**A Metarubric for Evaluating the Overall Quality of a Rubric**

Source: Adapted from Table 5.4. from *Making the Implicit Explicit*, Lovitts (2007), p. 107-108. Reprinted from D.D. Stevens & A. Levi (2004), p. 94.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Rubric Part | Evaluation Criteria | Yes | No |
| The dimensions | Does each dimension cover important parts of the  final student performance?  Does the dimension capture some key themes in the program learning outcome?  Are the dimensions clear?  Are the dimensions distinctly different from each other?  Do the dimensions represent skills that the student knows something about already (e.g., organization, analysis, using conventions?) |  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| The descriptors | Do the descriptions match the dimensions?  Are the descriptions clear and different from each other? |  |  |
|  |  |
| The overall rubric | Does the rubric clearly connect to the PLOs that it is designed to measure?  Can the rubric be understood by external audiences (avoids jargon and technical language)?  Does it reflect teachable skills, knowledge, and attitudes?  Does the rubric reward or penalize students based on skills unrelated to the outcome being measured?  Have all students had an equal opportunity to learn the content and skills necessary to be successful on the assignment?  Is the rubric appropriate for the conditions under which the assignment was completed?  Does the rubric address the student’s performance as a developmental task?  Does the rubric emphasize the appraisal of individual or group performance and indicate ways to improve? |  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| Fairness and sensibility | Does the rubric look like it will be fair to all students and free of bias?  Does it look like it will be useful to the program as student performance feedback?  Is the rubric practical, given the type of assignment?  Does the rubric make sense to the reader? |  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |