

LAMBDA BETA MEDIA SCHOLARSHIP SCORING RUBRIC

MEDIA SCHOLARSHIP CRITERIA CHECKLIST Paper Identification Code: _____

CoARC Student ID# _____

Date Received: _____

CRITERIA		RECEIVED
1.	Completed Application	
2.	Media Presentation	
3.	Letter of recommendation for this scholarship	
4.	Summary	
Points awarded to this media presentation		
Maximum points possible		18

LAMBDA BETA MEDIA SCHOLARSHIP SCORING RUBRIC

Scoring Rubric for Lambda Beta Media Scholarship

Element	0	1	2	3
<p>Relevance: The media presentation demonstrates clear implications for the profession of respiratory care.</p> <p>The presentation may be on a current respiratory therapy related topic in the literature, a class project, healthcare topic impacting respiratory therapy or a case study.</p> <p>Areas of practice may include, but are not limited to cardiopulmonary diagnostics, continuing care/rehabilitation, management, education, adult acute care, perinatal/pediatric care, subacute care, transport, or home respiratory care and research.</p>	<p>Information has little or nothing to do with contemporary practice of respiratory care.</p>	<p>Information presented relates to the practice of respiratory care.</p> <p>No references relate the information to respiratory care.</p>	<p>Information clearly relates to the practice of respiratory care.</p> <p>It includes a portion of information directly related to the practice of respiratory care.</p>	<p>Information clearly relates to the practice of respiratory care.</p> <p>It includes multiple references directly relating the subject matter to the current practice of respiratory care.</p>
<p>Content: An appropriate amount of information is presented.</p> <p>While the amount of information presented will be determined by the topic, it is recommended that the number of slides not exceed 35 and the presentation not exceed 60 minutes.</p>	<p>The presentation does not adequately address any element of respiratory care.</p> <p>No objectives or summary are provided.</p>	<p>The presentation includes statements directly from sources without expansion.</p> <p>Objectives are present, but the subject matter lacks organization and does not clearly address the objectives.</p>	<p>The presentation contains several direct statements from resources, but most are expanded to show evidence of critical thinking.</p> <p>The objectives are clear and the presentation directly addresses each objective.</p>	<p>The presentation includes critical and supportive information from relevant resources.</p> <p>Critical thinking is demonstrated consistently.</p> <p>The objectives are clear and the presentation directly addresses each objective.</p> <p>A summary is also present.</p>
<p>Methodological Adequacy: The presentation should include a title, clear objectives, introduction to the subject, background information as appropriate, content related to objectives, and current literature that supports the objectives.</p> <p>The presentation should also include a summary or impact of the findings on respiratory care.</p>	<p>The presentation is not adequate. It is missing one or more of the required methodological elements.</p>	<p>The presentation is marginally adequate.</p> <p>While all elements are present, an inadequate number of slides are used to address each element.</p>	<p>The presentation is adequate based on all required elements included.</p> <p>Minor errors are present.</p>	<p>The presentation is superior in its method of presentation.</p> <p>All elements are present and include supporting details and/or examples.</p>

LAMBDA BETA MEDIA SCHOLARSHIP SCORING RUBRIC

Element	0	1	2	3
<p>References: References should be prepared in accordance with Guidelines for Authors for Respiratory Care Journal</p> <p>References should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted on slides in an acceptable format for presentations. Include citations for images that are not open source in the media presentation. Be listed as they appear in the presentation, not alphabetically. Include year, volume number, and inclusive page numbers. Be double-spaced. <p>A reference page should be included as a separate attachment.</p>	<p>Reference list is not included.</p> <p>References are not drawn from an appropriate scientific (e.g., peer reviewed) literature base.</p> <p>No references on slides.</p>	<p>Reference list does not conform to standard style.</p> <p>References include, but are not consistently drawn, from the scientific literature.</p> <p>References included but format is not correct.</p>	<p>Reference list does not conform to standard style.</p> <p>References are consistently drawn from peer reviewed literature.</p> <p>References included on slides, but format is not correct.</p>	<p>Reference list conforms to a standard style.</p> <p>References are consistently drawn from the peer reviewed literature.</p> <p>References included and format are correct.</p>
<p>Organization, Style, and Proofreading: A presentation that presents evidence of critical thinking and the ability of the student to outline and scientifically address objectives.</p> <p>Transition between objectives should be clear with a summary.</p> <p>Graphics should support the content and add interest to the presentation.</p> <p>The notes page for slides should further expand on the content of each slide.</p> <p>The presentation content is the responsibility of the author.</p> <p>Authors should make every attempt to proof their presentation for errors in spelling, grammar, sequencing of content, structure and format before submitting their media presentation to Lambda Beta.</p>	<p>Presentation lacks objectives, and clear organization transitioning between objectives.</p> <p>Logic of arguments is not made clear.</p> <p>Notes not used (slides).</p> <p>Numerous (>20) errors in grammar or spelling.</p>	<p>Objectives were partially addressed.</p> <p>Graphics or tables do not support the objectives or text.</p> <p>Organization of presentation appears haphazard; transition between topics or objectives is not evident.</p> <p>Minimal use of notes (slides).</p> <p>Several (10 to 20) errors in grammar or spelling.</p>	<p>The presentation is generally clear; a few minor points may be confusing or not well presented.</p> <p>Graphics are available to support the content.</p> <p>The presentation is generally well organized; transition between topic/objectives is logical and shows evidence of critical thinking.</p> <p>Good use of the notes page (slides).</p> <p>Few errors (<10) in grammar or spelling.</p>	<p>The presentation is clear, logical and organized. Effective use of graphics to support the content.</p> <p>The notes clearly expand on the slide content giving the reviewer a good understanding of the content to be presented with each slide.</p> <p>No errors in grammar or spelling.</p>

LAMBDA BETA MEDIA SCHOLARSHIP SCORING RUBRIC

Element	0	1	2	3
<p>Presentation Format: The presentation should follow all the format guidelines provided in the application and available available at https://www.lambdabeta.org.</p> <p>Use only Times New Roman 12-point font size with 1-inch margins for other required elements (e.g., summary page and references). Print only on one side of the paper.</p> <p>Identification of the author with the CoARC Student ID # should be made only on the title page so the presentation may be reviewed confidentially.</p>	<p>The presentation does not comply with the guidelines.</p>	<p>The presentation is not in compliance with at least one of the guidelines.</p>	<p>The presentation is generally in compliance with the guidelines.</p>	<p>The presentation is in full compliance with the guidelines.</p>