

Rubric on Rubrics ☺

Components	No Evidence/ Ineffective	Developing	Useful	Meaningful
Components	Components are not relevant to the learning outcome.	It is not clear how components are relevant to achieving the learning outcome; some components appear relevant while others do not.	All components are clearly relevant to achieving success on the learning outcome.	Components clearly demonstrate thoughtful consideration of essential skills and/or knowledge needed to achieve success on the learning outcome.
Defined Levels of Performance	Levels of performance are not defined.	Levels of performance are poorly or insufficiently defined; distinctions between levels of performance are not clear, or are inconsistent.	Distinctions between levels of performance are clearly defined and generally consistent.	Distinctions between levels of performance are well developed, create a continuum of progress, and are highly consistent.
Alignment with Assignment and Learning Outcome	Scoring criteria is not reflective of or in alignment with the assignment or the learning outcome.	Scoring criteria appears to be in alignment with the assignment, the learning outcome, or both, but alignment of one or both may be inconsistent or unclear (e.g. assignment says 'describe', but rubric scores on 'synthesis').	Scoring criteria is clearly aligned with the assignment and the learning outcome.	Scoring criteria is clearly aligned with the assignment and the learning outcome, and it is clear that success on the assignment will demonstrate achievement of the learning outcome as well as result in a positive score on the rubric.
Learning Expectations/ Usefulness to Students	Learning expectations are not revealed in the rubric.	General concepts for learning are identified, but not in a way that provides clarification for students who are unsure about expectations (e.g. "not organized; somewhat organized; organized; highly organized" does not necessarily clarify what 'organized' looks like).	Useful information that helps guide students in meeting learning expectations is provided, and is appropriate to the course/content level (e.g. level of detail about what constitutes a quality research paper would likely be much higher for 101 students than for graduate students).	A very clear picture of learning expectations is communicated; expectations are thoughtfully and insightfully addressed so that students can recognize deficiencies, address them and/or pursue additional instruction/information as needed.
Appropriateness of Language	Language is incomprehensible, extremely vague and/or confusing.	Language may be appropriate for faculty but is not likely understood by, or is meaningful to the student; is laced with jargon; and/or is a deterrent for the student and interferes with the students' ability to use the rubric to enhance their learning/ performance on the outcome.	Language is accessible and appropriate for students; does not interfere with usefulness of rubric; and may reflect the particular context of the desired learning outcome (e.g. if the desired outcome is 'professionalism,' levels of performance may be "not professional, marginally professional, professional" etc.)	Language is accessible and appropriate to the particular student audience; helps to clarify both the assignment and learning expectations for the student; facilitates the students' use of the rubric to enhance their learning and/or performance; and reflects the particular context of the desired outcome.