## Assignment Assessment Rubrics

All student performance will be assessed using the following assignment rubrics.

Instructions are in teal highlight. Examples are noted with yellow highlight. Delete all highlighted words after use.

Faculty may opt to include the assignment assessment rubrics in the syllabus or in a separate place such as the Sakai course site but are required to tell students in a timely manner where the current version(s) is(are) located.

Course assignment assessment rubrics are **required** for assignments that assess student demonstration of competency(ies), and strongly recommended for all course assignments that comprise the course grade, so that expectations for success are clearly stated and not ambiguous for student learners.

Use the same assignment titles and grade points/percentages to match what was presented in the course syllabus, or note any changes.

1. **[EXAMPLE] Rubric: Class Participation/Discussions (30%)**

| **Criteria** | **Clearly excellent graduate work** | **Entirely adequate graduate work** | **Inadequate graduate work** | **Fail** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Quantity of Contributions**  **(5 points)** | (5 points)  Multiple comments during every class session. | (3-4 points)  Comments during most class sessions. | (2 points)  Rarely comments during any class sessions. | (0-1 points)  Never comments during any class sessions. |
| **Quality of Contributions**  **(5 points)** | (5 points)  All comments:   * Reflect scholarly deliberation and synthesis of material from the readings; * Are related to the discussion topic; * Prompt further discussion amongst peers. | (3-4 points)  Most comments   * Reflect scholarly deliberation and synthesis of material from the readings; * Are related to the discussion topic; * Prompt further discussion amongst peers. | (2 points)  Few comments   * Reflect scholarly deliberation and synthesis of material from the readings; * Are related to the discussion topic; * Prompt further discussion amongst peers. | (0-1 points)  No comments   * Reflect scholarly deliberation and synthesis of material from the readings; * Are related to the discussion topic; * Prompt further discussion amongst peers. |
| **Contribution to the Learning Community**  **(20 points)** | (19-20 points)  Always attempts to motivate the group discussion; always presents creative approaches to the topic.  **1. Validating** - Validates the contributions of others and explains why their contributions resonate  **2. Resourceful** - Shares or creates resources that contribute to the discussions  **3. Inquiring** - Offers feedback, asks questions, provides reflection or commentary  **4. Community Expander** - Leads a section of community to a new and deeper discourse. | (16-18 points)  Often attempts to motivate the group discussion; often presents creative approaches to the topic. | (16-18 points)  Sometimes attempts to motivate the group discussion but does not always succeed; sometimes presents creative approaches to the topic. | (0-12 points)  Rarely or never attempts to motivate the group discussion; rarely or never presents creative approaches to the topic. |

1. **[EXAMPLE] Rubric: Journal Article Critique (15%)**

| **Criteria** | **Clearly excellent graduate work (3)** | **Entirely adequate graduate work (2)** | **Inadequate graduate work (1)** | **Fail (0)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Introduction**  **(3 points)** | The introduction clearly summarizes the aims of and methods used by the authors. | |  | | --- | | The introduction summarizes the aims of and methods used by the authors but lacks clarity. | | |  | | --- | | The introduction summarizes the aims of and methods used by the authors but lacks clarity, and the connections to the paper are not obvious. | | There is not an introduction summarizing the aims of and methods used by the authors. |
| **Data Presentation**  **(3 points)** | There is a very clear understanding of experimental design, especially controls. The writer also has a clear understanding of what was observed and how it relates to the authors' model or hypothesis or the relevance of the data. | There is a partial understanding of experimental design, especially controls. The writer does not have a clear understanding of what was observed and how it relates to the authors' model or hypothesis or the relevance of the data. | There is a significant gap in understanding of experimental design, especially controls. The writer does not have a clear understanding of what was observed and how it relates to the authors' model or hypothesis or the relevance of the data. | There is very little to no understanding of experimental design, especially controls. The writer does not understand what was observed and how it relates to the authors' model or hypothesis or the relevance of the data. |
| **Criticism**  **(3 points)** | There is a clear understanding of the authors' interpretation, of the implications of the results for the hypothesis. The evaluation of design and conclusions is complete. Outside information is brought to bear on evaluating the design and conclusions is fully evident. | There is a mostly clear understanding of the authors' interpretation, of the implications of the results for the hypothesis. The evaluation of design and conclusions is mostly complete. Outside information is brought to bear on evaluating the design and conclusions is evident but not fully complete. | There is a partially clear understanding of the authors' interpretation, of the implications of the results for the hypothesis. The evaluation of design and conclusions is partially complete. Outside information is brought to bear on evaluating the design and conclusions is not evident. Includes an uncritical acceptance of authors' conclusions and/or baseless objections to them. | There is a not a clear understanding of the authors' interpretation, of the implications of the results for the hypothesis. The evaluation of design and conclusions is not complete. Outside information is not brought to bear on evaluating the design and conclusions are not evident. Little or no mention of authors' intent and/or little or no evaluation. |
| **Cohesiveness**  **(3 points)** | The data selected is very relevant to the article/author’s overall aims and the student’s conclusions assist in making the results of the selected article clearer. | The data selected is mostly relevant to the article/author’s aims and/or the student’s conclusions assist in making the results of the selected article not quite as clear and/or complete. | The data selected does not seem relevant to the article/author’s aims and/or the student’s conclusions do not assist in making the results of the selected article clear and/or complete. | The data selected shows a lack of understanding of the article/author’s paper and the student’s conclusions do not assist in making the results of the selected article clear and/or complete. |
| **Spelling and Grammar**  **(3 points)** | No spelling or grammatical errors. | Very few spelling or grammatical errors. | Multiple spelling or grammatical errors on the majority of pages. | 0-Excessive spelling or grammatical errors on the majority of pages. |

1. **[EXAMPLE] Rubric: Leading Class Discussion (15%)**

| **Criteria** | **Clearly excellent graduate work (3)** | **Entirely adequate graduate work (2)** | **Inadequate graduate work (1)** | **Fail (0)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **X**  **(3 points)** | Indicators of **all** elements of criterion demonstrated:  [insert all elements of competency] | Indicators of **most** elements of criterion demonstrated. | Indicators of **some** elements of criterion demonstrated. | Indicators of **little-to-no** elements of criterion demonstrated. |
| **X**  **(3 points)** | Indicators of **all** elements of criterion demonstrated:  [insert all elements of competency] | Indicators of **most** elements of criterion demonstrated. | Indicators of **some** elements of criterion demonstrated. | Indicators of **little-to-no** elements of criterion demonstrated. |
| **X**  **(3 points)** | Indicators of **all** elements of criterion demonstrated:  [insert all elements of competency] | Indicators of **most** elements of criterion demonstrated. | Indicators of **some** elements of criterion demonstrated. | Indicators of **little-to-no** elements of criterion demonstrated. |
| **X**  **(3 points)** | Indicators of **all** elements of criterion demonstrated:  [insert all elements of competency] | Indicators of **most** elements of criterion demonstrated. | Indicators of **some** elements of criterion demonstrated. | Indicators of **little-to-no** elements of criterion demonstrated. |
| **X**  **(3 points)** | Indicators of **all** elements of criterion demonstrated:  [insert all elements of competency] | Indicators of **most** elements of criterion demonstrated. | Indicators of **some** elements of criterion demonstrated. | Indicators of **little-to-no** elements of criterion demonstrated. |

1. **[EXAMPLE] Rubric: Semester Project Presentation (40%)**

| **Criteria** | **Clearly excellent graduate work** | **Entirely adequate graduate work** | **Inadequate graduate work** | **Fail** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Competency ##  (10 points) | (9-10 points)  Indicators of **all** elements of competency demonstrated:  [insert all elements of competency] | (8 points)  Indicators of **most** elements of competency demonstrated. | (7 points)  Indicators of **some** elements of competency demonstrated. | (0-6 points)  Indicators of **little-to-no** elements of competency demonstrated. |
| Competency ##  (10 points) | (9-10 points)  Indicators of **all** elements of competency demonstrated:  [insert all elements of competency] | (8 points)  Indicators of **most** elements of competency demonstrated. | (7 points)  Indicators of **some** elements of competency demonstrated. | (0-6 points)  Indicators of **little-to-no** elements of competency demonstrated. |
| Description of strengths and limitations  (5 points) | (5 points)  Fully clear and concise descriptions of both strengths and limitations | (3-4 points)  Mostly clear and concise descriptions of both strengths and limitations | (2 points)  Somewhat clear and concise descriptions of both strengths and limitations | (0-1 points)  Unclear descriptions of strengths and limitations |
| Organization and use of visual effects  (3 points) | (3 points)  Fully:   * Visual effects cover required components; * Visual effects are aligned with oral presentation and transition smoothly; * Visual information is consistently organized; * Visual effects enhance the audience's understanding of the presentation topic | (2 points)  Mostly:   * Visual effects cover required components; * Visual effects are aligned with oral presentation and transition smoothly; * Visual information is consistently organized; * Visual effects enhance the audience's understanding of the presentation topic | (1 point)  Somewhat:   * Visual effects cover required components; * Visual effects are aligned with oral presentation and transition smoothly; * Visual information is consistently organized; * Visual effects enhance the audience's understanding of the presentation topic | (0 points)  Little-to-none:   * Missing required components; Misalignment of visual/oral; * Missing visual effects, or they do not enhance the audience’s understanding of the presentation topic; * Font size is too small and cannot be read. |
| Slide Content  (3 points) | (3 points)   * The title of the presentation and presentation contents are relevant and without errors. * The key portions of the presentation are clear and well defined. | (2 points)   * The title of the presentation and contents are mostly relevant or contain minor errors. * The key portions of the presentation are mostly present and well discussed. | (1 point)   * The title of the presentation and contents are somewhat relevant and contain errors. * The key portions of the presentation are somewhat present and well discussed. | (0 points)   * The title of the presentation and contents are irrelevant and contain errors. * The key portions of the presentation are missing and lack clarity. |
| Source information  (3 points) | (3 points)  All of the supporting information was relevant and incorporated using valid sources and cited correctly. | (2 points)  Most of the supporting information was relevant and/or incorporated using mostly valid sources and cited correctly. | (1 point)  Some of the supporting information was relevant and/or incorporated using somewhat valid sources but is not consistently cited correctly. | (0 points)  Few/None of the supporting information was relevant and/or was not incorporated using valid sources and is inconsistently cited. |
| Delivery  (3 points) | (3 points)  Presenter maintains full eye contact, speaks clearly, and uses the notes effectively | (2 points)  Presenter mostly maintains eye contact, speaks clearly, and uses the notes effectively | (1 point)  Presenter somewhat maintains eye contact, speaks clearly, and uses the notes effectively | (0 points)  Presenter does not maintain eye contact, speak clearly, nor uses the notes effectively. |
| Time limit  (3 points) | (3 points)  Presentation was within the assigned time limit. | (2 points)  Presentation exceeded the assigned time limit by 1-3 minutes. | (1 point)  Presentation exceeded the assigned time limit by 3-5 minutes. | (0 points)  Presentation exceeded the assigned time limit by more than 5 minutes. |