

**Metarubric for Examining Performance Assessment Rubrics**

The purpose of this metarubric is to examine performance assessment rubrics in relation to the validity criterion of fairness. The criteria for this metarubric are adapted from Stevens and Levi (2005, p. 94), metarubric for evaluating the overall quality of rubrics, a metarubric developed by Pieper (2012), and Messick’s (1994) related the validation of performance assessments.

# Reviewer:

**Date of review:**

**Course Prefix, Number:**

**Name of Performance Assessment:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Purpose\** of Performance Assessment:**   * What is the *purpose* of the assessment? * How is the *purpose* communicated to candidates? * How is the performance assessment data interpreted and used? * What is the connection(s) between the data from this performance assessment and other data sources? |  |

\*Note: If the purpose of the performance assessment was articulated when completing the Validity Inquiry Form, this statement can be copied from that form.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rubric Part** | **Evaluation Criteria** | **Reviewer Ratings and Comments** | | | |
|  |  | **Needs Improvement** | **Acceptable** | **Effective** | **Comments** |
| **1. Criteria (left column of rubric)** | 1: The rubric criteria are explicitly aligned to the program’s outcomes/standards. |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rubric Part** | **Evaluation Criteria** | **Reviewer Ratings and Comments** | | | |
|  |  | **Needs Improvement** | **Acceptable** | **Effective** | **Comments** |
|  | 2: Each rubric criterion (i.e., outcome/standard) aligns directly with the assessment instructions (Pieper, 2012). |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3: The rubric includes a reasonable number of criteria (e.g., approximately 8) for the level of the student and “complexity of the [assessment]” (Stevens & Levi, 2005, p. 94). |  |  |  |  |
| **2. Scale (row headers across top of rubric)** | 4: The scale labels accurately represent each level of performance (Stevens & Levi, 2005). |  |  |  |  |
|  | 5: The scale labels are encouraging and informative without being negative or discouraging (Stevens & Levi, 2005, p. 94). |  |  |  |  |
|  | 6: Thinking across all key assessments in the program of study, the rubric includes levels that are consistent in terms of the scale label and numerical rating. |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rubric Part** | **Evaluation Criteria** | **Reviewer Ratings and Comments** | | | |
|  |  | **Needs Improvement** | **Acceptable** | **Effective** | **Comments** |
| **3. Descriptions (content in cells of rubric to guide scale rating for each criteria)** | 7: The descriptions align to each performance level and further explain the related rubric criterion with specific examples of how the criterion may be demonstrated. |  |  |  |  |
|  | 8: “The descriptions are clear and different from each other” (Stevens & Levi, 2005, p. 94) and distinguish between different levels of performance. |  |  |  |  |
|  | 9: The rubric will most likely provide useful performance feedback to the students (Stevens & Levi, 2005). |  |  |  |  |
| **4. Overall Qualities** | 10: The rubric includes the assessment title (Stevens & Levi, 2005). |  |  |  |  |
|  | 11: The instructions “encourage students to use the rubric for self‐ assessment and peer assessment” (Pieper, 2012). |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rubric Part** | **Evaluation Criteria** | **Reviewer Ratings and Comments** | | | |
|  |  | **Needs Improvement** | **Acceptable** | **Effective** | **Comments** |
| ***NOTE: The following items should be completed by the instructor(s) after the performance assessment has been implemented.*** | | | | | |
| **5. Use of Rubric** | 12: When the rubric is applied to a student work product, the “[rubric] criteria, performance levels, and descriptions [appear to] work effectively” (Pieper, 2012). |  |  |  |  |
|  | 13: There is no critical information missing from the instructions that may cause students to inadequately demonstrate his or her competency related to an outcome/standard (Messick, 1994). |  |  |  |  |
|  | 14: No extraneous information is included in assessment instructions and/or rubric that interferes with students’ ability to demonstrate his or her competency related to an outcome/standard (Messick, 1994). |  |  |  |  |
|  | 15: The rubric is only used to “reward or penalize students based on skills [related] to the outcome being measured” that have been taught (Stevens & Levi, 2005, p. 94). |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rubric Part** | **Evaluation Criteria** | **Reviewer Ratings and Comments** | | | |
|  |  | **Needs Improvement** | **Acceptable** | **Effective** | **Comments** |
|  | 16: Rubric comment areas are used to provide additional, useful feedback or instructional resources to students regarding their performance on the assessment rather than restating the performance level description. |  |  |  |  |
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