



**TEACHING & LEARNING  
CENTER**

# Rubric

- an assessment tool listing evaluation criteria for an assignment.
- divides the assigned work into parts and provides clear descriptions of the characteristics of the work associated with each part, at varying levels of skill.
- communicates the assignment requirements and acceptable performance standards.
- helps ensure consistent grading.
- students can more easily recognize the strengths and weaknesses of their work and direct their efforts accordingly.

# Marking Rubric for Assignments (using point range)

Criteria	Below Expectations	Proficient	Exemplary
<b>Reasoning and Analysis</b>	<b>0 to 4 points</b> Weak reasons and/or irrelevant or confusing reasons given that don't support the answers; incomplete answers.	<b>5 to 7 points</b> Reasons support answers with some / an important reason(s) overlooked; general examination and assessment.	<b>8 to 10 points</b> Clear and accurate answers; insightful, specific.
<b>Focus on Topic</b>	<b>0 to 4 points</b> Some of the documentation relates to the assigned topic; misuses or uses limited course vocabulary.	<b>5 to 7 points</b> The answers are not as detailed and/or concise as needed; and/ or use limited course vocabulary.	<b>8 to 10 points</b> Answers address the questions clearly and fully, showing higher level analysis and synthesis of concepts and uses course vocabulary.
<b>Accuracy of Facts and Citations</b>	<b>0 to 4 points</b> No direct quotes or "work consulted" used or referred to in the paper. Incorrect facts and / or citations.	<b>5 to 7 points</b> All facts are accurate and relate back to the answer, yet there was a disproportionate amount of opinion based statements then facts. Provided 2-5 citations throughout paper using the text, interview and or other related documentation.	<b>8 to 10 points</b> All facts are accurate and relate back to the answer. Provided 2-5 citations throughout paper using the text, interview and or other related documentation.
<b>MLA</b>	<b>0 to 4 points</b> Works not cited.	<b>5 to 7 points</b> Works cited are not all formatted in the correct MLA style.	<b>8 to 10 points</b> Works cited is formatted in the correct MLA style.
<b>Mechanics/Organisation</b>	<b>0 to 4 points</b> Numerous errors, paper hard to read; questions are not stated before answers; format details are not adhered to.	<b>5 to 7 points</b> Enough errors to distract the reader; organisation problems; questions not stated before answers; and / or format difficult to navigate.	<b>8 to 10 points</b> Use of correct grammar, spelling, and punctuation; well organized; one idea follows another in a logical sequence with clear transitions; questions stated before answers; format easy to navigate.

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Exceptional</b>
<b>Critical Observations</b>	10 Points  No analysis or insight or no posting	15 Points  Generally, competent, commonplace information	20 Points  Rich in content, thought, insight and analysis Substantial information, thought insight and analysis is apparent	25 Points  Rich in content, thought, insight and analysis
<b>Level of Participation and Timeliness</b>	10 Points  No posting credit at all for postings outside of date range.	15 Points  Contributes but doesn't respond to peers postings, and/or posts all requirements on the same day of the week.	20 Points  Contributes but doesn't meet the requirements of responding to two peers' postings and posts on at least two different days of the week.	25 Points  Post original contributions, responds to at least two peers' postings, and is active in the discussion throughout the week.
<b>Communication of Ideas</b>	0 Points  Does not communicate an idea.	15 Points  Ideas are communicated, but there is no evidence to support ideas, opinions, and conclusions.	20 Points  Ideas are communicated clearly and completely. Some examples/resources are provided to support ideas and opinions.	25 Points  Ideas are communicated eloquently and thoroughly. Specific examples/resources are provided to support ideas and opinions. Additional resources or application of the discussion topic are provided.
<b>Mechanics</b>	0 Points  Multiple spelling and grammar errors. Posts lack organization, and/or late posts or eplies.	15 Points  Less than 5 spelling or grammar errors, and/or some posts are made on a timely basis.	20 Points  Less than two spelling or grammar errors. Writing is clear and organized. All posts are made on a timely basis.	25 Points  No spelling or grammar errors. Writing is clear and concise. Postings have obvious logical/sequential organization. All posts are made on a timely basis.

### Discussion Forum Rubric

Adapted from: Michele M. Pelter, RN, Ph.D. is an Assistant Professor at the University of Nevada, Reno - Orvis School of Nursing who authored the course, "Introduction to Knowledge Development and Scientific Inquiry."

Name	Grading Rubric for Discussion Boards
Description	Karen Lynden is a Business Instructor, at the Rowan-Cabarrus Community College, whose course won an Exemplary Course Program award. The attached grading rubric for Discussion Boards includes criteria such as Promptness and Initiative, Mechanics of Writing, Relevance of Post, Creating Community and Critical Thinking/Analysis. For those using this for evaluations, the levels of achievement are Below Expectations, Proficient and Exemplary which are worth 0, 1 or 2 points respectively for a potential total of 10 points.

Criteria	Levels of Achievement		
	Below Expectations	Proficient	Exemplary
<b>Promptness and Initiative</b> 	<b>0 Points</b> No posting credit at all for postings outside of the date range.	<b>1 Points</b> Contributes but doesn't meet the requirement of responding to two peer postings, and /or posts all requirements on the same day of the week.	<b>2 Points</b> Posts original contribution, responds to at least two peers postings, and posts on at least two different days of the week.
<b>Mechanics of Writing</b> 	<b>0 Points</b> Poor spelling and grammar in posts; format is extremely hard to read would be deemed as unprofessional documentation by common business standards.	<b>1 Points</b> An error in spelling and grammar, yet overall format is clear.	<b>2 Points</b> Submissions are grammatically correct, posts with rare misspellings, format is easy to read/ professional delivery
<b>Relevance of Post</b> 	<b>0 Points</b> Posts topics which do not relate to the discussion; remarks are not backed up by a reference; rehashes or summarizes other postings; unclear connection to topic; minimal expression of opinions or ideas.	<b>1 Points</b> Most posts are short in length and offer no further insight into the topic; opinions and ideas are stated clearly with occasional lack of connection to topic, and/or provides limited citations (from text, website, etc) for the community to reference.	<b>2 Points</b> Consistently posts topics related to assigned topic; cites at least one but preferably several credible references related to topic (text, website, or other credible / scholarly references); expresses opinions and ideas in a clear and concise manner with obvious connection to topic.
<b>Creating Community</b> 	<b>0 Points</b> Argumentative or abrasive. No peer interaction.	<b>1 Points</b> Displays an effort to become involved with group; interacts with others. This category is concerned with quality of interactions.	<b>2 Points</b> Frequently attempts to motivate the group discussion; presents creative approaches to topic, can differ or counter peers points with diplomacy, if applicable. Refers to peer contributions. Creates community in the discussion. This category is concerned with quality of interactions.
<b>Critical Thinking/Analysis</b> 	<b>0 Points</b> Makes errors in interpreting topics; opinion based comments only; superficial commentary.	<b>1 Points</b> Accurately interprets topic; uses main points of information from resources/ references; may repeat the ideas of other but attempts to offer new insight; response does not provoke significant new thinking or further discussion.	<b>2 Points</b> Interprets topic in accurate and insightful ways. Uses information thoughtfully, in a ways that are factually relevant and accurate; postings shows analysis, might offer alternatives or creative viewpoints based on concrete evidence.

# Grading Rubric for Written Assignments

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Inadequate=D (Below Standard)</b>	<b>Adequate=C (Meets Standard)</b>	<b>Above Average=B (Exceeds Standard)</b>	<b>Exemplary=A (Far Exceeds Standard)</b>
<b>Organization</b>	Writing lacks logical organization. It shows some coherence but ideas lack unity. Serious errors.	Writing is coherent and logically organized. Some points remain misplaced and stray from the topic. Transitions evident but not used throughout essay.	Writing is coherent and logically organized with transitions used between ideas and paragraphs to create coherence. Overall unity of ideas is present.	Writing shows high degree of attention to logic and reasoning of points. Unity clearly leads the reader to the conclusion and stirs thought regarding the topic.
<b>Level of Content</b>	Shows some thinking and reasoning but most ideas are underdeveloped and unoriginal.	Content indicates thinking and reasoning applied with original thought on a few ideas.	Content indicates original thinking and develops ideas with sufficient and firm evidence.	Content indicates synthesis of ideas, in-depth analysis and evidences original thought and support for the topic.
<b>Development</b>	Main points lack detailed development. Ideas are vague with little evidence of critical thinking.	Main points are present with limited detail and development. Some critical thinking is present.	Main points well developed with quality supporting details and quantity. Critical thinking is weaved into points	Main points well developed with high quality and quantity support. Reveals high degree of critical thinking.
<b>Grammar &amp; Mechanics</b>	Spelling, punctuation, and grammatical errors create distraction, making reading difficult; fragments, comma splices, run-ons evident. Errors are frequent.	Most spelling, punctuation, and grammar correct allowing reader to progress though essay. Some errors remain.	Essay has few spelling, punctuation, and grammatical errors allowing reader to follow ideas clearly. Very few fragments or run-ons.	Essay is free of distracting spelling, punctuation, and grammatical errors; absent of fragments, comma splices, and run-ons.
<b>Style</b>	Mostly in elementary form with little or no variety in sentence structure, diction, rhetorical devices or emphasis.	Approaches college level usage of some variety in sentence patterns, diction, and rhetorical devices.	Attains college level style; tone is appropriate and rhetorical devices used to enhance content; sentence variety used effectively.	Shows outstanding style going beyond usual college level; rhetorical devices and tone used effectively; creative use of sentence structure and coordination
<b>Format</b>	Fails to follow format and assignment requirements; incorrect margins, spacing and indentation; neatness of essay needs attention.	Meets format and assignment requirements; generally correct margins, spacing, and indentations; essay is neat but may have some assembly errors.	Meets format and assignment requirements; margins, spacing, and indentations are correct; essay is neat and correctly assembled.	Meets all formal and assignment requirements and evidences attention to detail; all margins, spacing and indentations are correct; essay is neat and correctly assembled with professional look.

# Scoring Rubric for Short, Research-based Position Paper

## Undergraduate Cognitive Psychology, Anne L. Fay, Carnegie Mellon University

Dimension	Sophisticated	Competent	Needs Work
Introduction	Position and exceptions, if any, are clearly stated. Organization of the argument is completely and clearly outlined and implemented. 4-5 pts	Position is clearly stated. Organization of argument is clear in parts or only partially described and mostly implemented. 2-3 pts	Position is vague. Organization of argument is missing, vague, or not consistently maintained. 0-1 pts
Research	Research selected is highly relevant to the argument, is presented accurately and completely – the method, results, and implications are all presented accurately; Theory is relevant, accurately described and all relevant components are included; relationship between research and theory is clearly articulated and accurate. 8– 10 pts	Research is relevant to the argument and is mostly accurate and complete – there are some unclear components or some minor errors in the method, results or implications. Theory is relevant and accurately described, some components may not be present or are unclear. Connection to theory is mostly clear and complete, or has some minor errors. 5 – 7 pts	Research selected is not relevant to the argument or is vague and incomplete – components are missing or inaccurate or unclear. Theory is not relevant or only relevant for some aspects; theory is not clearly articulated and/or has incorrect or incomplete components. Relationship between theory and research is unclear or inaccurate, major errors in the logic are present. 0 – 4 pts
Conclusions	Conclusion is clearly stated and connections to the research and position are clear and relevant. The underlying logic is explicit. 4-5 pts	Conclusion is clearly stated and connections to research and position are mostly clear, some aspects may not be connected or minor errors in logic are present. 2-3 pts	Conclusion may not be clear and the connections to the research are incorrect or unclear or just a repetition of the findings without explanation. Underlying logic has major flaws; connection to position is not clear.
Writing	Paper is coherently organized and the logic is easy to follow. There are no spelling or grammatical errors and terminology is clearly defined. Writing is clear and concise and persuasive. 4-5 pts	Paper is generally well organized and most of the argument is easy to follow. There are only a few minor spelling or grammatical errors, or terms are not clearly defined. Writing is mostly clear but may lack conciseness. 2-3 pts	Paper is poorly organized and difficult to read – does not flow logically from one part to another. There are several spelling and/or grammatical errors; technical terms may not be defined or are poorly defined. Writing lacks clarity and conciseness. 0-1 pts

Levels of Achievement →	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
Criteria ↓					
Approach to Problem:	Author merely identifies the problem or does not address the problem.	Author describes the problem.	Author explains the problem.	Author analyzes the problem.	Author synthesizes the problem.
Collection and description of data:	N/A	Author does not describe the data collection method and/or the data collected is poorly organized and the presentation is unclear/unfocused; author demonstrates little or no understanding of the sociological term(s) used.	Author describes the data collection method and the data collected in vague terms; data is not very well-organized and the presentation is unclear/unfocused; author demonstrates an imprecise understanding of the sociological term(s) used.	Author describes the data collection method and the data collected in general terms; data is relatively well-organized and presented; author demonstrates a good grasp of the sociological term(s) used.	Author describes in rich detail the specifics of the data collection method and the data collected; data is well-organized and clearly presented; author demonstrates an in-depth comprehension of the sociological term(s) used; data and ideas are clearly linked to class materials/readings.
Synthesis of ideas:	N/A	There is no clear main idea to the paper. A reading may be discussed, but the main idea is not related to other ideas.	The main idea of one reading is presented as the dominant perspective of the paper.	Author presents a perspective that synthesizes the main ideas of several readings. This perspective is more general than Level 5.	Author presents a perspective that synthesizes the main ideas of several readings. This perspective creates an informative way to view the several main ideas of the readings or class materials in a way that gives more meaning to the readings as a whole rather than if the main ideas were presented individually.
Elegance of argument:	Little or no awareness of argument or complexity.	Poorly stated thesis, inadequate survey of available sources, poor organization.	Facts straight with a reasonable explanation of the subject under consideration.	Clearly stated thesis, good use of sources, well-organized.	Original and clearly stated thesis; persuasive, well-organized, imaginative use of source material; multiple sources cited.

Name

Research Paper - Norb Belz

Description

INDIVIDUAL RESEARCH PAPERS – ONE HEALTH CARE MANAGEMENT TOPIC OF PERSONAL INTEREST Topic must be related to health care organization and the management functions 5-page minimum with at least two refereed journal references (submit copies of references) Papers must be submitted in American Psychological Association (APA) style: <http://www.wisc.edu/writetest/Handbook/DocAPA.htm> Must meet due date.

Rubric Detail

## Levels of Achievement

Criteria	Failing	Emerging	Below Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard
<p><b>Effectively uses a variety of information-gathering techniques and information resources</b> ⌵</p> <p><b>Weight</b> 30.00%</p>	<p><b>0 %</b></p> <p>Fails to meet the minimum standard.</p>	<p><b>40 %</b></p> <p>Demonstrates little familiarity with basic information or demonstrates a command of only a few basic information-gathering techniques.</p>	<p><b>60 %</b></p> <p>Demonstrates knowledge of some basic information resources but is not aware of all necessary resources, or has command of a limited set of information-gathering techniques.</p>	<p><b>80 %</b></p> <p>Demonstrates knowledge of basic information resources and commands a useful range of information-gathering techniques.</p>	<p><b>100 %</b></p> <p>Demonstrates an extensive knowledge of basic information resources and commands a wide range of information-gathering techniques. Demonstrates creativity and resourcefulness in collecting data and creating original data.</p>
<p><b>Effectively interprets and synthesizes information</b> ⌵</p> <p><b>Weight</b> 30.00%</p>	<p><b>0 %</b></p> <p>Fails to meet the minimum standard.</p>	<p><b>40 %</b></p> <p>Rarely, if ever, interprets information gathered for tasks accurately or synthesizes the information concisely.</p>	<p><b>60 %</b></p> <p>Sporadically interprets the information gathered for tasks accurately and synthesizes the information concisely.</p>	<p><b>80 %</b></p> <p>Consistently interprets the information gathered for tasks accurately and synthesizes the information concisely.</p>	<p><b>100 %</b></p> <p>Consistently, interprets the information gathered for tasks in accurate and highly insightful way and provides highly creative and unique syntheses of that information.</p>
<p><b>Depth and breadth of understanding</b> ⌵</p> <p><b>Weight</b> 30.00%</p>	<p><b>0 %</b></p> <p>Fails to meet the minimum standard.</p>	<p><b>40 %</b></p> <p>Demonstrates severe misconceptions about the concepts and generalizations.</p>	<p><b>60 %</b></p> <p>Displays an incomplete understanding of the important concepts and generalizations and has some notable misconceptions.</p>	<p><b>80 %</b></p> <p>Displays a complete and accurate understanding of the important concepts or generalizations.</p>	<p><b>100 %</b></p> <p>Demonstrates a thorough understanding of the important concepts or generalizations and provides analysis and new insights into some aspect of that information.</p>
<p><b>Conventions and Punctuality</b> ⌵</p> <p><b>Weight</b> 10.00%</p>	<p><b>0 %</b></p> <p>Fails to meet the minimum standard. Not Punctual.</p>	<p><b>40 %</b></p> <p>Rarely uses proper sentence structure, grammar, punctuation, citation style, and spelling.</p>	<p><b>60 %</b></p> <p>Some correct use of, but also problems in, sentence structure, grammar, punctuation, citation style, and spelling.</p>	<p><b>80 %</b></p> <p>Sentence structure and grammar, generally strong, with only occasional lapses in punctuation, citation style, and spelling.</p>	<p><b>100 %</b></p> <p>Sentence structure and grammar excellent; correct use of punctuation and citation style, no spelling errors.</p>

Name

Article Reflection - Norb Belz

Description

Rubric Detail

Criteria	Levels of Achievement				
	Failing	Emerging	Below Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard
<b>Depth and Breath</b>  <b>Weight</b> 80.00%	<b>0 %</b> Fails to meet minimum standard.	<b>40 %</b> Demonstrates severe misconceptions about the concepts and generalizations.	<b>60 %</b> Displays an incomplete understanding of the important concepts and generalizations and has some notable misconceptions.	<b>80 %</b> Displays a complete and accurate understanding of the important concepts or generalizations.	<b>100 %</b> Demonstrates a thorough understanding of the important concepts or generalizations and provides analysis and new insights into some aspect of that information.
<b>Conventions and Punctuality</b>  <b>Weight</b> 20.00%	<b>0 %</b> Fails to meet minimum standard. Not Punctual.	<b>40 %</b> Rarely uses proper sentence structure, grammar, punctuation, citation style, and spelling.	<b>60 %</b> Some correct use of, but also problems in, sentence structure, grammar, punctuation, citation style, and spelling.	<b>80 %</b> Sentence structure and grammar, generally strong, with only occasional lapses in punctuation, citation style, and spelling.	<b>100 %</b> Sentence structure and grammar excellent; correct use of punctuation and citation style, no spelling errors.

Name Reflection Essay/Paper Rubric

Description

Rubric Detail

Criteria	Levels of Achievement		
	No Evidence	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory
<b>Cohesiveness of Essay</b>  Weight 18.00%	<b>0 %</b> The essay/paper is linear in presentation. All artifacts are listed and described separately and at length. Personal insight into how these artifacts benefited the student is not provided. The 'big picture' of the student's experiences is not evident. The reviewer understands what each artifact is but not how they tie together.	<b>50 %</b> The essay/paper attempts to tie artifacts together. The student provides some personal insight into how artifacts were beneficial. The student has created a general picture of their experiences. The reviewer understands that the student gained clinical and academic knowledge and skills.	<b>100 %</b> The essay/paper provides the 'big picture' of the student's experiences. The student interweaves information regarding specific artifacts and how these artifacts were beneficial. The reviewer is left with several details which make the student's experience unique.
<b>Experiences &amp; Accomplishments</b>  Weight 18.00%	<b>0 %</b> Insight into the reflection process is not evident as the writer did not articulate what was learned and what needs to be developed in the future.	<b>50 %</b> The reflection leaves a weak impression on the reader about what the writer learned. Insight into the reflection process is not evident as the writer did not clearly articulate what needs to be developed in the future.	<b>100 %</b> The reflection leaves an impression on the reader about what the student learned. Insight into the reflection process is somewhat evident as the writer articulated what needs to be developed in the future.
<b>Reflection &amp; Examples</b>  Weight 18.00%	<b>0 %</b> Does not reflect on own work at all and no examples are provided.	<b>50 %</b> Reflects on own work and improvement on occasion but does not provide many examples at all.	<b>100 %</b> Demonstrates an ability to reflect on own work and adequate number of examples are provided.
<b>Effort and Personal Responses</b>  Weight 18.00%	<b>0 %</b> No effort was made to write essay/paper. No evidence of a personal perspective within reflection.	<b>50 %</b> Little effort was made to write essay/paper. Little evidence of a personal perspective within reflection.	<b>100 %</b> Reflection demonstrates that some effort was made to write essay/paper. Evidence of a personal perspective within reflection.
<b>Goals and Levels of Learning</b>  Weight 18.00%	<b>0 %</b> Reflection does not reveal insight into personal goals and levels of learning.	<b>50 %</b> Reflection reveals some insight into personal goals and levels of learning.	<b>100 %</b> Reflection reveals insight into personal goals and levels of learning.
<b>Writing Mechanics</b>  Weight 10.00%	<b>0 %</b> Many spelling and grammatical errors. Serious organizational problems.	<b>50 %</b> Some spelling, grammatical errors and/or organizational problems.	<b>100 %</b> No spelling and grammatical errors. Organized paper.

# Studio Art Assignment Rubric

	Beginning (12-13)	Developing (14-15)	Apprentice (16-17)	Mastery (18-20)
Expression	Work appears to have limited unique characteristics.	Work has some unique forms or composition, although in large part references previous work.	Work appears unique in its compositional arrangement, with little reference to previous work.	Work appears unique in its concept with no apparent reference to previous work or known cultural icons.
Technique	Work contains many errors, improper use of materials, little understanding of technique.	Student demonstrates a developing ability with material and technique, with a number of errors.	Student demonstrates a high level of success with material and technique. Few errors in completion.	Student demonstrates a mastery of materials and techniques.
Design and Composition	Parts of the composition appear disconnected, and a unified whole is not achieved.	Some elements of the work appear unified, although some disconnected elements distract from the visual order.	Work appears unified with few distractions in the visual order with regard to the elements and principles of design.	A professional level of unity is achieved with regard to composition.
Assignment Parameters	Student failed to address most of the assignment requirements.	Student did not satisfy some of the assignment requirements.	Student satisfied the assignment requirements.	Student completed the assignment requirements and made interesting personal contributions.

# Math Problem Solving Rubric

	<b>Distinguished - 4</b>	<b>Proficient - 3</b>	<b>Apprentice - 2</b>	<b>Novice - 1</b>
Understands the Problem	Identifies special factors that influences the approach before starting the problem	Understands the problem	Understands enough to solve part of the problem or to get part of the solution	Doesn't understand enough to get started or make progress
Uses Information Appropriately	Explains why certain information is essential to the solution	Uses all appropriate information correctly	Uses some appropriate information correctly	Uses inappropriate information
Applies Appropriate Procedures	Explains why procedures are appropriate for the problem	Applies completely appropriate procedures	Applies some appropriate procedures	Applies inappropriate procedures
Uses Representations	Uses a representation that is unusual in its mathematical precision	Uses a representation that clearly depicts the problem	Uses a representation that gives some important information about the problem	Uses a representation that gives little or no significant information about the problem
Answers the Problem	Correct solution of problem and made a general rule about the solution or extended the solution to a more complicated solution	Correct solution	Copying error, computational error, partial answer for problem with multiple answers, no answer statement, answer labeled incorrectly	No answer or wrong answer based upon an inappropriate plan