**Handout for Creating Effective Rubrics**

The following information was included in a packet created by Mary Allen **(****mallen@csub.edu****)**, who presented a half-day workshop on creating and using rubrics to HSU faculty in November of this year. The workshop was extremely informative, and included many examples of effective rubrics across multiple disciplines, as well as detailed instructions about how to create and use the rubrics for effective grading and assessment.

If you would like more information, or would like to meet with a member of the committee for Program Planning and Assessment, please contact committee chair Beth Wilson (Beth.Wilson@humboldt.edu).

#### Program Assessment

**Program assessment** is an on-going process designed to monitor and improve student learning. Faculty:

* develop explicit statements of what students should learn (SLOs).
* verify that the program is designed to foster this learning (alignment).
* develop a meaningful, manageable, sustainable assessment plan.
* collect empirical data that indicate student attainment (assessment data).
* assess the evidence and reach a conclusion (students’ level of mastery is satisfactory or disappointing).
* use these data to improve student learning (close the loop).

**Rubrics** provide the criteria for classifying products or behaviors into categories that vary along a continuum. They can be used to classify virtually any product or behavior, such as essays, research reports, portfolios, works of art, recitals, oral presentations, performances, and group activities. Rubrics can be used to provide formative feedback to students, to grade students, and/or to assess courses or programs.

There are two major types of scoring rubrics:

* Holistic scoring — one global, holistic score for a product or behavior
* Analytic rubrics — separate scoring of specified characteristics of a product or behavior

**Rubrics have many strengths:**

* Complex products or behaviors can be examined efficiently.
* Developing a rubric helps to precisely define faculty expectations.
* Well-trained reviewers apply the same criteria and standards.
* Rubrics are criterion-referenced, rather than norm-referenced. Raters ask, “Did the student meet the criteria for level 5 of the rubric?” rather than “How well did this student do compared to other students?” This is more compatible with cooperative and collaborative learning environments than competitive grading schemes and is essential when using rubrics for program assessment because you want to learn how well students have met your standards.

**Rubrics can be used for grading, as well as assessment.**

**Here’s an assessment rubric—an analytic rubric with**

**three dimensions for assessing oral presentation skills.**

|  |
| --- |
| **Rubric for Assessing Oral Presentations** |
|  | **Below Expectation** | **Satisfactory** | **Exemplary** |
| Organization | No apparent organization. Evidence is not used to support assertions.  | The presentation has a focus and provides some evidence which supports conclusions. | The presentation is carefully organized and provides convincing evidence to support conclusions. |
| Content | The content is inaccurate or overly general. Listeners are unlikely to learn anything or may be misled. | The content is generally accurate, but incomplete. Listeners may learn some isolated facts, but they are unlikely to gain new insights about the topic. | The content is accurate and complete. Listeners are likely to gain new insights about the topic. |
| Delivery | The speaker appears anxious and uncomfortable, and reads notes, rather than speaks. Listeners are largely ignored. | The speaker is generally relaxed and comfortable, but too often relies on notes. Listeners are sometimes ignored or misunderstood. | The speaker is relaxed and comfortable, speaks without undue reliance on notes, and interacts effectively with listeners. |

**Alternative Format 1**.

Points are assigned and used for grading, as shown below, and the categories (Below Expectation, Satisfactory, Exemplary) can be used for assessment. Faculty who share an assessment rubric might:

* assign points in different ways, depending on the nature of their courses
* decide to add more rows for course-specific criteria or comments.

Notice how this rubric allows faculty, who may not be experts on oral presentation skills, to give detailed formative feedback to students. This feedback describes present skills and indicates what students should do to improve. Effective rubrics can help faculty reduce the time they spend grading and eliminate the need to repeatedly write the same comments to multiple students.

|  |
| --- |
| **Rubric for Grading Oral Presentations** |
|  | **Below Expectation** | **Satisfactory** | **Exemplary** | **Score** |
| Organization | No apparent organization. Evidence is not used to support assertions. (0-4) | The presentation has a focus and provides some evidence which supports conclusions.(5-6) | The presentation is carefully organized and provides convincing evidence to support conclusions.(7-8) |  |
| Content | The content is inaccurate or overly general. Listeners are unlikely to learn anything or may be misled.(0-8) | The content is generally accurate, but incomplete. Listeners may learn some isolated facts, but they are unlikely to gain new insights about the topic.(9-11) | The content is accurate and complete. Listeners are likely to gain new insights about the topic.(12-13) |  |
| Delivery | The speaker appears anxious and uncomfortable, and reads notes, rather than speaks. Listeners are largely ignored.(0-5) | The speaker is generally relaxed and comfortable, but too often relies on notes. Listeners are sometimes ignored or misunderstood.(6-7) | The speaker is relaxed and comfortable, speaks without undue reliance on notes, and interacts effectively with listeners.(8-9) |  |
| Total Score |  |

**Alternative Format 2.**

Weights are used for grading; categories (Below Expectation, Satisfactory, Exemplary) can be used for assessment. Individual faculty determine how to assign weights for their course grading. Faculty may circle or underline material in the cells to emphasize criteria that were particularly important during the assessment/grading, and they may add a section for comments or other grading criteria.

|  |
| --- |
| **Rubric for Grading Oral Presentations** |
|  | **Below Expectation** | **Satisfactory** | **Exemplary** | **Weight** |
| Organization | No apparent organization. Evidence is not used to support assertions.  | The presentation has a focus and provides some evidence which supports conclusions. | The presentation is carefully organized and provides convincing evidence to support conclusions | 30% |
| Content | The content is inaccurate or overly general. Listeners are unlikely to learn anything or may be misled. | The content is generally accurate, but incomplete. Listeners may learn some isolated facts, but they are unlikely to gain new insights about the topic. | The content is accurate and complete. Listeners are likely to gain new insights about the topic. | 50% |
| Delivery | The speaker appears anxious and uncomfortable, and reads notes, rather than speaks. Listeners are largely ignored. | The speaker is generally relaxed and comfortable, but too often relies on notes. Listeners are sometimes ignored or misunderstood. | The speaker is relaxed and comfortable, speaks without undue reliance on notes, and interacts effectively with listeners. | 20% |
| Comments |  |

**Alternative Format 3.**

Some faculty prefer to grade holistically, rather than through assigning numbers. In this example, the faculty member checks off characteristics of the speech and determines the grade based on a holistic judgment. The categories (Below Expectation, Satisfactory, Exemplary) can be used for assessment. Individual faculty might add scores or score ranges (see original example) or a “Weight” column (see Alternative Format 1) for grading purposes.

|  |
| --- |
| **Rubric for Grading Oral Presentations** |
|  | **Below Expectation** | **Satisfactory** | **Exemplary** |
| Organization | * No apparent organization.
* Evidence is not used to support assertions.
 | * The presentation has a focus.
* Student provides some evidence which supports conclusions.
 | * The presentation is carefully organized.
* Speaker provides convincing evidence to support conclusions
 |
| Content | * The content is inaccurate or overly general.
* Listeners are unlikely to learn anything or may be misled.
 | * The content is generally accurate, but incomplete.
* Listeners may learn some isolated facts, but they are unlikely to gain new insights about the topic.
 | * The content is accurate and complete.
* Listeners are likely to gain new insights about the topic.
 |
| Delivery | * The speaker appears anxious and uncomfortable.
* Speaker reads notes, rather than speaks.
* Listeners are largely ignored.
 | * The speaker is generally relaxed and comfortable.
* Speaker too often relies on notes.
* Listeners are sometimes ignored or misunderstood.
 | * The speaker is relaxed and comfortable.
* Speaker speaks without undue reliance on notes.
* Speaker interacts effectively with listeners.
 |

**Alternative Format 4.**

Combinations of Various Ideas. As long as the nine assessment cells are used in the same way by all faculty, grading and assessment can be done simultaneously.

|  |
| --- |
| **Rubric for Grading Oral Presentations** |
|  | **Below Expectation****1** | **Satisfactory****2** | **Exemplary****3** | **Weight** |
| Organization | * No apparent organization.
* Evidence is not used to support assertions.
 | * The presentation has a focus.
* Speaker provides some evidence which supports conclusions.
 | * The presentation is carefully organized.
* Speaker provides convincing evidence to support conclusions
 | 20% |
| Content | * The content is inaccurate or overly general.
* Listeners are unlikely to learn anything or may be misled.
 | * The content is generally accurate, but incomplete.
* Listeners may learn some isolated facts, but they are unlikely to gain new insights about the topic.
 | * The content is accurate and complete.
* Listeners are likely to gain new insights about the topic.
 | 40% |
| Delivery | * The speaker appears anxious and uncomfortable.
* Speaker reads notes, rather than speaks.
* Listeners are largely ignored.
 | * The speaker is generally relaxed and comfortable.
* Speaker too often relies on notes.
* Listeners are sometimes ignored or misunderstood.
 | * The speaker is relaxed and comfortable.
* Speaker speaks without undue reliance on notes.
* Speaker interacts effectively with listeners.
 | 20% |
| References | * Speaker fails to integrate journal articles into the speech.
 | * Speaker integrates 1 or 2 journal articles into the speech.
 | * Speaker integrates 3 or more journal articles into the speech.
 | 20% |

**Engineering Rubric**

## University of Alabama at Birmingham, **downloaded January 30, 2006 from** [**http://main.uab.edu/soeng/Templates/Inner.aspx?pid=80936**](http://main.uab.edu/soeng/Templates/Inner.aspx?pid=80936)

|  |
| --- |
| Outcome 10b - Graduates will be able to communicate effectively in written (10b) form  |
|  | Level 5  | Level 3  | Level 1  |
| **Articulation**  | Articulates ideas clearly and concisely  | Articulates ideas, but writing is somewhat disjointed, superfluous or difficult to follow  | Text rambles, points made are only understood with repeated reading, and key points are not organized  |
| **Organization**  | Organizes written materials in a logical sequence to enhance the reader's comprehension (paragraphs, subheading, etc.)  | Material are generally organized well, but paragraphs combine multiple thoughts or sections and sub-sections are not identified clearly  | Little or no structure or organization; no subheadings or proper paragraph structure used  |
| **Use of Supporting Graphs, Tables, etc**  | Uses graphs, tables, and diagrams to support points-to explain, interpret, and assess information  | Uses graphs, tables, and diagrams, but only in a few instances are they applied to support, explain or interpret information  | Graphs, tables or diagrams are used, but no reference is made to them  |
| **Neatness**  | Written work is presented neatly and professionally  | Work is not neatly presented throughout  | Work is not presented neatly  |
| **Grammar and Spelling**  | Grammar and spelling are correct  | One or two spelling/grammar errors per page  | Spelling/grammar errors present throughout more than 1/3 of the paper  |
| **Figure Formatting**  | Figures are all in proper format  | Figures are present but are flawed-axes mislabeled, no data points, etc  | No figures or graphics are used at all  |
| **Writing Style**  | Uses good professional writing style  | Style is informal or inappropriate, jargon is used, improper voice, tense…  | The writing style is inappropriate for the audience and for the assignment  |
| **Document Formatting**  | Conforms to the prescribed format (if any)  | The prescribed format is only followed in some portions of the paper  | The prescribed format is not followed  |

**Teaching Philosophy Statement Scoring Rubric**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion** | **Undocumented****0****Unacceptable** | **Minimal****1****Unacceptable** | **Basic****2****Acceptable** | **Proficient****3****Acceptable** | **Advanced****4****Acceptable** | **Score** |
| **Idea****Development** | The statement is incoherent or extremely brief or contains major logical inconsistencies | Statement expresses several ideas about teaching that are ambiguous or not connected | Statement meets one of the following criteria: logical, elaborated, consistent | Statement meets two of the following criteria: logical, elaborated, consistent. | Statement is logical, elaborated, and internally consistent | **Score:****\_\_\_\_\_** |
| **Illustrative****Examples** | No illustrative examples are included | The statement includes at least one example, but the relationship to teaching experience or plans is unclear | Examples from the writer’s experience show only one of ○ detail○ clearrelevance,○ vividness or memorability | Examples from the writer’s experience or plans are○ detailed andpertinent,○ but notmemorable | Illustrative examples from the writer’s experience or plans are detailed, pertinent, and memorable | **Score:****\_\_\_\_\_** |
| **Quality of****Writing** | The statement is very difficult to read because of its style, usage, mechanics, or organization | Two of the following apply:○ Organized,○ Unified,○ Free from errors of mechanics and usage,○ Appropriate academic style,○ Strongly suggestive of voice | Three of the following apply:○ Organized,○ Unified,○ Free from errors of mechanics and usage,○ Appropriate academic style,○ Strongly suggestive of voice | Four of the following apply:○ Organized,○ Unified,○ Free from errors of mechanics and usage,○ Appropriate academic style,○ Strongly suggestive of voice | Writing is clear, well organized, unified, freefrom errors of mechanics and usage, an appropriate academic style, with a strong suggestion of the author’s individual voice | **Score:****\_\_\_\_\_** |

**Total: \_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Mean: \_\_\_\_\_\_**

Comments:

Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Retrieved January 26, 2008 from page 7 of <http://academics.uww.edu/cni/docs/Phase%203%20StdntPckt%20011007.pdf>. This document contains detailed instructions for student preparation of their portfolio.

**California State University East Bay MBA Rubrics**

Retrieved January 3, 2007 from http://www.csuhayward.edu/ira/wasc/slo/SLO%20Bus%20Admin%20MBA.doc

Written Communication Rubric (0 – 17: Does not meet standard. 18 or above: Meets standard)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **1: Beginner** | **2: Novice** | **3: Proficient** | **4: Advanced** | **Score** |
| **Purpose Statement** | Ill defined or no thesis or statement of purpose | Vague or inconsistent statement of purpose | Expresses a clear, coherent thesis statement | Creative, insightful and/or skillfully designed thesis statement |  |
| **Sense of Audience** | Unfocused or absent sense of audience | Inconsistent sense of audience;Uses language inappropriate to target audience | Conveys an accurate sense of audience with appropriate use of disciplinary language | Strong sense of audience demonstrated through form and language |  |
| **Organization and** **development** | Inadequate organization and/or development | Some organization evident, but inconsistent | Connects ideas within document and to other sources and ideas;Points are logically developed and flow logically from one idea to the next | Effective organization contributes to full development of written presentation |  |
| **Support for ideas** | Inappropriate or insufficient details to support thesis | Includes some, but not adequate support for arguments | Advances argument with sound evidence and references | Expertly advances argument with well-researched evidence and documentation |  |
| **Understand-ing of Topic** | Demonstrates little or no understanding of topic | Demonstrates some understanding of topic;Does not make connections among ideas | Moves beyond surface understanding; Demonstrates facility with topical and disciplinary knowledge | Demonstrates disciplinary understanding and interconnections; makes links that suggest discovery of new information or new ways of relaying information |  |
| **Use of Grammar** | Multiple errors in grammar, sentence structure or spelling | Occasional errors in grammar, sentence structure or spelling | Uses correct grammar, sentence structure and spelling throughout document | Readability enhanced by facility in language use, range of diction and syntactic variety |  |
|  |  |  |  | **Total Points:** |  |