UNIVERSITY OF READING RUBRIC REVIEW TOOL

The Rubric Review Tool has been created collaboratively by colleagues within the EMA programme, TEL and ADE teams and adapted from prior work published by Steven Gilbert (2015).

The Tool is designed to help academic colleagues to assess the quality and usability of their rubrics, both scoring and qualitative. The resource provides questions that can be used to evaluate key features of a rubric including criteria, scales and performance descriptors. Colleagues should start with the questions listed on the left to reflect on their own rubrics and how they might meet baseline, good or exemplary practice.

This tool can be used:
- As an individual reflection tool or as a springboard for a team discussion
- To ensure an individual rubric meets the baseline standard recommended by the University of Reading
- To review rubric use at module and programme level
- To reflect on the level of staff and student engagement in rubric design and use

Having accessed these materials, if you need any further technical help surrounding rubrics, please contact the Technology Enhanced Learning team by e-mailing IT (it@reading.ac.uk). For additional pedagogic support, please contact the Academic Development and Enhancement Team within CQSD.

Svetlana Mazhurnaya (EMA Programme and Working Group lead)
Rodney Coombridge (ADE)
Emma Mayhew (EMA Programme)
Diane Joyce (ADE)
Geoff Taggart (EMA Programme)
Kamilah Jooganah (ADE)
Adam Bailey (TEL)

Rubrics Working Group
September 2018

Adapted from: Gilbert, S. (2015). Rubric for Rubrics. A Tool for Assessing the Quality and Use of Rubrics in Education. Retrieved from
http://www.tltgroup.org/resources/Rubrics/A_Rubric_for_Rubrics.htm

Criteria for Evaluating Rubrics	Baseline	Good	Exemplary
Alignment to Learning Outcomes 1. *Are your rubric criteria clearly linked to the module / programme learning outcomes? UoR Graduate Attributes? QAA subject benchmark statements?* 2. *Are your rubric descriptors appropriate for your programme level? E.g., There should be progression between L4, L5, L6 for UG level*	*rubric criteria are aligned to the module level outcomes in terms of knowledge, skills, techniques, scholarship and vocational achievement they assess *the performance level in the rubric descriptors is appropriate for the programme level.	baseline + *rubric criteria are aligned to the programme level learning outcomes *rubric criteria are aligned to the UoR graduate attributes	good + *rubric criteria are aligned to the subject specific QA indicators or external accreditation criteria *alignment to learning outcomes and criteria are jointly reviewed, discussed and revised by staff and students'
Clarity of Criteria 1. *Is the criteria choice appropriate for the level & assessment type?* 2. *Do the rubric criteria match the assessment brief?* 3. *Is there an appropriate / manageable number of criteria?* 4. *Are criteria measurable?* 5. *Are criteria sufficiently differentiated or do they overlap?* 6. *Is the language used accessible to students?*	*criteria are appropriate for the level & assessment type *criteria match those stated in the assessment brief *criteria number is manageable *criteria are measurable *the language used is accessible to students *criteria are sufficiently differentiated	baseline + * optional descriptions or guidance questions are provided for each criterion e.g. referencing - Have you used the APA referencing style?	good + * if these criteria are used for other module / programme assessments, their wording is consistent & helps students to identify potential skills transferability
Clarity of Scale & Grading Approach 1. *Is the grading approach (scoring or qualitative, holistic or analytical) appropriate for the assessment?* 2. *Is the grading approach transparent to endusers?* 3. *Is it clear how the final grade corresponds to the UoR marking ranges?* 4. *Is the scale range in a scoring rubric sufficiently distributed and differentiated?* 5. *Are the level labels appropriate?*	*scale is suitable for the discipline and assessment type *it is clear if the rubric is analytic or holistic, scoring or qualitative * if a grade is awarded, it is clear how it corresponds to the UoR percentage marking ranges *scale ranges are sufficiently distributed and differentiated *scale labels are clear *scale labels or ranges show clear progression of achievement	baseline + * the grading approach is consistent across the module assignments where appropriate e.g. for similar assessment types, "good" always equals 50-59% and the same type of rubric and approach to grading is used	good + *the grading approach is consistent across the programme where appropriate *the level labels used consistently for similar assessment types across the programme

Criteria for Evaluating Rubrics	Baseline	Good	Exemplary
Clarity of the descriptors 1. *Are there descriptors for each level of achievement?* 2. *Are the descriptors sufficiently differentiated for each level of achievement?* 3. *Is the threshold / pass level clearly defined?* 4. *Is the language accessible to users?* 5. *Are they appropriate for the level of the course?* 6. *Does the language focus on the achievement & progress rather than deficiency?* 7. *Do the descriptors feed forward in a clear and succinct way?*	*descriptors are provided for each level of achievement on the rubric criteria *descriptors are sufficiently differentiated for each criterion and level *the threshold / pass level is clearly established *descriptors are succinct, use positive phrasing and language accessible to students *descriptors make it clear how to improve	baseline + *the performance level in the rubric descriptors is appropriate for the programme level *there are exemplifications of the qualitative terms used such as "good", adequate", "excellent", "sufficient" * rubric descriptors for this assessment type are differentiated for levels 4,5,6 allowing for progression	good + *descriptors are jointly designed with students
Clarity of Expectations/ Guidance to students 1. *Is the rubric available to the students?* 2. *Are the students trained in using it?* 3. *Is there reference to it in programme materials?* 4. *Are students involved in designing / reviewing the rubric?*	*rubric is shared prior to an assessment *rationale behind the rubric type and the grading approach are communicated to students *students are encouraged to use the rubric for self-assessment	baseline + * reference is made to the rubric throughout the module *formative and summative feedback provided on the assessment are linked to the rubric criteria and descriptors *students are guided in using the rubric for peer and/or self-evaluation * feedback from students informs the rubric design/ review	good + *rubric is regularly referred to during the programme to help students identify the skills and knowledge they are developing *faculty and students are jointly responsible for design of rubrics and students use them in peer and/or self-evaluation
Clarity of Expectations/ Guidance to markers 1. *Are appropriate standardisation & moderation procedures in place?* 2. *Does the use of rubric result in an acceptable degree of marker consensus (inter-rater reliability)?* 3. *Does the use of rubric result in one marker's consistency (intra-rater reliability)?* 4. *Are staff involved in the rubric design / review?*	*standardisation procedures are in place and sessions are held before every marking period *the same rubric is used to mark the same module assessment by multiple markers *cross-scoring by faculty and/or students occasionally produces inconsistent results	baseline + * rubrics are amended when required to add clarity and/or remove ambiguities *there is general agreement between different scorers when using the rubric (e.g. differs by less than 5-10% or less than ½ level)	good + *cross-scoring of assessments using rubric results in consistent agreement among scorers with a difference in scoring of no more than 5 percentage points *staff are involved in the rubric design / review