

# **NUTR\*4900 (Section 01): Selected Topics in Human Nutrition Prenatal Nutrition**

## **Winter 2018 Course Syllabus**

**Department of Family Relations and Applied Nutrition  
University of Guelph**

**Instructor:** Laura Forbes, PhD, RD  
MACS 326  
519-824-4120 x 52544  
forbesl@uoguelph.ca

**Office hours:** by appointment

### **Course Description**

This course requires reading and discussion on selected areas in human nutrition and its application; oral presentations and term papers. The topic focus will be recent studies in prenatal nutrition. Primarily for Applied Human Nutrition majors.

**Class times:** Tuesday and Thursday, 11:30 AM – 12:50 PM, ALEX 117

### **Course website:**

Announcements, updated schedules, grades, and other information will be posted on CourseLink, a website for on-campus courses:

<https://courselink.uoguelph.ca/shared/login/login.html>.

**Prerequisite(s):** FRHD\*3070 (Research Methods: Family Studies)  
NUTR\*4010 (Nutritional Assessment)  
NUTR\*3090 (Clinical Nutrition I)

### **Learning Outcomes:**

1. To develop competency in the description and critical appraisal of journal articles in selected applied nutrition topic areas.
2. Effectively communicate – in writing and orally – critical appraisals of research and research articles.
3. To gain proficiency in facilitating and participating in informed discussion about research.
4. To develop peer review skills on oral and written work appraising the research literature.

## Evaluation:

Method	% of final grade	Due date
<b>Oral</b>		
Article critique (as a pair/group)	15	Jan 25 – Feb 8
Discussant for an article critique (with same partner as above)	5	Jan 25 – Feb 8
Individual student seminar	20	Mar 1 – Apr 3
<b>Written</b>		
Term Paper Topic Approval	0	Feb 1 submit to Dropbox by 11:59 p.m.
Individual critical appraisal	10	Feb 15, submit to Dropbox by 11:59 p.m.
Individual term paper	30	April 6, submit to Dropbox by 11:59 p.m.
<b>Engagement</b>		
Participation in class discussions and self-reflection on engagement	10	Throughout Self reflection due on Apr 6 submit to Dropbox by 11:59
Peer review of term paper	10	1. Submit your draft for review by Mar 23, submit to Dropbox by 11:59 p.m. 2. Complete your peer review by Mar 30, submit to Dropbox by 11:59 p.m.

## Managing Evidence

### Citation Manager

It is recommended you learn to use a citation manager to manage references for your term paper. It allows you to collect references from a wide variety of electronic resources (e.g., PubMed) to create your own personal reference database. If you use Microsoft Word, your collected references can be seamlessly integrated into your term paper following any known standard format for the text of the paper and the reference list.

<http://www.lib.uoguelph.ca.subzero.lib.uoguelph.ca/get-assistance/writing/citations>

### Statistics Help

- You can consult a statistician to help with interpretation of data analysis
- The Data Resource Centre in McLaughlin library can help. Here's how:
  - o Go to the UG Library website
  - o Click Get Assistance > Map, GIS & Data > Book Maps, GIS & Data Appointments
  - o State in the message you are enrolled in NUTR\*4900

o Once the form is submitted, the DRC staff will forward the message accordingly. Within 24 hours, you can expect a response regarding setting up a consultation.

### **Communicating**

- a. **Paraphrasing others' ideas and work** Knowing how to summarize or adapt others' work for different purposes is a key skill needed in applied nutrition. Visit the Library's Citation Help page for help with citing: <https://www.lib.uoguelph.ca/get-assistance/writing/citations>
- b. **Referencing Style** Nutrition journals use many different styles for referencing – for this course pick either APA (name, year) OR CS (citation-sequence) and use it correctly. <https://www.lib.uoguelph.ca/get-assistance/writing/citations>

### **Policies (Others may be added as need arises)**

#### 1. E-mail Communication

As per university regulations, all students are required to check their <uoguelph.ca> e-mail account regularly: e-mail is the official route of communication between the University and its students.

If you have a question about course material or assignments, please post your question on the CourseLink Discussion board so that all of your classmates can see the answer.

#### 2. Copies of out-of-class assignments

Keep paper and/or other reliable back-up copies of all out-of-class assignments: you may be asked to resubmit work at any time.

#### 3. Late Work and Missed Work

If you are not able to meet an in-course requirement due to illness or compassionate reasons, please advise me in writing (email is acceptable). Where possible, this should be done in advance of the missed work or event. If this is not possible, this should be done as soon as possible after the due date, and certainly no later than one week. If appropriate, documentation of your inability to meet the course requirement is necessary. See the undergraduate calendar for information on regulations and procedures for Academic Consideration:

<http://www.uoguelph.ca/registrar/calendars/undergraduate/current/c08/c08-ac.shtml>

Late work that is not eligible for academic consideration will be penalized 10% of the grade for each day late.

#### 4. Audio-Recording of Materials

Presentations which are made in relation to course work—including lectures—cannot be recorded or copied without the permission of the presenter, whether the instructor, a classmate or guest lecturer. Material recorded with permission is restricted to use for that course unless further permission is granted.

#### 5. Accessibility

The University of Guelph is committed to creating a barrier-free environment. Providing services for students is a shared responsibility among students, faculty and administrators. This relationship is based on respect of individual rights, the dignity of the individual and the University community's shared commitment to an open and supportive learning environment. Students requiring service or accommodation, whether due to an identified, ongoing disability or a short-term disability should contact the Student Accessibility Services as soon as possible. For more information, contact SAS (formerly CSD) at 519-824-4120 ext. 56208 or email [sas@uoguelph.ca](mailto:sas@uoguelph.ca) or see the website: <https://www.uoguelph.ca/csd/>

## 6. Academic Misconduct

The University of Guelph is committed to upholding the highest standards of academic integrity and it is the responsibility of all members of the University community – faculty, staff, and students – to be aware of what constitutes academic misconduct and to do as much as possible to prevent academic offences from occurring. University of Guelph students have the responsibility of abiding by the University's policy on academic misconduct regardless of their location of study; faculty, staff and students have the responsibility of supporting an environment that discourages misconduct. Students need to remain aware that instructors have access to and the right to use electronic and other means of detection.

Please note: Whether or not a student intended to commit academic misconduct is not relevant for a finding of guilt. Hurried or careless submission of assignments does not excuse students from responsibility for verifying the academic integrity of their work before submitting it. Students who are in any doubt as to whether an action on their part could be construed as an academic offence should consult with a faculty member or faculty advisor.

The Academic Misconduct Policy is detailed in the Undergraduate Calendar: <http://www.uoguelph.ca/registrar/calendars/undergraduate/current/c08/c08-amisconduct.shtml>

## 7. Turnitin

Course instructors are allowed to use software to help in detecting plagiarism or unauthorized copying of student assignments. Plagiarism is one of the most common types of academic misconduct. Plagiarism involves students using the work, ideas and/or the exact wording of other people or sources without giving proper credit to others for the work, ideas and/or words in their papers. Students can unintentionally commit misconduct because they do not know how to reference outside sources properly or because they don't check their work carefully enough before handing it in. As the Undergraduate Calendar states: "Whether or not a student intended to commit academic misconduct is not relevant for a finding of guilt. Hurried or careless submission of assignments does not excuse students from responsibility for verifying the academic integrity of their work before submitting it".

In this course, both the students and instructor can use Turnitin.com to detect possible plagiarism, unauthorized collaboration or copying. You are encouraged but not required to screen your own written assignments through Turnitin as many times as you wish before the

due date. You will be able to see and print reports that show you exactly where you have properly and improperly referenced the outside sources and materials in your assignment.

### **Schedule\* and Readings\*\***

*\*The schedule of classes may be revised as needed, but adequate notice will be given. If class is cancelled (e.g., bad weather), all remaining presentations will be shifted one class forward. The cancelled presentation will be the next presentation.*

*\*\*All assigned readings are available through Open Access, and have been uploaded on Courselink.*

Date	Topic	Required readings – bring to class
January 9	Course introduction	Course outline
January 11	Jacqueline Kreller-Vanderkooy – finding and critiquing the literature <b>DUE today in class:</b> Tell me who your article critique partner is	Bring your laptop – <u>room CRSC 116</u>
January 16	Review of research methods and critical appraisal	There are several readings, but they’re short! 1. Handout “Using a scientific journal article to write a critical review” 2. Guyatt et al. “GRADE” What is Quality of Evidence? 3. Quality of Cohort Studies Newcastle Ottawa Scale 4. Risk of Bias Scale for Intervention studies - Cochrane
January 18	Lucia Costanzo - Understanding stats	Bring your laptop <b>CRSC 116</b>
January 23	Sample article critique	Fayyaz F, Wang F, Jacobs RL, O'Connor DL, Bell RC, Field CJ, Team AS. Folate, vitamin B12, and vitamin B6 status of a group of high socioeconomic status women in the Alberta Pregnancy Outcomes and Nutrition (APrON) cohort. Appl Physiol Nutr Metab. 2014 Dec;39:1402-8.
January 25	Presenters:	Dzakpasu S, Fahey J, Kirby RS, Tough SC, Chalmers B, Heaman MI,

	Discussants:	Bartholomew S, Biringier A, Darling EK, et al. Contribution of prepregnancy body mass index and gestational weight gain to adverse neonatal outcomes: population attributable fractions for Canada. BMC Pregnancy Childbirth. 2015 Feb;15:21
	Presenters:  Discussants:	Dodd JM, McPhee AJ, Turnbull D, Yelland LN, Deussen AR, Grivell RM, Crowther CA, Wittert G, Owens JA, et al. The effects of antenatal dietary and lifestyle advice for women who are overweight or obese on neonatal health outcomes: the LIMIT randomised trial. BMC Med. 2014 Oct;12:163
January 30	Presenters:  Discussants:	Lussana F, Painter RC, Ocke MC, Buller HR, Bossuyt PM, Roseboom TJ. Prenatal exposure to the Dutch famine is associated with a preference for fatty foods and a more atherogenic lipid profile. Am J Clin Nutr. 2008 Dec;88:1648-52.
	Presenters:  Discussants:	Ware S, Voigt JP, Langley-Evans SC. Body composition and behaviour in adult rats are influenced by maternal diet, maternal age and high-fat feeding. J Nutr Sci. 2015;4:e3.
February 1	<b>DUE:</b> Term Paper Topic Approval submit to Dropbox by 11:59 Presenters:	Zuccolo L, Lewis SJ, Smith GD, Sayal K, Draper ES, Fraser R, Barrow M, Alati R, Ring S, et al. Prenatal alcohol

	Discussants:	exposure and offspring cognition and school performance. A 'Mendelian randomization' natural experiment. <i>Int J Epidemiol.</i> 2013 Oct;42:1358-70.
	Presenters:  Discussants:	Strandberg-Larsen K, Poulsen G, Bech BH, Chatzi L, Cordier S, Dale MTG, Fernandez M, Henriksen TB, Jaddoe VW, et al. Association of light-to-moderate alcohol drinking in pregnancy with preterm birth and birth weight: elucidating bias by pooling data from nine European cohorts. <i>Eur J Epidemiol.</i> 2017 Sep;32:751-64.
February 6	Dr. F will return your Term Paper Approvals in class Presenters:  Discussants:	Taylor CM, Golding J, Emond AM. Blood mercury levels and fish consumption in pregnancy: Risks and benefits for birth outcomes in a prospective observational birth cohort. <i>Int J Hyg Environ Health.</i> 2016 08;219:513-20.
	Presenters:  Discussants:	Murcia M, Ballester F, Enning AM, Iñiguez C, Valvi D, Basterrechea M, Rebagliato M, Vioque J, Maruri M, et al. Prenatal mercury exposure and birth outcomes. <i>Environ Res.</i> 2016 Nov;151:11-20.
February 8	Presenters:  Discussants:	Donazar-Ezcurra M, Lopez-Del Burgo C, Martinez-Gonzalez MA, Basterra-Gortari FJ, de Irala J, Bes-Rastrollo M. Soft drink consumption and gestational diabetes risk in the SUN project. <i>Clin Nutr.</i> 2017 Feb.
	Presenters:	Graham JE, Mayan M, McCargar LJ, Bell RC, Team SM. Making compromises: a

	Discussants:	qualitative study of sugar consumption behaviors during pregnancy. J Nutr Educ Behav. 2013 Nov-Dec;45:578-85.
February 13	Open work time/ get help from Dr. F	
February 15	Sarah Gibbons – writing strategies for your term paper	Bring your laptop <b>Location TBA</b>
<b>READING WEEK</b>		
February 27	Open work time/get help from Dr. F <b>DUE:</b> written critical appraisal – submit to Dropbox by 11:59 pm	
March 1	Seminars	1. 2.
March 6	Seminars	1. 2.
March 8	Seminars	1. 2.
March 13	Seminars	1. 2.
March 15	Seminars	1. 2.
March 20	Seminars	1. 2.
March 22	Seminars <b>DUE Mar 23:</b> Submit your draft term paper for peer review to the Dropbox by 11:59pm	1. 2.
March 27	Seminars	1. 2.
March 29	Seminars <b>DUE Mar 30:</b> Submit your peer review to the Dropbox by 11:59pm	1. 2.
April 3	Seminars	1. 2. 3.
April 5	Open work time/get help from Dr. F	
April 6	<b>DUE:</b> Self-reflection on engagement due in Dropbox	



	by 11:59 pm <b>DUE:</b> Term paper due in Dropbox by 11:59 pm	
--	---	--

## **COURSE COMPONENT DESCRIPTIONS AND INSTRUCTIONS**

### **A1. Oral presentation of article critique (15%)**

You and a classmate (choose your own partner) will work together to present a critical review of an assigned research article. You will create and present a PowerPoint presentation about the article. In preparing the presentation, you should seek out background information necessary to understand the article, and be able to explain the research methods and results to the class. Provide a critique of the article and be sure to differentiate strengths and limitations of the research as distinct from strengths and limitations of the writing and presentation of the article. Using a quality assessment tool (we will discuss these in class) may help you with your critique. Don't forget to summarize/conclude your presentation. Be prepared to answer questions concerning the article. Each presentation will be followed by general class discussion led by another team of students (discussants – see A2 below).

Each presentation should be 10-15 minutes (max), followed by 10 minutes of discussion.

Tips:

- ✓ A good rule of thumb for PowerPoint slides is one slide per minute. Therefore, a 10 to 15 minute presentation should contain roughly 10 to 15 slides.
- ✓ If you have to go smaller than font size 24 to get all the information in, you have too much information. Cut back. Don't go smaller than font size 24 (except in select cases).
- ✓ Information from tables should be simplified for slides.

Post your PowerPoint presentation to the Courselink Dropbox by 8:00 AM the day of your presentation. If the presentation is posted after 8:00 AM the day of your presentation, it will be considered late and you will incur a 10% penalty. Your posted presentation will be considered the final version - revised presentations will not be accepted. You will use my laptop (PC not Mac) to present.

### **A2. Discussant for an Article Critique (5%):**

You and your partner from part A1 will be assigned to be discussants for one additional article critique presentation. As a discussant, your role is to:

- Come to class extra-prepared to discuss your assigned article. You and your partner should meet prior to your discussant date to prepare to do the following:
- Thank the presenter
- Lead a 10-minute discussion, facilitating class involvement.
  - Identify two (2) issues/findings in the areas of sampling, study design, and/or measurement

- Ask two (2) pertinent questions to class to encourage discussion
- Presenter can clarify points and participate in discussion
- Summarize discussion at the end, giving final interpretation and overview
- **You will not use PowerPoint as the discussant.**

### **A3. Individual Written Critical Appraisal - critique of three articles (10%)**

Choose 1 article that was critiqued in class. Your article of choice must NOT be the one you presented or the one you were a discussant on. Search the literature to find 2 more articles on the same topic. You are to independently complete a critique of these three articles.

Provide some background and context for the topic before reviewing the three articles and critically integrating these reviews. You should summarize the research articles by briefly describing the methods used, the key results, the key strengths and limitations including risk of bias or other quality assessment review (as you see it, not just as the authors describe them), and three (3) recommendations (1 per article) for how you would improve the studies if you were to lead them. In the last section of your paper, present a critical evaluation of what is known so far about the topic, based on your three studies, and discuss the implications for practice or further research.

The critique has a maximum of 8000 characters including spaces or about 4 pages (8.5" x 11" paper; double-spaced; 2.5 cm margins; 12-point font size). The page limit does include any tables or graphs, but does not include separate pages for the title page and the reference section (use single space). If more than 4 pages of review are submitted, only the first 4 pages will be graded. You should paraphrase rather than use quotations extensively.

### **B0. Term paper/presentation Topic Approval (no grade)**

Each student will choose a prenatal nutrition related topic which will be the topic of your Term Presentation (B1) and your Final Term Paper (B3). Prepare a maximum 250 word outline of your topic (point form is fine) and attach 3-4 abstracts for approval. I will return the outline to you, indicating "approved" or "requires revision". Students who need to revise their submissions should make an appointment to meet with me to determine how to refine the topic.

### **B1. Presentation on Term Topic (20%)**

You will present a 15-minute talk on your topic and lead the discussion period after (total of 20 minutes). A timer will be used; the presentation will be limited to 15 minutes and the discussion period to 5 minutes. Choose three primary (i.e. original) research articles to discuss. Because research articles are highly focused, you'll need to seek out background information to help orient your audience to the specific topic. Review articles can be used to provide an overview of the topic, but should not be included as one of the original research articles in your presentation.

There will be two to three seminars per class. A lottery system will be used to determine the date of your seminar.

Post your PowerPoint presentation to Dropbox by 8:00 AM the day of your seminar. If the presentation is posted after 8:00 AM the day of your presentation, it will be considered late and you will incur a 10% penalty. Your posted presentation will be considered the final version - revised presentations will not be accepted.

### **B2. Peer review of term paper (10%)**

You will submit a draft of your term paper to be peer-reviewed and you will be reviewing the term paper of another student. You will be marked on the quality of feedback you provide to your fellow student. Each student will submit a draft of their paper to Courselink by **March 23<sup>rd</sup>**. A substantially incomplete draft (as determined by the instructor) will not be peer-reviewed. The paper will then be sent to an anonymous reviewer who will complete the peer review form and will make comments and suggestions for change using Track Changes. They will submit their reviews to Dropbox by **March 30<sup>th</sup>**. I will send the review back to each author by email. Peer reviewers are anonymous, but authors are not because of the oral presentations.

### **B3. Submission of Final Paper (30%)**

You will have until **April 6<sup>th</sup>** to complete the paper and address the suggestions from the peer reviewer that you feel improve the paper. The final paper will be submitted to Courselink as a Word document or a PDF file.

### **Guidelines for Term Paper**

The term paper should be a maximum of 25,000 characters (with spaces) or about 12 pages long and include an introduction (including your research question), a summary of the main findings, completion of quality assessment, discussion of the strengths and limitations of the research, implications of the results, conclusions, and your suggestions for future research/implications for practice. If more than 12 pages of review are submitted, only the first 12 pages will be graded. Use headings and sub-headings to organize your report and include page numbers. At least **10 recently-published, "primary" journal articles should be critiqued to address your research question**. Reviews or meta-analyses can be used to provide an overview of the topic, but should not be included as one of the original research articles. (You will also need to review more articles, books or internet sources for background). You can include the same three articles from your seminar in your term paper. If you decide to use tables to summarize the studies, the paragraph text must complement and integrate findings in the tables.

Checklist for the term paper:

- Maximum of 25,000 characters or about 12 pages
- Should have a title page, reference section (use single space for the reference section), and appendix that shows the abstracts for each "primary" journal article reviewed in the paper
- Your name and page numbers are in the header or footer of the document
- Double-spaced
- 2.5 cm. margins
- 11-12-point font size

The character and page limit does not include the number of separate pages for the title page, the reference section, and the appendix.

### **C. Participation (10%)**

Participation in class discussions is an essential component of the course. Therefore, it is expected that you attend and participate fully in all sessions. You are expected to come to class prepared to ask discussion questions and to comment on questions raised by the discussants. Your preparation and participation in the discussions will contribute to our learning experience and will be appreciated by all. The required readings for the first half of the semester are conveniently posted to CourseLink. **You are expected to read all of these articles prior to class.**

The participation grade completed by the instructor will be based on two components: a) the first component is based on attendance (attendance list) and the frequency and quality of your oral participation in class. b) Another component of the participation grade will be based on your self-reflection on engagement. You will complete the Self-reflection on Participation form and assign yourself a grade out of 10. I will take this grade into consideration in determining your overall grade for participation. The self-reflection is due Thursday **April 6<sup>th</sup>** by 11:59 pm in Dropbox.

## **Critiquing a Journal Article**

- Critical appraisal involves identifying strengths and limitations not just of the article itself, but importantly, the design of the study, and the science, on which the article is based. Keep this in mind as you consider each of the components below.

### **Title**

Does the title adequately describe the content of the article?

### **Abstract**

Are the purpose of the study, basic methods, main findings, and main conclusions stated?

### **Introduction**

- Is this study justified based on the presented literature?
- Is the rationale for the study clearly and concisely summarized, and is it well justified?
- Are the objectives or hypotheses clearly stated?

### **Methods**

#### **Participants**

- Are there clear and appropriate inclusion and exclusion criteria?
- Is the sample size justified and adequate?
- Is the selection of the participants adequately explained?
- Is the sample selection procedure adequate to meet the study objectives?
- Are participants representative of the population of interest?
- Are control groups used and are they adequate and appropriate?
- How were the control group participants selected?
- Have control group participants been properly matched with the intervention group participants on the basis of age, sex, ethnicity, socio-economic status, etc.?
- Is the response rate given?
- Is information on the non-respondents given to allow for comparison to respondents?
- Are there drop-outs?
- Are details provided on dropouts and the reason for discontinuation of the study?
- Are all participants accounted for?

#### **Research design**

- Is the research design (e.g., cross-sectional design; randomized design) clear and appropriate for the objectives?
- What is the rationale for this design?
- Are extraneous variables controlled?

### Methods

- Were appropriate methods used to collect data that will meet the objectives?
- Is sufficient detail about data collection methods provided to allow for replication of the study?
- Have the appropriate statistical methods been used for analysis?
- Are the statistical methods explained clearly and in detail?
- Have they provided the significance level for deciding on the outcome?
- Have strategies for handling missing data or loss of participants been described?
- Was informed consent obtained?

### **Results**

- Are descriptive results given (to determine if groups are representative or comparable)?
- Are the results that are emphasized important in answering the questions of interest?
- Are there any discrepancies in the results presented?
- Are the tables and graphs self-explanatory? Are they necessary?
- Are there any errors in the results?
- Are the tables and graphs also discussed in the text (but there is not excessive overlap)?
- Do the tables and graphs agree with the text?
- Is complete information reported (e.g., coefficients, confidence intervals, test values, degrees of freedom, p values)?
- Are confounding variables considered?
- Has it been shown that intervention and control groups are comparable on important variables?
- Is adjustment necessary to compensate for important differences between intervention and control groups?

### **Discussion**

- Are new and important aspects of the study emphasized?
- Does the discussion interpret rather than repeat the results section?
- Are the limitations and biases of the methods and results discussed?
- Can generalizations be made to the larger population?
- Does this study confirm or contradict previous reports?
- If results were unexpected, are possible reasons given to explain these findings?
- Are the results of clinical or social significance?
- Is the effect of missing data or confounding variables considered?
- Are the conclusions warranted from the results? (Sometimes, non-significant results are discussed as if they were statistically significant).
- Are implications of the results discussed and properly qualified?
- Were the study questions answered?
- Are future research directions discussed?
- What research questions are left unanswered?

## Other

- Length: appropriate for the scientific content presented, or wordy and repetitive?
- Language, grammar of high quality?

**NUTR\*4900 PARTICIPATION (10%, INSTRUCTOR TO COMPLETE)**

**Name:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

	<b>Number of times</b>
Present	
Notified absence	
Not notified absence	

**General Participation in classes: Almost none /Low active / Moderately active / High active**

**Comments:**

**TOTAL        /10**



## Oral Presentations

- Oral Critique of Assigned Reading
- Oral Presentation re: Partial Literature Review

(page 1 of 2)

Presenters: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

### CONTENT

#### 1. Introduction

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Gives appropriate introduction. Sets the stage for what is to follow.							Dull opening. Partial or no introduction. No rationale given.		

#### 2. Content

20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Treated in some depth. Critical thinking demonstrated. Evidence of synthesis/integration. Important points stressed. Interesting. Logical flow. Organized.														Superficial. Lack of critical thinking. Poor synthesis/integration. Important points lacking. Uninteresting. Poor flow. Disorganized.					

#### 3. Understanding

20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Understanding of topic and article(s) is clear. Makes accurate statements. Answers questions well.														Unclear, confused. Some inaccuracies. Difficulty answering questions.					

#### 4. Summary/Conclusion

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Repeats key ideas. Places content in larger context. Gives a final interpretation and overview.							Concludes abruptly without summarizing main points. Does not repeat key ideas. Does not place what was presented into context.		

**DELIVERY**

**5. Visual Aids**

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
Are effective in enhancing talk and help understanding. Slides are easy to read, and not crowded with information.				←—————→				Do not add much to presentation. Poor choice of fonts/graphics. Shown too quickly. Slides cluttered. Not well explained.		

**6. Audience Contact**

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
Maintains interest. Establishes eye contact. Minimal reading from slides/notes. Enthusiastic.				←—————→				Audience bored, and not involved. Does not look at audience. Reads slides/notes. Lacks enthusiasm.		

**7. Voice, Language and Mannerisms**

5	4	3	2	1
Voice can be heard easily. Tone of voice varied. Good diction. Does not raise voice at end of sentences. Relaxed posture, no distracting mannerisms.		←—————→		Hard to hear. Monotonous voice. Poor pronunciation. Raises voice at end of sentences. Interjects “um” and/or “OK”. Tense, stiff, and/or displays mannerisms which detract.

**8. Timing**

5	4	3	2	1
Pace is good throughout. Number of slides and content suited to time available. Right amount of time to explain each slide.		←—————→		Rushed at end, or too slow. Attempted too many ideas/slides for time available. Not enough/too much time spent on slides.

**9. Overall Style and Level of Presentation**

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
Appropriate for audience (professional, “pitched” at suitable level). Relaxed. Confident. Engaged classmates.				←—————→				Unprofessional. Too informal. Presented at a level too high/too low for this audience. Didn’t engage classmates.		


**Comments:**

Total	/100
-------	------


## Evaluation of Facilitating Discussion of Assigned Reading

**Discussants:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_


### 1. Issues/findings

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
Identifies two issues in the areas of sampling, research design, measurement, etc. Provides background for the audience.							Focuses on only one issue or covers too many for the audience to grasp. No background.			

### 2. Questions for audience

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
Posed two relevant questions for the audience to encourage discussion of critical issues. Able to keep the discussion going.							No questions, or trivial questions which do not help the audience to understand critical points. Discussion falls flat.			

### 3. Delivery

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
Relaxed, enthusiastic. Is concise and clear. Professional. Easily heard.							Tense, appears bored. Rambles and/or confuses audience with explanations. Unprofessional. Too quiet or too loud.			

**Comments:**

Total	/30
-------	-----

## Written Evaluation

- Written Critical Appraisal**
- Term Topic Literature Review Paper**

**Student:** \_\_\_\_\_

Component	%
<b>The objective (or purpose) of this paper</b> is stated in specific terms. It is clear which aspects of the problem will be considered. It is sufficiently restricted to permit analysis in some depth. The meanings of terms or concepts which are central to this paper have been clearly explained; definitions given.	/ 5
<b>The review of literature</b> provides a synthesis of relevant material, ideas are well understood; and information has been used accurately. Discussion of the studies is integrated. It has been structured to be consistent with the scope of the topic; shows some breadth of coverage of topic, as well as depth.	/ 20
<b>The sources of information</b> were most appropriate for problem chosen. Maximum use was made of primary sources. Sources were sufficient for this project.	/ 10
<b>Critical appraisal of the literature</b> is well done with a thorough discussion of the strengths and limitations of the studies.	/ 25
<b>Recommendations for future research</b> are appropriate.	/ 5
<b>Organization, presentation, and composition.</b> Skilful, pleasant, and easy to read. Paragraphs develop logically. Meanings are clear. Sentence structure is concise, grammatically correct, and cohesive. Minimum use of extraneous or repetitious material. Systematically using subheadings. Ample margins allowed. References are easy for the reader to find and follow. No spelling or punctuation errors. References are cited correctly, following the APA or biomedical style.	/ 30
<b>Recommendations for health professionals</b> are clear and based on the review.	/ 5
<b>Total</b>	/ 100%

**Comments:**

**Peer Review Form for Term Paper**  
**adapted from Guidelines for a *Canadian Journal***

Title:

**Word Count:**

After reading the manuscript, please answer the questions by circling your response. If you respond “No”, “Uncertain” or “Improvement required”, a detailed explanation should be provided to assist the author of the paper.

**Introduction**

1. Is the research question or hypothesis clearly stated?  
 Yes             Improvement required             No
2. Is the stated research question **relevant**?  
 Yes             Uncertain             No
3. Is the relevant background literature analyzed and referenced in a thorough yet concise fashion?  
 Yes             Improvement required             No

**Results**

4. Are the literature review results clearly presented?  
 Yes             Improvement required             No
5. Are the results relevant to the research subject?  
 Yes             Improvement required             No
6. Are the tables and figures (if any) appropriate and clear?  
 Yes             Improvement required             No
7. Are the results credible (i.e., do they seem probable)?  
 Yes             Improvement required             No

**Discussion**

8. Do the discussion and conclusions follow from the results?  
 Yes             Improvement required             No
9. Are other interpretations examined and discussed?  
 Yes             Improvement required             No
10. Are the limits of the review and of the results described?  
 Yes             Improvement required             No

**References**

11. Are the references appropriate?  
 Yes             Improvement required             No

Please provide your detailed comments on the above answers or on other aspects of the review which, in your opinion, will assist the author of the paper. Use Comments and Track Changes to assist the author to make revisions.

## NUTR\*4900 Self-Reflection on Engagement

Name:

Date:

1. In the classroom, I contributed to the class in the following ways:

2. My level of participation was

- a. High
- b. Average
- c. Low

Justify your rating:

3. To prepare for class, I:

4. Outside of the classroom, I contributed to the class in the following ways (e.g., discussed content with classmates/others, extra readings, sought assistance with writing, researching, and/or statistical interpretation, provided feedback to other groups)

**YOUR SELF-ASSIGNED GRADE FOR PARTICIPATION \_\_\_\_\_/10**  
**[This grade will be taken into consideration for your overall participation grade]**