
Item Name: Rubric for Assessing Rubrics

Document #: 160

Author: Dr. Bonnie B. Mullinix

Institution: Monmouth University

Discipline: Any

Type of Item: rubric

Type of Rubric: holistic

File Type: pdf

Appropriate for use at these levels

Any: yes

Classroom: yes

Academic Program: yes

Institution: yes

Description
This rubric includes definitions of four levels of performance for each of six areas of evaluation criteria: clarity of criteria, distinction between levels, reliability of scoring, clarity of expectations/guidance to learners, support of metacognition (awareness of learning), and engagement of learners in rubric development/ use.
Copyright Information
Dr. Bonnie B. Mullinix © Monmouth University, December 2003
Disclaimer
<p>The information provided in this document is static and retrieved at a specific point in time. Therefore, this information may not represent updates or revisions made since its retrieval. The Office of University Evaluation and The Center for Learning and Teaching Excellence at Arizona State University make no guarantees concerning the accuracy, completeness, reliability, or suitability of the information for your needs.</p> <p>Trademarks, service marks, logos, and/or domain names are the property of their respective owners, who have no association with or make any endorsement of information provided by this service.</p> <p>We identified the source of all material used in this service wherever possible, however, specific copyright information is continually updated.</p>

A Rubric for Rubrics

A Tool for Assessing the Quality and Use of Rubrics in Education

Criteria	1 Unacceptable	2 Acceptable	3 Good/Solid	4 Exemplary
Clarity of criteria	Criteria being assessed are unclear, inappropriate and/or have significant overlap	Criteria being assessed can be identified, but are not clearly differentiated or are inappropriate	Criteria being assessed are clear, appropriate and distinct	Each criteria is distinct, clearly delineated and fully appropriate for the assignment(s)/course
Distinction between Levels	Little/no distinction can be made between levels of achievement	Some distinction between levels is made, but is not totally clear how well	Distinction between levels is apparent	Each level is distinct and progresses in a clear and logical order
Reliability of Scoring	Cross-scoring among faculty and/or students often results in significant differences	Cross-scoring by faculty and/or students occasionally produces inconsistent results	There is general agreement between different scorers when using the rubric (<i>e.g. differs by less than 5-10% or less than ½ level</i>)	Cross-scoring of assignments using rubric results in consistent agreement among scorers
Clarity of Expectations/ Guidance to Learners	Rubric is not shared with learners	Rubric is shared and provides some idea of the assignment/ expectations	Rubric is referenced - used to introduce an assignment/guide learners	Rubric serves as primary reference point for discussion and guidance for assignments as well as evaluation of assignment(s),
Support of Metacognition (Awareness of Learning)	Rubric is not shared with learners	Rubric is shared but not discussed/ referenced with respect to what is being learned through the assignment(s)/course	Rubric is shared and identified as a tool for helping learners to understand what they are learning through the assignment/ in the course	Rubric is regularly referenced and used to help learners identify the skills and knowledge they are developing throughout the course/ assignment(s)
Engagement of Learners in Rubric Development/ Use *	Learners are not engaged in either development or use of the rubrics	Learners offered the rubric and may choose to use it for self assessment	Learners discuss the design of the rubric and offer feedback/ input and are responsible for use of rubrics in peer and/or self-evaluation	Faculty and learners are jointly responsible for design of rubrics and learners use them in peer and/or self-evaluation

**Considered optional by some educators and a critical component by others*

Scoring:	0 - 10 = needs improvement	11 - 15 = workable	16 – 20 = solid/good	21 – 24 = exemplary
----------	----------------------------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------