



Assessment Task:

Date:

Reviewer(s):

Questions for Evaluating Rubric Quality	Comments/Feedback for Each Review Question
<p><b>1. Do the number of performance levels and rubric format make sense?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Format matches purpose and use.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Adjacent performance levels are <i>qualitatively</i> different.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Levels reflect how completion of the task might naturally progress with instruction.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>2. Is descriptive language maximized?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Little or no judgmental language.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Avoids use of subjective language (poor, neat, ample, etc.) and frequency indicators (rarely, often, etc.).</li> </ul>	
<p><b>3. Do descriptors emphasize quality over quantity?</b> (e.g., relevant, descriptive details/sources versus three details/sources)</p>	
<p><b>4. Do descriptors state performance in the positive?</b> (e.g., what is happening rather than what is <i>not</i> happening)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Lowest levels focus on beginning stages.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Describes a (real) progression of learning.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Have student work samples or piloting informed performance descriptions?</li> </ul>	
<p><b>5. Do descriptors describe excellent rather than perfect performance?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Describes a progression from <i>Novice</i> to <i>Expert</i> performance.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Performance descriptors increase with depth, complexity, and/or breadth of knowledge.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Minor errors not weighted more than quality of ideas or thinking.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>6. Do rubric language and criteria match rigor expectations of task?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Range of criteria aligns with task expectations (form, accuracy, process, impact, construction of knowledge).</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Not limited to basic skills and concepts or only routine tasks.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> At least one criterion builds to transfer and construction of knowledge/deeper understanding.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>7. Is the language kid-friendly?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Could this be used for peer and self-assessment?</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Have students had input into the writing or refinement of performance level descriptions?</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Additional Notes:</b></p>	



Available for download at <http://resources.corwin.com/DeeperCompetencyBasedLearning>.

© Karin Hess (2009, updated 2017). A local assessment toolkit to support deeper learning: Guiding school leaders in linking research with classroom practice. Permission to reproduce is given only when authorship is fully cited [karinhessvt@gmail.com].