



RUBRIC QUALITY REVIEW WORKSHEET



Assessment/Task: _____

Date: _____

Reviewer(s): _____

Questions for Evaluating Rubric Quality	Comments or Feedback for Each Review Question
<p>1. Do the number of performance levels and rubric format make sense?</p> <p>Format matches purpose and use</p> <p>Adjacent performance levels are qualitatively different</p> <p>Levels reflect how completion of the task might naturally progress with instruction</p>	
<p>2. Is descriptive language maximized?</p> <p>Little or no judgmental language</p> <p>Avoids use of subjective language (poor, neat, ample, etc.) and frequency indicators (rarely, often, etc.)</p>	
<p>3. Do descriptors emphasize quality over quantity?</p> <p>(e.g., relevant, descriptive details/sources versus three details or sources)</p>	
<p>4. Do descriptors state performance in the positive—what IS happening, rather than what is NOT happening?</p> <p>Lowest levels focus on beginning stages</p> <p>Describes a (real) progression of learning</p> <p>Have student work samples or piloting informed performance descriptions?</p>	
<p>5. Do descriptors describe excellent <i>rather than</i> perfect performance?</p> <p>Describes a progression from Novice to Expert performance</p> <p>Performance descriptors increase with depth, complexity, and/or breadth of knowledge</p> <p>Minor errors not weighted more than quality of ideas or thinking</p>	
<p>6. Do rubric language and criteria match rigor expectations of task?</p> <p>A range of criteria align with task expectations (form, accuracy, process, impact, construction of knowledge)</p> <p>Not limited to basic skills and concepts or only routine tasks</p> <p>At least one criterion builds to transfer and construction of knowledge or deeper understanding</p>	
<p>7. Is the language kid friendly?</p> <p>Could this be used for peer- and self assessment?</p> <p>Have students had input into the writing or refinement of performance level descriptions?</p>	

ADDITIONAL NOTES