the student should fail the exam.

Step 1: After the presentation is completed, the mentor conducts at least two formal rounds of questions from the committee members, and then permits follow-up questions and additional inquiries until the committee is finished. The mentor will invite questions from the audience. *It is very important that the student demonstrates his/her command of the topic by answering the questions and may not rely on the committee members for assistance or committee members should not answer for the student*

Step 2: After questions have concluded, the mentor will close the public portion of the examination. Other students, faculty, and guests are excused. The committee, including at-large members, meets in private without the student to discuss the examination and vote using this evaluation worksheet. Based on these votes the mentor will complete the results form and make sure that it is returned to the Doctoral Program Coordinator who will forward it to Graduate Education.

Step 3A: If the student passes the oral exam, the committee calls in the student solely to review what suggestions are being made by the committee and what revisions the student must make as he or she works forward with the formal dissertation committee to revise the Memo of Understanding (MOA) and/or Dissertation Proposal Prospectus. The student has 30 days for to secure those revisions and their formal Dissertation Committee approvals.

Step 3B: If the student fails the oral exam, the doctoral committee program coordinator must be called in along with the student, who will then witness the conversation with the committee and can further explain the steps for retaking the oral exam (see also Section 5 of the 2016-17 Student Handbook).


Student: _____

Grader: _____

Rubric for Grading the Comprehensive Written Exam¹

Approved by Doctoral Committee 12/12/2022

Component	Pass with Distinction (2 points)	Pass (1 point)	Fail (0 points)	SCORE
Abstract	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Abstract provides all necessary information in a concise and easily digestible format Background motivates research and highlights importance of the research question Research question, methods, and results meet criteria for Pass Provides evaluation of relevance or uniqueness of the findings in the immediate context of research question and the broader field 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Abstract provides necessary information, but is not concise or includes extraneous information Background is relevant to the research question but lacks some specificity Research question is clearly stated Methods include adequate description of data source and statistical analysis Results directly related to research question Closing remarks fully supported by the study findings Provides a logical conclusion based on stated background and findings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Abstract is absent or incomplete Background provided is not relevant to the research question Research question is absent or unclear Methods missing important information to provide context to the analysis or highly disorganized Results not relevant to the research question or presented in a disorganized/confusing manner Importance of results unclear or lacking specificity 	
Introduction (One score considering both literature review and problem description)	<p>Literature review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comprehensive, thorough, complete, coherent, concise, and up to date Shows critical and analytical thinking about the literature Synthesizes the literature Is selective-discriminates between important and unimportant works Adds own insights, including gaps in the literature Uses current literature to build an argument and advance the field <p>Problem description</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Pass 	<p>Literature review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comprehensive but not exhaustive Provides a thoughtful, accurate critique of the literature Shows understanding of and command over the most relevant literature Selects literature wisely and judiciously Uses literature to build a case for the research <p>Problem description</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poses a good question or problem Explains why the problem is important and significant Sets the problem in context 	<p>Literature review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presents minimal overview of the work Contains extraneous material Provides inadequate or incomplete coverage of the literature Has clearly not read enough literature nor cites enough sources Lacks critical analysis and synthesis or misinterprets the literature Is not selective-does not distinguish between more-and less- relevant works Does not identify gaps in the literature Does not cite articles that represent current state of the field Is an undifferentiated list, "This person said this, this person said that" <p>Problem description</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Makes a case for a small problem or fails to make any case Does not do a good job of explaining why the problem is important Provides minimum or poor context for the problem or fails to present an outline of the research 	
Theory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Simple and applicable Well-conceived, logically consistent, and internally coherent Identifies and critically analyzes strength and weakness Compares or tests competing theories Advances concepts Develops, adds to, revises, or synthesizes theory (ies) Aligns with research question, methods, and observations Has broad applicability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete and appropriate Uses existing theory well Informs the research question and measures Identifies where it works and where it does not work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is absent, omitted, or wrong Is misunderstood or misinterpreted Cannot explain it or why it is being used Uses inappropriately Does not align with research question, literature review, or methods Understands theory at the base level Does not specify or critically analyze the theory's underlying assumptions 	

Component	Pass with Distinction (2 points)	Pass (1 point)	Fail (0 points)	SCORE
Methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides thorough and comprehensive description of study design, setting, participants, data source or measurement, quantification of variables and statistical methods Flows from question and theory Uses state-of-the-art tools, techniques, or approaches Uses multiple methods/analyses Analysis is sophisticated, robust, and precise 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate for the problem Uses existing methods, techniques, or approaches in correct ways Discusses why method was chosen Analysis is objective, thorough, appropriate, and correct 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lacks a method Uses wrong (statistical) method for the problem Uses (statistical) method incorrectly Methods do not relate to question or theory Is fatally flawed or has major confound Does not describe or describes poorly (insufficient detail) Is minimally documented Analysis is wrong, inappropriate, or incompetent 	
Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is aligned with question and theory Summarized information about study results Presents data clearly and cleverly (tables and/or figures) Details about information given in tables and/or figures Identifies when results contradict prior theories or findings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Links results to question and theory Substantiates the results Provides plausible arguments and explanations Tables are organized and clear Figures display important results 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results are correct but not robust Includes extraneous information and material Has difficulty making sense of data Overstates the results No tables or figures Tables and figures poorly organized, do not present results clearly, or not relevant to study aims 	
Discussion and Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides perspective of the importance of study Provides a critical analysis of major findings Refers to the introduction Discusses additional findings and how these fit with existing literature Underscores and explains major points and findings Discusses strength, weaknesses, and limitations Identifies contributions, implications, applications, and significance Places the work in wider context Raises new questions and discusses future directions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides a good summary of the results Refers to the introduction States what has been done Ties everything together States its contribution Identifies possible implications Discusses limitations and strengths Identifies some future directions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summarizes what has been accomplished Presents details rather than summary of results Repeats the introduction Does not tie things up Does not understand the results or what has been done Claims to have proved or accomplished things that have not been proved or accomplished Does not address the significance or implications of the research Does not address obvious or major study strengths or limitations Does not place the work in context Identifies a few, nonspecific next steps Does not draw conclusions 	
Control of mechanics, sentence structure, grammar, spelling, font and format	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Well written Brief, interesting, and compelling free from errors in mechanics, usage, and sentence structure General appearance and design decisions are thoughtful and polished 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Well written but less eloquent Is less interesting; has less breadth, depth, and insight May have a few errors in mechanics, usage, and sentence structure Formatting and design choices careless but paper is readable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poorly written or organized Is marred by an accumulation of errors in mechanics, usage, and sentence structure Careless formatting, font choice, or appearance yield paper unreadable 	
TOTAL SCORE				

¹ modified from: Barbara Lovitts. Making the Implicit Explicit: Creating Performance Expectations for the Dissertation, 2007.

Dissertation Outcome Evaluation Worksheet¹

Each committee member completes his/her own worksheet either during the dissertation defense or immediately following.

	A. Written dissertation	Pass with Distinction	Pass	Fail	Comments
1	Introduction				
2	Literature review				
3	Theory				
4	Methods/approach				
5	Results/data analysis				
6	Discussion/conclusion				
7	B. Dissertation defense				

A. Written Dissertation

Fail: A student receives one or more “Fail” in categories 1-6 from two or more members of the committee.

- For example, if committee member A felt category 4 was a fail and committee member B felt category 6 was a fail, then the student should fail the exam.

Passing with distinction: A student receives at least 4 “Pass with Distinction” in categories 1-6 from two or more members of the committee.

Passing: A student receives any other combination of scores from the committee members.

Dissertation Defense Procedures

Step 1: After the presentation is completed, the chair/mentor conducts at least two formal rounds of questions from the committee members, and then permits follow-up questions and additional inquiries until the committee is finished. The chair/mentor will invite questions from the audience. *It is very important that the student demonstrates his/her command of the topic by answering the questions and not relying on the committee members for assistance.*

Step 2: After questions have concluded, the mentor will close the public portion of the examination. Other students, faculty, and guests are excused. If needed, the committee will meet with the student privately to go over additional questions not suitable for the public forum.

Step 3: The mentor will excuse the student when all questions have concluded in the private portion.

Step 4: The committee will meet in private to discuss the examination and each committee member completes the Dissertation Outcome Evaluation Worksheet. The student's dissertation committee then votes and, based on these votes, the chair/mentor will complete both results form (one for the oral defense and another for the written defense) and returns them, along with worksheets, to the doctoral program coordinator who will forward it to Graduate Education. The committee should return the completed results form in a timely manner after the defense either passing or failing the student. The committee can no longer "hold" the results form until the student completes the requested changes to the Dissertation.

Guidelines for Quality: Written Dissertation

Component	Pass with Distinction	Pass	Fail
Introductions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well written • Brief, interesting, and compelling • Motivates the work • Has a hook • Provides a clear statement of the problem • Explains why the problem is important and significant • Places the problem in context • Presents an overview of the theory, methods, results, and conclusions • Lays out the study's implications • Provides a road map of the dissertation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well written but less eloquent • Is less interesting; has less breadth, depth, and insight • Motivates the work but less well • Poses a good question or problem • Explains why the problem is important and significant • Provides an overview of the dissertation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poorly written or organized • Lacks minimal motivation for the work • Makes a case for a small problem or fails to make any case • Does not do a good job of explaining why the problem is important • Provides minimum or poor context for the problem or fails to present an outline of the research • Presents minimal overview of the work • Contains extraneous material
Literature review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive, thorough, complete, coherent, concise, and up to date • Shows critical and analytical thinking about the literature • Synthesizes the literature • Integrates literature from other fields • Displays understanding of the history and context of the problem • Identifies problem and limitations • Is selective-discriminates between important and unimportant works • Identifies and organizes analysis around themes or conceptual categories • Adds own insights • Uses literature to build an argument and advance the field • Is like a good review article • Makes readers look at the literature differently 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive but not exhaustive • Provides a thoughtful, accurate critique of the literature • Shows understanding of and command over the most relevant literature • Selects literature wisely and judiciously • Sets the problem in context • Uses literature to build a case for the research 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides inadequate or incomplete coverage of the literature • Has clearly not read enough literature nor cites enough sources • Lacks critical analysis and synthesis or misinterprets the literature • Is not selective-does not distinguish between more-and less-relevant works • Misses, omits, or ignores important studies, whole areas or literature of people who have done the same thing • Misses some important works • Cites sources student has not read or has only read the abstract • Cites articles that are out of date • Is an undifferentiated list, "This person said this, this person said that" • Does not put problem in context for the research
Theory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Original, creative, insightful, and innovative • Simple and elegant • Well-conceived, logically consistent, and internally coherent • Identifies and critically analyzes strength and weakness • Uses more than one theory • Compares or tests competing theories • Advances concepts • Develops, adds to, revises, or synthesizes theory(ies) • Aligns with research question, methods, and observations • Has broad applicability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete and correct • Uses existing theory well • Informs the research question and measures • Identifies where it works and where it does not work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is absent, omitted, or wrong • Is misunderstood or misinterpreted • Cannot explain it or why it is being used • Uses inappropriately • Does not align with research question, literature review, or methods • Understands theory at the base level • Does not specify or critically analyze the theory's underlying assumptions

Guidelines for Quality of Written Dissertation

Component	Pass with Distinction	Pass	Fail
Methods/Approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Original, clear, creative, and innovative • Provides thorough and comprehensive description • Identifies strength and weakness/advantages and disadvantages • Flows from question and theory • Uses state-of-the-art tools, techniques, or approaches • Applies or develops new methods, approaches, techniques tools, devices, or instruments • Uses multiple methods 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate for the problem • Uses existing methods, techniques, or approaches in correct and creative ways • Discusses why method was chosen • Describes advantages and disadvantages 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lacks a method • Uses wrong (statistical) method for the problem • Uses (statistical) method incorrectly • Methods do not relate to question or theory • Is fatally flawed or has major confound • Does not describe or describes poorly (insufficient detail) • Is minimally documented • Shows basic competence
Results and Data Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Original, insightful • Uses advanced, powerful, cutting-edge techniques • Analysis is sophisticated, robust, and precise • Is aligned with question and theory • Sees complex patterns in the data • Iteratively explores questions raised by analyses • Results are usable, meaningful, and unambiguous • Presents data clearly and cleverly • Makes proper inferences • Provides plausible interpretations • Discusses limitations • Refutes or disproves prior theories or finding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis is objective, thorough, appropriate, and correct • Uses standard methods • Produces rich, high-quality data • Links results to question and theory • Substantiates the results • Provides plausible arguments and explanations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis is wrong, inappropriate, or incompetent • Produces small amount of data • Results are correct but not robust • Includes extraneous information and material • Has difficulty making sense of data • Interpretation is too simplistic • Data are wrong, insufficient, fudged, fabricated, or falsified • Data or evidence do not support the theory or argument • Interpretation is too simplistic, and not objective, cogent, or inferences • Overstates the results
Discussion and Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Short, clear, and concise • Interesting, surprising, insightful • Summarizes the work • Refers back to the introduction • Ties everything together • Explains what has been accomplished • Underscores and explains major points and findings • Discusses strength, weaknesses, and limitations • Identifies contributions, implications, applications, and significance • Places the work in a wider context • Raises new questions and discusses future directions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides a good summary of the results • Refers back to the introduction • States what has been done • Ties everything together • States its contribution • Identifies possible implications • Discusses limitations • Identifies some future directions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summarizes what has been accomplished • Repeats or summarizes the results or major points • Repeats the introduction • Does not tie things up • Does not understand the results or what has been done • Claims to have proved or accomplished things that have not been proved or accomplished • Does not address the significance or implications of the research • Does not place the work in context • Identifies a few, nonspecific next steps • Does not draw conclusions • Is inadequate or missing

¹ adapted from: Barbara Lovitts. Making the Implicit Explicit: Creating Performance Expectations for the Dissertation, 2007.

B. Guidelines for Quality: Dissertation Defense

Pass with Distinction	Pass	Fail
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slides enhanced the presentation; they were easy to read and graphs/figures were easy to interpret. • The presentation had a clear and deliberate organizational structure. • The language was effective; delivery was clear and powerful. • The presentation was well timed, points made reflect their relative importance, and the presentation stayed within the allotted time. • The candidate answered additional questions posed by the faculty and adequately participated in a discussion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most slides were easy to read and graphs/figures were easy to interpret. • The presentation was adequately organized. • Language and delivery were generally good, but could have been more effective. • The balance between the points made reflect their relative importance, but could have been more effective. The presentation, stayed within the allotted time. • The candidate answered additional questions posed by the faculty but needed some additional guidance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most slides were difficult to read and most graphs/figures were hard to understand. • The organization lacked any structure. • Language was unclear; delivery relied exclusively on notes. • The presentation did not stay within the allotted time and/or there was little balance between the points made and their relative importance. • The candidate was unable to answer many additional questions posed by the faculty and needed extensive guidance.