USING RUBRICS TO ASSESS STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES AT THE PROGRAM LEVEL

THE UNIVERSITY of NORTH CAROLINA at CHAPEL HILL

OFFICE of INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH and ASSESSMENT

July 2017

Table of Contents

Using Rubrics to Assess Student Learning Outcomes at the Program Level 3
What are Rubrics? 3
What Do Rubrics Consist of? 3
What are the Benefits and Challenges of Using Rubrics? 5
How is a Rubric Created and Used in Assessing Program-Level Student Learning Outcomes? 6
More Questions and Answers about Using Rubrics in Program-Level Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes 7
Examples of Rubrics 8
Contact Information 9
Appendix A - Sample Rubrics | Papers 10
Rubric for a Research Paper in the Humanities 11
Rubric for a Paper in the Social and Behavioral Sciences 12
Appendix B - Sample Rubrics | Presentations 14
Scoring Rubric for General Oral Presentation 15
Poster Presentation Peer Scoring Rubric 16
Appendix C - Sample Rubrics | Arts and Humanities 17
Rubric for Visual Arts 18
Rubric for Digital Media Project 19
Appendix D - Sample Rubrics | Science and Math 20
Rubric for Conducting an Experiment in the Lab 21
Evaluation Rubric for Undergraduate Research Project in the Sciences 22
Science Lab Report Evaluation Rubric 23
Evaluation Rubric for Mathematical Proofs 24
Appendix E - Sample Rubrics | Graduate Work 25
Evaluation Rubric for Thesis in Linguistics 26
Rubric for a Dissertation 27
Thesis Proposal Rubric 30
Appendix F - Sample Rubrics | Miscellaneous 31
Undergraduate Internship Rubric 32
A Rubric for Rubrics 33

Using Rubrics to Assess Student Learning Outcomes at the Program Level

What are Rubrics?

A rubric is a scoring guide with **criteria** for evaluating students' work in direct relation to one or more of the program's learning outcomes and a rating scale indicating differing **levels of performance**.

Rubrics are:

- Used to examine how well students have met learning outcomes rather than how well they perform compared to their peers.
- Typically include specific, observable, and measurable descriptors that define expectations at each level of performance for each criterion.

They can be used to assess student performance in course assignments, exams, practica and internships, research papers, portfolios, group projects, public presentations, and many other types of work. The overall scores and any subscales developed to measure more specific elements of performance are easily aggregated for further analysis at the program level.

What Do Rubrics Consist of?

Holistic scales, checklists, rating scales, and analytic scales can be used in rubrics.

- Holistic scales allow the rater to assign a single score based on an overall judgment of the student work. The holistic scales include global indicators, but may lack specific feedback needed to target student growth.

Excellent writer 6	The essay clearly states a position, provides support for the position, raises a counter argument or objection, and refutes it. The evidence, both in support of the position and in refutation of counterpositions, is persuasive and original (that is, drawn from the student's own observations, not borrowed). The essay tackles a significant objection or counterargument, not a trivial one. The relationships between position, evidence, counterargument, and refutation are clear, and the essay does not contain extraneous or irrelevant information.
Good writer 5	The essay states a position, supports it, raises an objection or counterargument, and refutes it. The essay may, however, contain one or more of the following ragged edges: evidence is not uniformly persuasive or original; the counter-argument is not a very serious threat to the position; one has to read between the lines to see relationships between ideas and some ideas seem out of place or irrelevant.
Average Writer 4	The essay states a position and raises a counterargument, but their is well developed. The objection or counterargument considered may lean toward the trivial. The essay may also seem disorganised. Nonetheless, the essay should receive a 4 in acknowledgement of the cognitive complexity of the task. It is more difficult to address arguments and counterarguments than it is simply to support one line of argument.
Fair writer 3	The essay states a position, provides strong and original evidence supporting the position, and is well organised. However, the essay does not address possible objections or counterarguments. Thus, even though the support seems stronger and the essay may be more well organised than the 4 essay, it should not receive more than a 3.
Weak writer 2	The essay states a position and provides some support, but it doesn't do it very well. Evidence is scanty, general, trivial or not original. The essay achieves its length largely through repetition of ideas and inclusion of irrelevant information. The overall impression is that the essay has been dashed off at the last minute.
Very weak writer 1	The essay does not state the student's position on the issue. Instead, it restates the position presented in the assignment and summarizes the evidence discussed in the text or in class. The essay may include an occasional I agree with, but it provides nothing beyond what was said in class or in the readings. The essay receives a 1 rather than a 0 because there may be some merit to being able to summarise what the author of the text said.

Source : Gibbs, G., Habeshaw, S. and Habeshaw, T, (1986). 53 Interesting Ways to Assess Your Students. *Technical and Educational Services:Bristo*, pp. 11-26.

- Checklists are dichotomous (e.g. Yes/No; Met/Not Met) and easy to use; however, they may not provide substantive information regarding the performance levels.

Interactive Presentation Checklist	Yes	No
Time Management		
1. Did I use my time at an even pace, completing all sections of the presentation?		
2. Did I set up and begin promptly?		
Organization		
3. Was the flow of my presentation and material logical and smooth?		
4. Were all the presented materials well-organized and readily available?		
Resource use		
5. Did I use different media to present my information?		
6. Did I use the most important media for the kind of information I presented?		
Audience Awareness		
7. Did I make frequent eye contact with my audience?		
8. Did I vary my voice to suit my presentation?		
9. Did I present my material in a way that suited my audience?		
Aesthetics		
10. Did I present myself in a professional way in my dress and grooming?		
11. Did I hand out and use materials that were ascetically pleasing?		

- Rating scales identify a range of performance without specific descriptors for each performance level (e.g. Exceeds Expectation/Meets Expectation/Below Expectation). They may not provide sufficient information for raters to score consistently and the feedback to students may not be specific enough for revision or future growth.

Rating Scale Example: Computer Program Quality Assessment

Expected Learning Outcome: The student will write efficient, documented, error-free computer programs that meet the specifications.

Criteria for Success: A maximum of one item is rated as "Below Expectations".

Computer Program	Below Expectations=1	Meets Expectations=2	Exceeds Expectations=3	Comments
Achieves what it was designed to do				
Operates without errors				
Source code is efficient				
Source code is well- documented				

Exceeds Expectations = Performance is above the expectations stated in the outcomes.

Meets Expectations = Performance meets the expectations stated in the outcomes.

Below Expectations = Performance does not meet the expectations stated in the outcomes.

- Analytic scales articulate specific levels of performance for each individual criterion. Scoring using analytic scales is typically more consistent and specific areas of growth can be identified. The analytic scales take more time to develop.

Analytic Scale Rubric for Evaluating a Portfolio					
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**Score**
Portfolio Requirement	Poor ePortfolio is missing more than 4 minimum requirements as stated in the syllabus.	Fair ePortfolio is missing 3 minimum requirements as stated in the syllabus.	Good ePortfolio meets all minimum requirements as stated in the syllabus.	Exceptional ePortfolio meets all minimum and above requirements as stated in the syllabus.	
Creative use of Technology	Poor No use of graphics, Internet resources, photographs, sound and /or video to enhance ePortfolio and reflective statements.	Fair Little use of graphics, Internet resources, photographs, sound and /or video to enhance ePortfolio and reflective statements.	Good Some use of graphics, Internet resources, photographs, sound and /or video to enhance ePortfolio and reflective statements.	Exceptional Good use of graphics, Internet resources, photographs, sound and /or video to enhance ePortfolio and reflective statements.	
Artifacts	Poor Most artifacts and work samples are unrelated to the purpose of the course and portfolio.	Fair Few artifacts and work samples are related to the purpose of the course.	Good Most artifacts and work samples are related to the purpose of the course and portfolio.	Exceptional All artifacts and work samples are clearly and directly related to the purpose of the course and portfolio.	
Organization & Writing	Poor The text has many errors in grammar capitalization, punctuation, and spelling requiring major editing and revision.	Fair The text has errors in grammar, capitalization, punctuation, and spelling requiring editing and revision.	Good The text has a few errors in grammar, capitalization, punctuation, and spelling requiring editing and revision. Easy to read and navigate.	Exceptional The text has no errors in grammar, capitalization, punctuation, and spelling. Easy to read and navigate.	
Reflections	Poor Considerable difficulty in expressing reflections demonstrates level of students' progress and knowledge development. Reflections incorporate the what, so what and now what in artifacts.	Fair Difficulty expressing and reflecting demonstrates level students' progress and knowledge development. Reflections incorporate the what, so what and now what in artifacts.	Good Most reflections demonstrate students' progress and knowledge development. Reflections incorporate the what, so what and now what in artifacts.	Exceptional All reflections demonstrate students' progress and knowledge development. Reflections incorporate the what, so what and now what in artifacts	

What are the Benefits and Challenges of Using Rubrics?

Benefits –

- Establishes shared expectations and assessment practices, especially when faculty members collaborate to develop them
- Can be used to evaluate student work consistently
- Make it more efficient to assess multifaceted examples of student work or performance

Challenges –

- Take time and effort to develop
- Need to include descriptions of specific criteria, and preferably exemplars of student work to benchmark different levels of performance
- May be a less precise measure because of the broad range of performance within each specified level

How is a Rubric Created and Used in Assessing Program-Level Student Learning Outcomes?

How to Create and Use a Rubric
- ✓ Review SLOs
- ✓ Identify Student Work
- ✓ Establish Criteria
- ✓ Identify Scale
- ✓ Determine Range and Target
- ✓ Conduct Pilot
- ✓ Develop Sampling Plan
- ✓ Aggregate Scores

1. **First, review each of the program's student learning outcomes.** Where in the program do students have opportunities to demonstrate that they have achieved each of the outcomes? Capstone courses, senior or upper level courses, research or internship experiences, comprehensive exams, dissertation defenses, etc.?

2. **Once you have mapped the outcomes to the courses, exams, and other activities within the program, what specific assignments or means of demonstrating skill can serve as a source of student work that can be assessed in relation to the learning outcome?**

3. **Establish the criteria. What are the performance dimensions associated with the learning outcome?** What are the critical components of the student performance that you need to capture as evidence of learning when assessing the work?

4. **Identify the scale.** What is the appropriate scale for measuring each student's performance on these dimensions?

   - **Holistic scales –** provide an overall evaluation; appropriate for assessment that does not require specific feedback;
   - **Checklist –** appropriate for assessment criteria that can be addressed using a dichotomous scale (e.g. Yes/No);
   - **Rating scales –** provide feedback on the performance level; appropriate for assessment that does not require specific description of each performance level;
   - **Analytic scales –** provides detailed description of each performance level.

5. **Determine the range of performance levels and the program's target.** The target is the average performance or percentage of students who achieved a certain score target that the program aspires to or considers to be a minimum threshold for success in achieving the learning outcome.

   - The number of performance levels may vary. Many people start with a 3-point scale (e.g. Exceeds Expectation/Meet Expectation/Below Expectation), 4-point scale (e.g. Outstanding/Good/ Average/Poor), or 5-point scale (e.g. Advanced/Proficient/Developing/Emerging/Beginning)

6. **Pilot the rubric.** Is the rubric valid and reliable?

   - Share the rubric with colleagues
   - Test the rubric on samples of student work
   - If you are using multiple raters, hold a session to discuss common definitions, standards, and expectations for quality. Practice using the rubric on the same pieces of work and comparing ratings to determine the consistency in judgments across raters.

7. **Develop your sampling plan for selecting work to be assessed with the rubric.**

8. **Aggregate the rating scores across the entire sample.** Compare the results to the program's target for performance on that learning outcome.

After implementing the rubric, continue to review the findings. In addition to proving a consistent method for assessing student work, **rubrics can identify opportunities for program improvement**. Trends uncovered through aggregated rubric scores can determine areas where students need additional instruction or support, as well as inform changes in the curriculum or how content is taught.

More Questions and Answers about Using Rubrics in Program-Level Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes

Question: Do rubrics have to be created and used in assessing all student work to measure achievement of expected learning outcomes?

> ***Answer**: **No.** There are a number of different methods of assessing program-level student learning outcomes. However, there are advantages to using rubrics, including greater reliability and consistency in rating performance across the program, the ease with which scores can be aggregated across the program to do more sophisticated analysis, and the ability to examine different dimensions of performance as opposed to just an overall grade or score.*

Question: Why can't we just use average course grades to assess student achievement of learning outcomes?

> ***Answer:** Accreditors do not recommend using course grades to assess learning outcomes. They argue that course grades, especially at the undergraduate level, often include class participation, attendance, and other behavior not directly related to the learning outcomes. Further, average final grades provide no insights into relative strengths and weaknesses of students across the various components of the outcome. Carnegie Mellon University's website offers a useful description of the differences between course grades and assessment of program-level learning outcomes. Instead, assess a specific assignment within one or more courses that maps to the learning outcome of interest.*

Question: Is there ever a situation in which we can use average course grades as evidence of achieving program-level learning outcomes?

> ***Answer:** This may be possible at the graduate level if you can document that that 100% of the course grade was based on the quality of a paper, research project, or final exam that directly measured the learning outcome. But if a graduate program has a comprehensive or qualifying exam or dissertation proposal that measures the knowledge covered in the required core courses, why not just use the performances on those milestones as evidence of achievement of the outcome? Reporting on course grades would be redundant.*

Question: We mapped our undergraduate level student learning outcome for research skills to the final paper in our capstone course, which reports the procedures and results of their semester-long project. The course instructor graded the papers measuring competency in each of the stages of the research process. Do we need to have additional faculty independently re-evaluate the papers using a formal rubric?

> ***Answer: No.*** When there is such a close fit between the learning outcome and the work being used to assess it, the scores or ratings originally assigned by the instructor can probably be used as evidence as to whether students are achieving the outcome. Most of the time, no one is more qualified to evaluate the work than the person who taught the course. For the department's annual Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Report, the instructor could prepare a brief report for the DUS or undergraduate studies committee that includes a description of the assignment, a copy of the rubric or grading scheme used, the results of the analysis of student performance, observations about strengths and weaknesses, and recommendations for improving student learning related to the research skills outcome.

Question: To assess our learning outcome related to critical thinking skills, we plan to sample final papers from a set of senior-level courses in our major and have them rated by two faculty members with a rubric designed to measure critical thinking. Some faculty have criticized this plan, saying that it is a poor use of time to re-grade student work and that averaging final course grades across the set of courses should provide sufficient data for this assessment exercise. In addition, concerns were expressed that having other faculty not associated with the course re-grade another faculty member's papers sends a message of distrust and raises questions about their academic freedom to make judgments about student performance in their own courses. How do I explain this?

Answer: *The papers will be used for a secondary analysis to assess whether students are achieving a single program-level outcome. This is not the same as having the papers completely re-graded by independent raters using the same criteria as the original instructor. The instructors no doubt evaluated the papers with additional expectations unique to their particular courses, such as specific subject matter knowledge. They might have taken critical thinking skills into account when grading the papers, but unless common criteria for this competency were used across instructors and assignments, aggregating the course grades will not provide very reliable information about whether seniors have achieved this specific skill.*

In addition, it is important for all involved to understand that the assessment of learning outcomes is student-focused; it is not used to evaluate instructors. And, there is no reason to exclude the original course instructors from rating the papers for evidence of critical thinking skills, although it is a good idea have them rate papers that they have not already read for another purpose.

In selecting the courses and papers for use in this exercise, the raters will need to ensure that the different assignments provided comparable opportunities for students to demonstrate critical thinking skills. Raters should meet to reach a common understanding of the rubric and how it is to be applied, and to test the consistency of their ratings.

Examples of Rubrics

Examples of rubrics used by other institutions to evaluate different kinds of student work are provided in the Appendix. They can be used as models, or you can copy and adapt them for your own purposes. However, please be sure to acknowledge the source (listed under each matrix) of each instrument if you distribute it.

Another great source for rubrics is the American Association of Colleges and Universities' (AAC&U) Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education (VALUE) project. This set of 16 rubrics includes the following that are relevant for measuring a number of learning outcomes across majors:

Critical Thinking	Oral Communication
Creative Thinking	Quantitative Literacy
Inquiry and Analysis	Problem Solving
Written Communication	Integrative and Applied Learning

The VALUE rubrics, which are being used by hundreds of institutions, are free and can be downloaded from AAC&U's website: http://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics .

Contact Information

For more information about assessment resources, including rubrics, please go to:
http://oira.unc.edu/institutional-effectiveness/assessment-resources/

Please feel free to contact the Office of Institutional Research & Assessment for help:
Dr. Bryant Hutson, Interim Director of Assessment
bhutson@email.unc.edu

Appendix A

Sample Rubrics | Papers

Rubric for a Research Paper in the Humanities

	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Unacceptable
Introduction	Strong introduction of topic's key question(s), terms. Clearly delineates subtopics to be reviewed. Specific thesis statement.	Conveys topic and key question(s). Clearly delineates subtopics to be reviewed. General thesis statement.	Conveys topic, but not key question(s). Describes subtopics to be reviewed. General theses statement.	Does not adequately convey topic. Does not describe subtopics to be reviewed. Lacks adequate theses statement.
Focus & Sequencing	All material clearly related to subtopic, main topic. Strong organization and integration of material within subtopics. Strong transitions linking subtopics, and main topic.	All material clearly related to subtopic, main topic and logically organized within subtopics. Clear, varied transitions linking subtopics, and main topic.	Most material clearly related to subtopic, main topic. Material may not be organized within subtopics. Attempts to provide variety of transitions	Little evidence material is logically organized into topic, subtopics or related to topic. Many transitions are unclear or nonexistent.
Support	Strong peer- reviewed research based support for thesis.	Sources well selected to support thesis with some research in support of thesis.	Sources generally acceptable but not peer-reviewed research (evidence) based.	Few sources supporting thesis. Sources insignificant or unsubstantiated.
Conclusion	Strong review of key conclusions. Strong integration with thesis statement. Insightful discussion of impact of the researched material on topic.	Strong review of key conclusions. Strong integration with thesis statement. Discusses impact of researched material on topic.	Review of key conclusions. Some integration with thesis statement. Discusses impact of researched material on topic.	Does not summarize evidence with respect to thesis statement. Does not discuss the impact of researched material on topic.
Grammar & Mechanics	The paper is free of grammatical errors and spelling & punctuation.	Grammatical errors or spelling & punctuation are rare and do not detract from the paper.	Very few grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors interfere with reading the paper.	Grammatical errors or spelling & punctuation substantially detract from the paper.
Communication	Scholarly style. Writing is flowing and easy to follow.	Scholarly style. Writing has minimal awkward of unclear passages.	Word choice occasionally informal in tone. Writing has a few awkward or unclear passages.	Word choice is informal in tone. Writing is choppy, with many awkward or unclear passages.
Citations & References	All references and citations are correctly written and present No errors in MLA style.	Rare errors in MLA style that do not detract from the paper. Scholarly style. Writing has minimal awkward of unclear passages.	Errors in MLA style are noticeable. Word choice occasionally informal in tone. Writing has a few awkward or unclear passages.	Reference and citation errors detract significantly from paper.

(Adapted from the University of Kentucky)

Rubric for a Paper in the Social and Behavioral Sciences

	Exemplary	Accomplished	Developing	Beginning	Unacceptable
Focus	• Relevant research is thoroughly and completely discussed. • Key concepts are identified and operationally defined. • Objective stance maintained throughout document.	• Relevant research is adequately addressed. • Most of the key concepts are identified and operationally defined. • Contains some irrelevant information but does not detract from focus. • Objective stance mostly maintained.	• Paper addresses the relevant research generally satisfactorily, though explanations and elaborations may be imprecise. • Most of the key concepts are identified and operationally defined, though the definitions may be imprecise. • Contains some irrelevant information but does not significantly detract from focus. • Objectivity mostly maintained, though occasional subjective remarks occur.	• Paper does not adequately address the relevant research. • Very few key concepts are identified and clearly defined. • Paper contains too much irrelevant information that seriously detracts from focus. • Frequent subjective intrusions.	• Relevant research not discussed. • Key concepts either not identified or are identified in a confusing manner. • Contains irrelevant information. • Very frequent subjective remarks.
Organization and Development	• Organization and development of content is logical and is well-developed. • Hypotheses/Aims/Objectives are clearly formulated and articulated. • Conclusion is fully and clearly articulated.	• Organization and development of content is logical with minimal errors. Content and central ideas developed. • Hypotheses/Aims/ Objectives are adequately formulated and articulated. • Conclusion is adequately and clearly articulated.	• Organization and development of content is adequate. • Contents not well developed. • Hypotheses/Aims/Objectives are stated, but may lack precision and clarity. • Conclusion is stated, but lacks precision and clarity.	• Organization and development of content is insufficient. • Content is not developed. • Hypotheses/Aims/ Objectives are poorly stated and do not become evident until the end. • Conclusion is poorly stated, and is faulty • Paper has many problems with structure.	• Organization and development lacking. • Content and central ideas are not developed. • Hypotheses/Aims/Objectives are not stated and do not become evident until the end. • Conclusion is not stated. • Paper has no logic and paragraphs are random and lack explanation.
Style	• Sophisticated and varied sentence structure and length. • Objective, efficient academic language.	• Frequently varied sentence structure and length with rare style or structure errors. • Mostly objective, efficient academic language.	• Occasional variation in sentence structure and length. • Generally, pragmatically adequate, though some informal style may appear.	• No variation in sentence structure – very simple syntax, short and simple sentences. • Style frequently pragmatically inadequate with excess informal language.	• No variation in sentence structure – very simple and frequently erroneous syntax. • Very short sentences. • Style mostly pragmatically inadequate with excess informal language.
Research	• Flawless APA format and document design. • Unfailingly correct in-text citations. • Flawless reference section. • Complete absence of plagiarism.	• Mostly appropriate APA section headings and • Subheadings. Infrequent errors in in-text citations. • Occasional errors in reference section. • Complete absence of plagiarism.	• Some lapses in APA conformity. • Paper sections occasionally inconsistent with APA. • Some errors in in-text citations and in reference section. • Complete absence of plagiarism.	• Frequent lapses in APA conformity. • Paper sections frequently • APA inconsistent. • Frequent errors in in-text citations and in reference section. • Complete absence of plagiarism.	• Paper mostly APA inconsistent. • Widespread errors in in-text citations and in reference section. • Evidence of plagiarism.

(Adapted from Texas A&M University)

Rubric for Grading an Essay Exam

Criteria & Points Assigned	Missing or Serious Problems	Below Expectations	Meets Expectations	Excellent Work	Points Earned
	0	1	2	3	
Relevance of answer to the question	The essay did not answer the question.	Answer is incomplete. Excessive discussion of unrelated issues and/or significant errors in content.	Answer is brief with insufficient detail. Unrelated issues were introduced and/or minor errors in content.	Answer is complete; sufficient detail provided to support assertions; answer focuses only on issues related to the question; factually correct.	
Thoroughness of answer	None of the relevant details were included.	Serious gaps in the basic details needed.	Most of the basic details are included but some are missing.	Deals fully with the entire question.	
Organization and logic of answer	Weak organization; sentences rambling; ideas are repeated.	Minor problems of organization or logic; Needs work on creating transitions between ideas.	Clear and logical presentation; good development of an argument; Transitions are made clearly and smoothly.		
Mechanics of writing (spelling, punctuation, grammar, clarity of prose)	Major problems with mechanics of language; Awkward sentence construction; Poor or absent transitions; Frequently difficult to understand.	Frequent problems with mechanics of language; Occasional awkward sentences and poor transitions; reduce readability.	Clear, readable, prose. Good use of transitions; no problems with spelling, punctuation, or grammar.		

(Adapted from the University of West Florida)

Appendix B

Sample Rubrics | Presentations

Scoring Rubric for General Oral Presentation

Category	Scoring Criteria	Total Points	Score
Organization (15 points)	The type of presentation is appropriate for the topic and audience.	5	
	Information is presented in a logical sequence.	5	
	Presentation appropriately cites requisite number of references.	5	
Content (45 points)	Introduction is attention-getting, lays out the problem well, and establishes a framework for the rest of the presentation.	5	
	Technical terms are well-defined in language appropriate for the target audience.	5	
	Presentation contains accurate information.	10	
	Material included is relevant to the overall message/purpose.	10	
	Appropriate amount of material is prepared, and points made reflect well their relative importance.	10	
	There is an obvious conclusion summarizing the presentation.	5	
Presentation (40 points)	Speaker maintains good eye contact with the audience and is appropriately animated (e.g., gestures, moving around, etc.).	5	
	Speaker uses a clear, audible voice.	5	
	Delivery is poised, controlled, and smooth.	5	
	Good language skills and pronunciation are used.	5	
	Visual aids are well prepared, informative, effective, and not distracting.	5	
	Length of presentation is within the assigned time limits.	5	
	Information was well communicated.	10	
Score	**Total Points**	**100**	

Poster Presentation Peer Scoring Rubric

Presenter's Name: _____

Poster #: _____

Poster Research Category: _____

Score Key:
0 = No Attempt
1 = Developing
2 = Competent
3 =Exemplary

Please rate the poster/presenter from 0 to 3 on each of the following (circle one):

1. Statement of Research Problem/Rationale:				
a) Clearly stated questions or hypotheses being addressed	0	1	2	3
b) Well-explained rationale/justification for the study	0	1	2	3
c) Project objectives are clearly outlined	0	1	2	3
2. Literature Review/Background Theory:				
a) Relevant previous work thoroughly reviewed	0	1	2	3
b) Gap in knowledge/exploration identified	0	1	2	3
c) Succinct	0	1	2	3
d) References are cited appropriately	0	1	2	3
3. Methods (Explanation/Appropriateness):				
a) Clear description of methods used	0	1	2	3
b) Methods are appropriate to address aim/question	0	1	2	3
4. Analysis/Results:				
a) Figures/tables used appropriately and clearly to present the data	0	1	2	3
b) Findings are presented clearly and accurately	0	1	2	3
c) Analysis is well explained and appropriately applied	0	1	2	3
5. Conclusion/Discussion:				
a) Addressed study's problem/question	0	1	2	3
b) Conclusions are sufficiently supported by results	0	1	2	3
c) Results are placed into broader framework	0	1	2	3
d) Importance of findings is addressed	0	1	2	3
6. Presentation Overall:				
a) Effective overall aesthetic/organization of poster	0	1	2	3
b) Flow of information is logical and facilitates understanding	0	1	2	3
c) Presenter summarized study clearly	0	1	2	3
d) Presenter answered questions well	0	1	2	3
e) Length of poster summary (by presenter) was appropriate	0	1	2	3
f) Study is innovative and has potential to contribute to the field	0	1	2	3

Total_____/ 66

Comments:_____

(Adapted from Florida Atlantic University)

Appendix C

Sample Rubrics | Arts and Humanities

Rubric for Visual Arts

	Exceeding Expectations	Meeting Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Not Meeting Expectations
Portfolio/ Performance	The student demonstrates deep understanding of the principles and elements used in the art form under study, and demonstrates creativity with the medium chosen. The work produced will demonstrate high quality, and be presented in a professional manner.	The student demonstrates solid understanding of the principles and elements used in the art form under study, and demonstrates creativity with the medium chosen. The work produced will demonstrate good quality, and be presented in a somewhat professional manner.	The student demonstrates basic understanding of the principles and elements used in the art form under study, and demonstrates creativity with the medium chosen. The work produced will demonstrate developing quality, and be presented in an acceptable manner.	The student demonstrates limited understanding of the principles and elements used in the art under study, and has difficulty demonstrating creativity with the medium chosen. The work produced will be of sub-standard quality, and be presented in a nonprofessional manner.
Craftsmanship	The student will demonstrate exemplary knowledge of a variety of techniques which can be used in working with their chosen art form. Demonstration of new insights and working methods, and some historic knowledge of the uses and development of the medium chosen are essential.	The students will demonstrate proficient knowledge of a variety of techniques which can be used in working with their chosen art form. He or she will indicate knowledge of some new insights and working methods, and some historic knowledge of the uses and development of the medium chosen.	The student will demonstrate developing knowledge of a variety of techniques which can be used in working with their chosen art form. He or she will also demonstrate some insights and working methods, and some historic knowledge of the uses and development of the medium chosen.	The student demonstrates deficient knowledge of a variety of techniques which can be used in working with their chosen art form. He or she does not demonstrate new insights and working methods, and has insufficient historic knowledge of the uses and development of the medium chosen
Interpretation/ Analysis	Students will demonstrate an exemplary ability to analyze and interpret the art form under study. The student will demonstrate an excellent understanding of this art form.	Students will demonstrate proficient ability to analyze and interpret the art form understudy. The student will demonstrate a solid understanding of this art form.	Students will demonstrate a developing ability to analyze and interpret the art form understudy. The student will demonstrate an understanding of this art form at a beginning level.	Students will demonstrate deficiencies in their ability to analyze and interpret the art form understudy. The student will demonstrate an insufficient understanding of this art form at any level.

(Adapted from Otis School of Arts and Design)

Rubric for Digital Media Project

	Exceeding Expectations	Meeting Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Not Meeting Expectations
Organization	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is clearly and consistently observable.	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is clearly observable.	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is intermittently observable.	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is not observable.
Content Development	Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to illustrate mastery of the subject.	Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to explore ideas within the context of the assignment.	Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop and explore ideas through most of the work.	Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop simple ideas in some parts of the work.
Storyboard or organizing document	Illustrates the presentation structure with thumbnail sketches of each scene. Notes showing transitions, effects, etc., are clearly planned	Includes presentation structure with thumbnail sketches of each scene. Notes showing transitions, effects, etc. are presented.	Thumbnail sketches are not always clearly marked. Descriptions of scenes, transitions, etc. are incomplete or difficult to follow.	Documents incomplete and unclear.
Technical Elements (audio, lighting, video, timing, etc)	Project is edited with only high quality shots and sounds remaining. Transitions are smooth and project's timing is appropriate and enhances clarity.	Project is edited with only quality shots and sounds remaining. Pacing and timing are appropriate and enhance clarity.	Project is edited in places. Transitions are noticeable and detract from viewing. Pacing and timing are choppy.	Project is edited poorly with distracting pacing and timing. Clarity is impacted by poor technical control.

(Adapted from Angelo State University)

Appendix D

Sample Rubrics | Science and Math

Rubric for Conducting an Experiment in the Lab

	Exemplary	Competent	Needs Work
Materials	All materials needed are present and entered on the lab report. The materials are appropriate for the procedure. The student is not wasteful of the materials.	All materials needed are present, but not all are entered on the lab report, or some materials are absent and must be obtained during the procedure. The materials are appropriate for the procedure.	All materials needed are not present and are not entered on the lab report. The materials are not all appropriate for the procedure or there are some major omissions.
Procedure	The procedure is well designed and allows control of all variables selected. All stages of the procedure are entered on the lab report.	The procedure could be more efficiently designed, but it allows control of all variables selected. Most stages of the procedure are entered on the lab report.	The procedure does not allow control of all variables selected. Many stages of the procedure are not entered on the lab report.
Courtesy and Safety	While conducting the procedure, the student is tidy, respectful of others, mindful of safety, and leaves the area clean.	While conducting the procedure, the student is mostly tidy, sometimes respectful of others, sometimes mindful of safety, and leaves the area clean only after being reminded.	While conducting the procedure, the student is untidy, not respectful of others, not mindful of safety, and leaves the area messy even after being reminded.
Purpose	Research question and hypothesis are stated clearly, and the relationship between the two is clear. The variables are selected.	Research question and hypothesis are stated, but one or both are not as clear as they might be, or the relationship between the two is unclear. The variables are selected.	Research question and hypothesis are not stated clearly, and the relationship between the two is unclear or absent. The variables are not selected.
Data Collection	Raw data, including units, are recorded in a way that is appropriate and clear. The title of the data table is included.	Raw data, including units, are recorded although not as clearly or appropriately as they might be. The title of the data table is included.	Raw data, including units, are not recorded in a way that is appropriate and clear. The title of the data table is not included.
Data Analysis	Data are presented in ways (charts, tables, graphs) that best facilitate understanding and interpretation. Error analysis is included.	Data are presented in ways (charts, tables, graphs) that can be understood and interpreted, although not as clearly as they might be. Error analysis is included.	Data are presented in ways (charts, tables, graphs) that are very unclear. Error analysis is not included.
Evaluation of Experiment	The results are fully interpreted and compared with literature values. The limitations and weaknesses are discussed and suggestions are made as to how to limit or eliminate them.	The results are interpreted and compared with literature values, but not as fully as they might be. The limitations and weaknesses are discussed, but few or no suggestions are made as to how to limit or eliminate them.	The results are not interpreted in a logical way or compared with literature values. The limitations and weaknesses are not discussed, nor are suggestions made as to how to limit or eliminate them.

(Adapted from Stevens, D.D. & Levi, A.J., (2005). *Introduction to Rubrics.* Sterling, VA: Stylus)

Evaluation Rubric for Undergraduate Research Project in the Sciences

	Exemplary	Acceptable	Unacceptable
Statement of the Problem/Hypothesis	The student has independently identified and developed a research question/hypothesis that provides a contribution to the scientific literature in the research area.	The student has made independent contributions and development to a general idea or project suggested by faculty advisor.	The question under study is poorly specified and/or is completely specified by the faculty advisor with no development or contribution by the student.
Role of Theory	The experiment is a novel test of one or more current theories, or the experiment tests an important set of novel phenomena. Relevant theory is clearly and correctly described so that the contribution of the experiment is clear.	The experiment tests one or more current theories, or seeks to document expand understanding of phenomena described in the empirical literature.	The experiment is unrelated or misconstrues current theory and is a poor extension of the empirical literature.
Development of Idea	Logical, testable prediction(s) are identified and tested in the first experiment. One or more follow on experiments are conducted to expand theoretical conclusions or rule out alternative explanations.	Logical, testable prediction(s) are identified and tested in a single experiment.	The logic underlying the experiment is incorrect, badly explained, or missing entirely.
Experimental Design	The design of the experiment is novel. Independent and dependent variable(s) have been identified and possible confounding factors are controlled.	Appropriate independent and dependent variable(s) are used. Adequate care has been taken to control possible confounding factors.	Inappropriate independent and/or dependent variable(s) are used. Limited effort has been taken to control possible confounding factors.
Analysis and Presentation of Data	The data analysis technique is sophisticated and appropriate for data collected, informative with respect to the question being studied. Data is appropriately reported and displayed so that relevant findings are apparent.	The data analysis technique is appropriate for the data collected and correctly computed. Data is appropriately reported and displayed so that relevant findings are obvious.	The data analysis technique is inappropriate and/or incorrectly computed. Data displays are incorrect, sloppy, or difficult to interpret.
Interpretation of Results	The conclusions drawn are appropriate given the data and analyses conducted. Alternative interpretations are developed into follow-on experiments to further limit conclusions.	The conclusions drawn are appropriate given the data and analyses conducted. Alternative interpretations are considered and either convincingly rejected or used as the basis for further research suggestions.	Conclusions are inappropriate given the data. Obvious alternative interpretations are omitted.

(Adapted from Brown University)

Science Lab Report Evaluation Rubric

This analytic rubric is used to verify specific tasks performed when producing a lab report. The rubric permits students to self-assess as well as receive feedback from the instructor.

Category	Scoring Criteria	Weight	Student Evaluation	Instructor Evaluation
Lab Introduction ***15 points***	The question to be answered during the lab is stated.	**5**		
	Research references used to prepare for the lab are listed.	**5**		
	The hypothesis clearly shows it is based on research and not just speculation.	**5**		
Procedures ***15 points***	Procedures are written as part of pre-lab preparation and clearly state the plan for the experiment. If adjustments are made during the lab, those changes are noted as they occur.	**5**		
	All procedures are followed in appropriate order.	**5**		
	Specific formulas for chemicals used or equations for reactions that occur during the lab, when required, are shown on the procedures side of the lab sheet.	**5**		
Observations ***15 points***	Results that occur during a procedure are clearly recorded.	**5**		
	Measurements, when required, are recorded as observations, using proper units.	**5**		
	Calculations, when required, are clearly shown on the observation side of the lab sheet.	**5**		
Conclusion ***25 points***	Reasoning for the lab design is summarized, listing any facts or assumptions on which the lab is based.	**5**		
	The essential data gathered during the lab is summarized	**5**		
	Essential data from the lab is used to answer the lab question.	**5**		
	Aspects of the lab most likely responsible for measurable experimental error are identified	**10**		
Presentation ***25 points***	The report is neatly printed in ink, with no visible corrections.	**10**		
	The report is written in such a way that others could accurately duplicate the experiment and compare their data.	**5**		
	There is a clear diagram of the essential apparatus used in the experiment drawn in the largest available white space on the front of the lab report sheet.	**10**		
Lab Safety ***5 points***	No group members were cited for safety violations during the lab period.	**5**		
Score	**Total Points**	**100**		
Self-Evaluation	Students are expected to honestly evaluate their own work. If the difference between the student evaluation and the teacher evaluation is more than 10 points, 5 points will be deducted from the teacher's score when the grade is recorded.			
Deadline	Lab reports are due at the beginning of class the day after lab. Reports will be accepted at the beginning of class the second day after lab for 3/4 credit. No credit will be given after this time.			

(Adapted from California State University)

Evaluation Rubric for Mathematical Proofs

	Exemplary	Proficient	Acceptable	Unacceptable
Use of Mathematical Notation	The proof uses accurate and appropriate mathematical notation and terminology. Symbolic notation is used where it clearly simplifies the discourse, and avoided when English will better serve the reader.	Notation and terminology are correctly used, but there may be instances where the discourse would benefit from either more or less use of symbols versus English	Most, but not all, the notation and terminology is used accurately. Errors are identifiable and correctable by a reader of experience similar to the author.	Notation and/or terminology is frequently misused. The writer may use personal rather than standard notation.
Use of Definitions	Relevant definitions appear where needed to guide the logical flow.	The proof accurately invokes all needed definitions, though they may appear other than precisely where needed.	Some relevant definitions are missing or misstated, but the proof is otherwise understandable.	Several relevant definitions are missing or incorrectly stated, compromising the argument beyond repair.
Concise Writing	The proof is well-organized and clear, without inclusion of irrelevant definitions or theorems. Spelling and grammar are correct.	The author generally avoids digressions, but may repeat some ideas in an unnecessary way.	The proof is well-organized but includes extraneous steps, definitions, theorems, or unnecessary repetition.	The proof contains several extraneous steps which lead to a confused organization.
Reference to Earlier Theorems	The proof accurately references necessary prior theorems, with explicit statements or names	Reference to necessary prior theorems is complete, but may be somewhat vague.	Some theorems necessary to the deductions are used correctly, but others are missing, misused, or stated inaccurately.	Reference to prior theorems is generally lacking, or the theorems in question are stated inaccurately.
Logical Flow	A clear, complete, and properly ordered chain of deductive steps leads from the hypothesis to the conclusion. The proof moves seamlessly between symbolic notation and standard English.	The chain of deductive steps is complete and correctly ordered.	One or more intermediate deductive steps are missing or unclear, but the correctness of the proof is not compromised.	The hypothesis or conclusion is missing or incorrectly stated. The stated chain of deductions does not lead to the stated conclusion.

(Adapted from Dartmouth College)

Appendix E

Sample Rubrics | Graduate Work

Evaluation Rubric for Thesis in Linguistics

	High Pass	Pass	Low Pass	Fail
Statement of the Problem	• Very well written. • Articulates a concise and interesting hypothesis about a significant empirical linguistic problem and its broad significance.	• Clearly written. • Presents interesting hypothesis and describes its importance.	• Provides a general discussion of the hypothesis and relevant issues, but does not discuss its broader significance.	• Shows a fundamental lack of understanding of the problem. Poorly written, incomplete, and lacks structure.
Grounding in the Literature	• Places the work within a larger context. • Appropriately integrates relevant material. • Shows deep understanding of the significance of the research.	• Provides a meaningful summary of the literature and builds a case for the research.	• Cites most of the key literature. Lacks critical analysis and synthesis.	• Fails to cite important, relevant literature. • Does not clearly relate the literature to the student's contribution. • Misinterprets the literature.
Methods and Data Sources	• Uses original or creative use of linguistic analysis methods. • Data are novel and appropriate for the study.	• Uses existing linguistic analysis methodology well. • Data are appropriate to the study design.	• Demonstrates competent use of existing methods. • Collected data allow an adequate test of the hypothesis.	• Uses incorrect methodology. • Data are not handled appropriately.
Results	• Meaningful results obtained from sophisticated data analyses. • Analyses map back to the hypotheses. • Discusses the limitations of the analysis.	• Well executed. • Shows good understanding of the analytical methods. • Provides good arguments for or against the hypotheses.	• Analyses are executed correctly, but additional analyses may have yielded further insights.	• Misanalyzes data or fails to analyze relevant data. • Results do not follow from the analysis and mistakes are made in interpretation.
Discussion/ Conclusion	• Places the study in a larger theoretical context. • Informs our understanding of the nature of language.	• States what was done and identifies its significance and limitations.	• Summarizes and repeats what was found. Does not discuss the significance or limitations of the research.	• Insufficient or incoherent discussion of results. • Shows lack of understanding of linguistic theories.
Overall	• Original and significant.	• Informative, clearly written, and well-organized.	• Demonstrates competence.	• Poorly written; does not understand basic concepts.

(Adapted from the Department of Linguistics, University of Kansas)

Rubric for a Dissertation

	Exemplary Scholarship	Developed Scholarship	Developing Scholarship	Emerging Scholarship
Abstract	• Clear and concise • States the problem, findings, methodology, and significance.	• Organized well • States the research problem, findings, methodology, and significance.	• The abstract has an introduction to the findings. • Statement of the problem, findings, methodology, and/or significance may need some more organizational work.	• Introduction to the problem or findings missing or not developed in a clear way. • Findings, methodology, and/or significance not well organized.
Research Question or Thesis	• The question or thesis is original and significant in its potential to address critical issues within the respective field.	• The question or thesis is original and clear in its potential contribution.	• The question or thesis may be original but its significance to the field is not well supported.	• The question or thesis needs more development to make the case that it is interesting or important.
Literature Review	• Mastery of and creative and critical engagement with relevant literature in the field. • Demonstrates the gap in the literature relevant to their study and makes a compelling argument that the candidate's research will address the gap.	• An insightful review that integrates relevant literature. • Demonstrates that the student can use the literature to discuss scholarly trends, develop hypotheses, and identify the gap in literature their work will address.	• Provides an analysis of previous findings. • Adequate coverage of relevant literature but weak connection with their research question or thesis.	• The literature review is incomplete and does not include some of the important references related to the field and subject of the study. • Relevance of the presented literature to the research question unclear.
Theoretical Frameworks	• Works with multiple demonstrably relevant, complementary and competing theories • Addresses how their work will contribute to, support, or change established theory.	• Current theories are connected to and provide a clear framework for the research. • Discusses the impact their work may have on existing theories.	• Current theories are connected to but provide a weak framework for the research. • Little or no discussion of the impact their research may have on existing theories.	• Theoretical framework is missing, unclear, or misunderstood.

Methods and Approaches	• Study design manifests a deep understanding of the field. • Iteratively explores ethical questions raised by the data or theoretical analysis. • Discusses the limitations of the study design and potential bias. • Clear connection between methodology and data analysis.	• Creative methodology and study design. • Study biases and/or limitations within the study clearly discussed. • Ethical issues are considered appropriately. • Clear discussion of connection between methodology and data analysis.	• Choice of methodology and study design shows basic competence but lacks originality. • Some consideration of ethical issues. • Limited discussion of study biases and/or limitations within the study design. • Connection between the methodology and the data analysis underdeveloped.	• Uses a methodology and/or data that does not lend itself well to the study of the question. • Shows lack of awareness of limitations within the study design. • Ethical issues of research are not considered. • No clear connection between the methodology and the data analysis.
Analysis and Interpretation	• Analysis is rigorous, nuanced, and transparent. • Findings are connected to research question and theoretical foundations. • A rigorous discussion of the validity of the findings is presented and linked to previous work in the field.	• Analysis is complete and well-connected to the research question and theoretical framework. • Validity of the findings are addressed thoroughly.	• The analysis has a weak connection back to theory. • A more thorough analysis should be considered. • Validity of the findings is addressed but may lack a thorough approach.	• The analysis is incomplete or poorly implemented. • The findings are not supported by the analysis.
Conclusions	• Provides a focused discussion of conclusions, situating them in the literature. • Advances the field and raises new questions. • Makes a compelling and interesting argument as to the importance of their findings.	• Conclusions are well-presented and insightful • Presents a compelling argument as to how their study addresses a gap in the literature.	• Summarizes the results and provides a general discussion in reference to the literature. • There is limited discussion of the gap in the literature their study addresses.	• Summary of results is unclear or absent. • The connection between the findings and data may not be established in a convincing way. • Little or no interpretation is provided or the interpretation may not fit the findings.

Writing and Scholarly Voice	• Writing is precise and clear. • Lexicon of the field is clearly explained and defined. • Scholarly style and format are accurately used. • The candidate's 'voice' is heard and yields a definitive understanding of the issues being discussed.	• Writing is grammatically correct, precise, and clear. • Lexicon of the field is clearly explained and defined. • Scholarly style and format are accurately used.	• Writing is somewhat developed and professional. • The lexicon of the field is understood and used properly. • Spelling, punctuation, grammar, and formatting generally meet program and institutional standards.	• Tone does not exhibit an understanding of the academic writing genre. • The candidate appears to not have a command of the field's lexicon. • Errors of spelling, punctuation or formatting may be present.
Oral Defense	• Masterfully defends research by providing clear and insightful answers to questions. • Uses presentation resources as a guide.	• Competently defends research by providing very helpful answers to questions. • May occasionally manifest need for further reflection on minor points. • Uses presentation resources as a guide.	• Answers questions, but may lack insight. • Frequently shows a need for deeper reflection on minor points. • Relies too much on presentation materials.	• Does not adequately defend research. • Frequently shows a need for deeper reflection on key points. • Reads the material from presentation to make the report and is clearly not comfortable with the topic.

Thesis Proposal Rubric

	Fully Met (3)	Met (2)	Partially Met (1)	Not Met (0)
Proposal Overview	Effectively and insightfully develops a set of testable, supportable and impactful study hypotheses.	Develops a set of testable and supportable hypotheses.	Develops hypotheses.	Hypotheses are not testable or justifiable.
Justification for Hypotheses	The introduction section provides a cogent overview of conceptual and theoretical issues related to the study hypotheses.	The introduction section provides a logical overview of conceptual and theoretical issues related to the study hypotheses.	The proposal provides weak support for study hypotheses.	Very little support for the conceptual and theoretical relevant to the study hypotheses was provided.
Supporting Evidence	Provides clearly appropriate evidence to support position.	Provides adequate evidence to support position.	Provides inappropriate or insufficient evidence to support position.	Provides little or no evidence to support position
Review of Relevant Research	Sophisticated integration, synthesis, and critique of literature from related fields. Places work within larger context.	Provides a meaningful summary of the literature. Shows understanding of relevant literature	Fails to cite important or relevant scholarship. Misinterprets research findings.	Provides little or no relevant scholarship.
Focus	The proposal is well organized and has a tight and cohesive focus that is integrated throughout the document.	The proposal has an organizational structure and the focus is clear throughout.	The proposal is somewhat focused or has minor drifts in the focus.	The document lacks focus or contains major drifts in focus
Methodology	Identifies appropriate methodologies and research techniques (e.g., justifies the sample, procedures, and measures). Data analytic plan is suitable to test study hypotheses. Provides appropriate justification for controls. Project is feasible	Identifies appropriate methodologies and research techniques but some details are missing or vague.	Identifies appropriate methodologies and research techniques but many details are missing or vague. The methodology is largely incomplete.	The methodologies described are either not suited or poorly suited to test hypotheses. The methodology is under-developed and/or is not feasible.
Clarity and Organization	The proposal is well written and ideas are well developed and explained.	The proposal effectively communicates ideas. Some sections lack clarity.	The proposal communicates ideas adequately. Many sections lack clarity.	The proposal is poorly written and confusing.
References and Citations	Properly and explicitly cited. Reference list matches citations	Properly cited. May have a few instances in which proper citations are missing.	The proposal has several instances of improper use of citations. Contains several statements without appropriately citing.	The proposal lacks proper citations or includes no citations.

(Adapted from the University of New Orleans)

Appendix F

Sample Rubrics | Miscellaneous

Undergraduate Internship Rubric

Criteria	Exemplary	Proficient	Acceptable	Emerging	Insufficient
Prompt and Regular Attendance	• Exhibits perfect attendance • Is continually on-time	• Is late or absent no more than once during the internship	• Is late or absent no more than twice during the internship	• Is late or absent no more than three times during the internship	• Is late or absent four or more times during the internship.
Disposition	• Inspires positive interactions among others in the workplace • Responds in a mature manner to prevent or resolve conflict	• Initiates positive interactions with others • Responds in a mature manner to resolve conflict	• Displays positive interactions with others • Responds in a mature manner to resolve conflict	• Displays positive interactions with some people in this setting • Attempts to resolve conflict in a mature manner	• Does not display positive interactions with people in this setting. • Is unable to resolve conflict in a mature manner
Responsive to Feedback	• Actively seeks out and applies constructive feedback	• Seeks constructive feedback	• Accepts constructive feedback	• Attempts to accept constructive feedback	• Does not accept constructive feedback
Professionalism	• Conducts self in a professional manner that brings praise to the organization	• Conducts self in manner that brings praise from other employees	• Conducts self in expected professional manner	• Conducts self in acceptable manner some of the time	• Does not conduct self in an acceptable manner
Organization	• Keeps workspace and projects well-organized • Always follows organizational policies and procedures	• Keeps workspace and projects well-organized • Follows organizational policies and procedures consistently	• Keeps workspace and projects somewhat organized • Follows organizational policies and procedures most of the time	• Takes steps to keep workspace and projects organized • Attempts to follow organizational policies and procedures	• Does not keep workspace and projects organized • Does not follow organizational policies and procedures
Reliability & Responsibility	• Can be relied on to perform job tasks at all times	• Can be relied on to perform job tasks nearly all times	• Can be relied on to perform job tasks most of the time	• Can be relied on to perform job tasks some of the time	• Cannot be relied on to perform job tasks
Initiative	• Displays motivation in all interactions • Creates solutions to problems with no instruction	• Displays motivation in nearly all interactions • Creates solutions to problems with little instruction	• Displays motivation in most interactions • Creates solutions to problems when instructed	• Displays motivation in some interactions • Occasionally creates solutions to problems when instructed	• Does not display motivation in interactions • Unwilling or unable to create solutions to problems when instructed
Communication with Supervisor	• Always responds to supervisor communication • Initiates communication	• Always responds to supervisor communication • Often initiates communication	• Always responds to supervisor communication	• Typically responds to supervisor initiated communication	• Fails to respond to supervisor communication
Fulfills Expectations	• Consistently exceeds expectations and goals set by supervisor and organization	• Sometimes exceeds expectations and goals set by supervisor and organization	• Meets expectations and goals set by supervisor and organization	• Meets some expectations and goals set by supervisor and organization	• Does not meet expectations and goals set by supervisor and organization

A Rubric for Rubrics

Criteria	Unacceptable	Developing	Acceptable
Selection and Clarity of Criteria	Criteria being assessed are unclear, have significant overlap, or are not derived from appropriate standards for task and subject area.	Criteria being assessed can be identified, but not all are clearly differentiated or derived from appropriate standard for task and subject area.	All criteria are clear, distinct, and derived from appropriate standards for task and subject area.
Distinction Between Levels	Little or no distinction can be made between levels of achievement.	Some distinction between levels is clear, but may be too narrow or too wide.	Each level is distinct and progresses in a clear and logical order.
Quality of Writing	Writing is not understandable to all users of rubric, including students. Has vague and unclear language which makes it difficult for raters to agree on a score.	Writing is mostly understandable to all users of rubric, including students. Some language by be confusing among raters.	Writing is understandable to all users of rubric, including students. Has clear, specific language that helps raters reliable agree on a score.
Reliability of Scoring	Cross-scoring among faculty and/or students often results in significant differences.	Cross-sharing by faculty and/or students occasionally creates inconsistent results.	Cross-scoring of assignments results in consistent agreement among scorers.
Use of Rubric to Communicate Expectations and Guide Students	Rubric is not shared with students.	Rubric is shared with students when the task is completed and is only used for evaluation of student work.	Rubric serves as a primary reference point as students begin their work, for discussion and guidance, as well we evaluation of student work.
Engagement of Students in Using Rubrics	Students are not engaged in either development or use of the rubrics.	Students are offered the rubric and use it for self-assessment.	Students discuss the design of the rubric and offer feedback/input and are responsible for use of rubrics in peer and/or self-evaluation

(Adapted from a model developed by Dr. Bonnie Mullinix, TLT Group)