



Fundamentals of Rubrics

by Sandy Bargainnier, The Pennsylvania State University

High quality assessment and evaluation of any performance depends on accurate and reliable measurement of key performance factors. Low-level understanding is conveniently investigated with the help of simple, quantitative tools, such as multiple-choice tests, true-false quizzes, and vocabulary definitions. On the other hand, systems thinking, procedural knowledge, and attitude formation require more sophisticated measurement schemes. By explicitly stating significant performance criteria, rubrics classify and organize performance observations with respect to different skill levels, behaviors, and/or product quality. This module outlines attributes of a quality rubric and contrasts the purposes of holistic rubrics and analytic rubrics in performance measurement.

Purpose and Use of Rubrics

Measuring a performance, a work product, or a learning skill can prove to be challenging without the appropriate measurement tool. Rubrics are tools that can help multiple instructors come to similar conclusions about construction of higher-level conceptual knowledge, performance skills, and attitudes. Basic facts and concepts, also referred to as “declarative knowledge” (Angelo, T. 2002; Bloom, 1956, Anderson and Krathwohl, 2001), can be measured with selected-response methods. However, higher order thinking, procedural knowledge, and enduring understanding require more open-ended, complex and authentic types of assessment and evaluation (Wiggins and McTighe, 1998, Angelo, 2002). Assessments and evaluations that require students to “construct” knowledge (called constructed-response) cannot be scored easily with an answer key.

Rubrics are designed to help instructors measure ability to use and apply factual, conceptual, procedural, and metacognitive knowledge (Angelo, 2002, Anderson and Krathwohl, 2001, Bloom, 1956). For example, if an instructor wants to measure the ability to use a math formula to solve a biomechanics problem, the quality of a dance performance, or an attitude as reflected in journal writing, a rubric can help make the measurement more objective and meaningful.

Types of Rubrics

There are several types of rubrics. A generic rubric is used to assess or evaluate a process (i.e., problem solving) across disciplines, whereas a task-specific rubric is applicable only for a specific, defined task (see Table 1).

After selecting either a generic or a task-specific rubric, the facilitator needs to decide between holistic and analytic rubrics, depending on what he or she wants to assess or evaluate. Analytic rubrics work better when students self-assess a complex performance, product, process, or learning skill. Analytic rubrics help both learner and measurer identify strengths and areas for improvement. However, scoring and use may take longer with an analytic rubric than with a holistic rubric (see Table 1).

Table 1 Dribbling Rubric (Task-specific, Analytic)

| Point Level | Description of Dribbling Ability |
|-------------|--|
| 0 points | Cannot perform the skill. |
| 1 point | Can control a ball through four cones three feet apart in more than ten seconds. |
| 2 points | Can control a ball through four cones three feet apart in ten seconds. |
| 3 points | Can control a ball through four cones three feet apart in seven seconds. |
| 4 points | Can control a ball through four cones three feet apart in five seconds |

From Physical Education Rubrics. Available on-line at <<http://www.cwu.edu/~gossge/curriculum/rubric/rubrics>>

A holistic rubric (See Table 2) requires the measurer to score the overall process or product as a whole, without judging the component parts separately (Nitko, 2001). Performance expectations and criteria that are holistic in nature (i.e., problem-solving) are best measured and evaluated using a holistic rubric. Holistic rubrics are quick to use and provide the measurer with a snapshot of the performance at hand. One limitation of use includes the inability to provide detailed and specific feedback of the performance.

The Role of Rubrics in Instruction

Cognitive learning theory and its constructivist approach to knowledge suggests looking not for what students can repeat or mimic, but for what they can generate, demonstrate, and exhibit (Brooks and Brooks, 1999). Active learning suggests that students demonstrate what they know and are able to do. Rather than measuring discrete,

isolated knowledge, authentic assessment emphasizes the application and use of knowledge. Authentic assessment includes the holistic performance of meaningful, complex tasks in challenging environments that involve contextualized problems (Montgomery, 2002). (See *Using Rubrics for Assessment*.)

Rubrics are the tools that provide the criteria and levels of performance to assess student work that is not traditional (i.e., performances, portfolios, papers, teamwork, etc.). When used for assessment, rubrics help both student and instructor identify strengths and areas for improvement in the learning process. A rubric should accompany all non-traditional assignments from the beginning.

The sample rubric (see *Oral Communication*) is used in a variety of undergraduate courses that use oral presentations as a method of evaluation. The rubric is distributed with the assignment. Discussion about rubric use occurs from the beginning of the assignment. Students use the rubric for self-assessment. Peers use the same rubric to provide specific feedback on strengths and areas for improvement.

Analytic rubrics, which include specific and detailed criteria, can help the learner, peers, and instructors assess the learner's progress in a performance, work product, or learning skill. When students know the performance criteria, the mystery of "what is most important" to learn is removed and quality learning can begin.

The Role of Rubrics for Evaluation

When analytic rubrics are used for evaluation purposes (i.e., a grade, pass or fail for certification), the criteria are clear, and the scoring process publicly reflects the expectations of a high quality performance. Students know the expectations and do not question scores as much when the performance criteria are clear and outlined at the beginning of an assignment. The process of converting rubric scores to grades varies as much as rubrics. (See *Using Rubrics for Evaluation*.)

Holistic rubrics are best suited for a summative evaluation of a performance, product, or process, so that the student receives an overall score based on overall performance. A holistic rubric provides a quick snapshot of a performance or achievement. The holistic rubric does not inform students where strengths and weaknesses lie, and therefore may not be as useful to them as an analytic rubric (see Table 2 on the next page).

Attributes of a Quality Rubric

The plethora of types and styles of rubrics can be daunting for a novice user (Coxon, 2003). The following attributes of a quality rubric can help novices and experts alike to assess the quality of a rubric (Arter and McTighe, 2001; Wiggins, 1998). (See *Methodology for Measurement*.)

1. Clear criteria

The rubric must have clear criteria. Wiggins (1998) states that we must be careful to ensure that the criteria are necessary and, as a set, sufficient for meeting the targeted achievement (see *Methodology for Measurement*). The criteria should define a comprehensive set of behaviors that make up the performance. The criteria defining each level of performance must be significant and should be mapped to the same scale.

Before deciding on the performance criteria, it is important to clearly define what will be measured. After this, it is important to research the best criteria (or best practices) in the areas to be measured before developing the criteria. For example, the measurer has to determine what the "problem solving" experts would identify as high performing and low performing criteria about this skill. The same holds true for any performance, work product, or learning skill.

It is important that the rubric covers the features that indicate quality performance because the relationship between performance criteria and rubrics is key to improved student learning (Arter and McTighe, 2001; Huba and Freed, 2000). For example, to assess the student's ability to write a persuasive paragraph, the rubric should not predominantly be designed around the number of grammar, spelling, and typographical errors.

2. Rich, descriptive language

The rubric must include rich and descriptive language. Students and multiple instructors need to understand the definitions, indicators, and samples of work (Arter and McTighe, 2001) so they can use the rubric to improve learning and assessment. The descriptors that differentiate quality should be user-friendly to students. A rubric should always describe the different levels of performance in tangible, qualitative terms in each descriptor. Therefore, when using comparative language to differentiate quality, the rubric must compare a relative quality, not an arbitrary quantity (Wiggins, 1998).

The organization of a rubric should be effectively sequenced to flow with the natural steps in the performance. Related aspects should be clustered. Descriptive labels for levels of performance enhance the creation and application of rubrics.

Table 2 **Problem Solving Rubric (Generic, Holistic)**

Level 1 — Totally Dependent Individuals

1. Hardly ever see anything besides surface factors of a problem, and their understanding of the problem always stays unclear.
2. Miss most key issues and important assumptions.
3. Are disorganized, without priorities, and accept quick solutions without testing and validating.
4. Use information without assessment and take foolish risks, or become immobilized.
5. Use other peoples' solutions and never learn from past efforts.

Level 2 — Individuals who rely on others

1. Identify problems from how they feel and clarify them through expressing emotions.
2. State issues concerning personal needs and identify assumptions others make about them.
3. Are emotional and reactive to daily issues and test to see if solutions make them comfortable.
4. Use information provided and will do what others ask.
5. Modify other peoples' solutions and occasionally see patterns in how they use them.

Level 3 — Self-reliant Individuals

1. Can identify and clarify their key problems, so they can focus on the most important.
2. Identify several of the key issues and some of the important assumptions.
3. Are semi-organized with some priorities and make sure they are satisfied with the solution.
4. Make use of available information and take needed risks to get what they really want.
5. Produce acceptable solutions and sometimes reuse the most obvious solutions.

Level 4 — Professional Consultants

1. Can help others see problems they overlooked and clarify them to others' satisfaction.
2. Identify most key issues concerning context, constraints and needs, and most important assumptions.
3. Are more systematic and have priorities and criteria, which they use to test and validate solutions.
4. Access extensive information so they can take the risks others won't.
5. Are strong at modeling problems and at times generalize solutions for future reuse.

Level 5 — Premier Problem Solvers

1. Can see hidden problems others overlook and clarify them so others can see their importance.
2. Identify all key issues concerning context, constraints and needs, and important assumptions.
3. Are systematic, and apply clear priorities and quality criteria to test and validate both the process and solution.
4. Access all critical information so they can take the risks required at minimal cost.
5. Are excellent at modeling problems, taking time to generalize for future use and appropriate reuse.

3. Focus on positive attainment

The rubric should focus on positive attainment of the desired performance. Another key consideration when assessing rubrics is the use of positive language when describing the levels of performance. The narrative should clearly describe positive attainment, rather than lack of attainment. For example, stating that the learner “needs to project voice loudly so all in the audience can hear” provides positive guidance to improve performance as compared to “inaudible.” The description for each level should help both the learner and measurer to clearly distinguish the differences in levels of performance.

4. Differentiation of performance, product, and effort

The rubric should clearly measure the desired performance (i.e., problem-solving, dribbling, oral communication) and not just effort. This requires very clear and specific performance criteria and observable descriptors at each level of performance. One should not confuse effort or product with actual performance. For example, in physical education, it is common to see rubrics that make shooting three out of four foul shots an exemplary performance. This rubric example is describing the product—the student made the foul shot.

What the above description does not capture is the quality of the performance. A description that helps the measurer distinguish between levels of performance might include proper technique, hand placement, location on the court, etc. Based on a “quantity versus quality” description, the student could have kicked the ball into the hoop with his or her feet to complete three out of four foul shots. Rubrics should clearly state the evidence that will be used to measure the performance. This evidence should distinguish between “just doing it” (a yes /no checklist type performance) and being able to differentiate quality levels of performance.

5. Universal validity and reliability

A rubric should be easy to interpret for instructors and students alike. Both should be able to use the rubric for instruction, assessment, and evaluation. Rubrics should be valid and reliable. A valid rubric measures key aspects central to quality of performance. A reliable rubric yields consistent results for different users. Reliability is increased by using rich, descriptive language. A rubric should also be fair to all students in regards to reading level, language, and examples.

Concluding Thoughts

Consistent use of well-designed rubrics significantly improves the facilitation of learning by providing both students and instructors with clarity and commonality of purpose. Students can better validate their own progress, and instructors can fairly and consistently document the students’ skills and growth. Using rubrics across programs and/or course sequences can also insure consistent measurement of quality of performance by students who have different instructors. Rubrics can provide a well-founded measurement system for improving teacher performance and collecting data for research projects. Creating and using quality rubrics is well worth the considerable time and effort involved. (See *Designing Analytic Rubrics*, and *Designing Holistic Rubrics*.)

References

- Anderson, L., & Krathwohl, D. (2001). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom’s taxonomy of educational objectives*. New York: Longman.
- Angelo, T. (2002). *Fostering critical thinking in our courses: Practical, research-based strategies to improve learning*. The Pennsylvania State University Teaching and Learning Colloquy VIII, May 8, 2002.
- Arter, J. & McTighe, J. (2001). *Scoring rubrics in the classroom: Using performance criteria for assessing and improving student performance*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Bloom, B., (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals. Handbook I: cognitive domain*. New York: David McKay.
- Brooks, J., & Brooks, M. (1999). *In search of understanding: The case for constructivist classrooms*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Coxon, E. (2003). Rubrics. The staff room for Ontario’s K-12 teachers. [WWW page] URL <<http://www.odyssey.on.ca/~elaine.coxon/rubrics.htm>>
- Huba, M., & Freed, J. (2000). *Learner-centered assessment on college campuses: Shifting the focus from teaching to learning*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Montgomery, K. (2002). *Authentic tasks and rubrics: Going beyond traditional assessments in college teaching*. College Teaching. Heldref Publication.
- Nitko, A.J. (2001). *Educational assessment of students* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.
- Wiggins, G. (1998). *Educative assessment designing assessments to inform and improve student performance*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Wiggins, G. & McTighe, J. (1998). *Understanding by design*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.