



Ollscoil Chathair
Bhaile Átha Cliath
Dublin City University

DCU Guide to Assessment Rubrics

Developed by DCU Teaching Enhancement Unit, June 2023

Table of Contents

DCU Guide to Assessment Rubrics.....	1
Table of Contents.....	1
What are assessment rubrics?.....	2
How do rubrics help teaching staff?.....	2
How do rubrics help learners?.....	3
Key Points.....	3
Analytic Rubric Example.....	4
Single Point Rubric - Example.....	5
Common problems with Rubrics.....	6
Rubric Builder Tool.....	7
Step 1 - Determining the Criteria.....	8
Step 2 - Writing the Performance Level Descriptors.....	10
Getting Value from your Rubric in Class.....	20
Appendix I Using Logic and Language Patterns in Rubrics.....	22
Further References.....	26

What are assessment rubrics?

Although definitions and interpretations of what a rubric is vary across the practice and research literature, DCU defines rubrics (as per Dawson, 2015) as **tools that are used in the process of assessing student work**. Rubrics are used to facilitate [constructive alignment](#) by ensuring that student work is evaluated in close alignment with module or programme learning outcomes. Rubrics have two essential features:

1. Evaluative criteria;
2. Descriptions of different levels of performance for those criteria.

Arguably, a well-developed rubric is one of the most useful timesaving and quality-enhancing tools you can utilize to support your teaching and assessment within a higher education programme. The focus of this guide is on the pedagogical design of rubrics. For more technical guidance on Loop, note that a comprehensive suite of resources on grading, rubrics, and marking guides is available in the [Assessment & Feedback](#) area of the [Loop Staff Support](#) Page.

How do rubrics help teaching staff?

Developing and maintaining a good rubric takes time and requires thought. However, the evidence from research and practice indicates that it is time well-spent. This is because rubrics have been demonstrated to:

- Effectively communicate expectations surrounding assessment to learners (Ragupathi and Lee, 2020);
- Increase the *validity*¹ and *face validity*² of their assessment tasks;
- Minimise the workload associated with marking and feedback (Allan and Majerus, 2019);
- Facilitate easier moderation and increase *inter-rater reliability*³ across marking teams (Hack, 2013, Reddy and Andrade, 2010).
- Reflect the application of DCU's [Principles for Promoting Academic Integrity](#).

¹ Assessment *validity* refers to the extent to which a task or tests actually measures what it is supposed to measure.

² *Face validity* in assessment refers to the extent to which a test appears to measure what it is supposed to measure and seems relevant and appropriate to stakeholders (including learners).

³ *Inter-rater reliability* refers to the degree to which assessors working independently are likely to reach the same or similar marks on students' work.

How do rubrics help learners?

Learners experience immediate benefits from the provision of a rubric alongside an assessment brief or outline. Research has demonstrated that rubrics can help learners:

- Better comprehend task requirements and expectations (Brookhart, 2018);
- Perform better on assessed tasks (Suskie, 2018);
- Develop capabilities to self-assess and self-regulate (Cockett and Jackson, 2018);
- Reduce anxiety and work more confidently on tasks (Ragupathi and Lee, 2020).

Key Points

- Rubrics should be provided to learners when they receive their assessment brief/instructions. At this point they help learners understand the expectations and the criteria that will be used to grade them (increasing transparency).
- After the task is completed, they are used to grade learners' work efficiently and fairly, and help marking teams to grade consistently.
- When the grades are returned to learners they receive a copy of the rubric, which provides them with high-level feedback indicating their individual performance level against the criteria.

Different types of rubrics are used across the broader education and training sector, inclusive of primary, post primary and further education. In higher education settings **analytic rubrics** are commonly used (Brookhart, 2018) and adapt well to most assessment tasks (see example on the following page).

Analytic Rubric Example

1. Evaluative Criteria

2. Performance Level Descriptors

	Excellent	Good	Sufficient	Insufficient
Defining a Problem	Constructs a clear and insightful problem statement with evidence of all relevant contextual factors.	Constructs a problem statement with evidence of most relevant contextual factors.	Constructs a problem statement with evidence of some contextual factors but statement may be superficial or incomplete.	Does not construct a problem statement or identify relevant contextual factors.
Proposing a Solution	Develops a logical, consistent plan and recognizes consequences of solution and articulates reasons for choosing solution.	Develops a logical, consistent plan for the solution.	Develops a plan for the solution. May have some logical flaws or inconsistencies.	Plan to solve problem is incomplete, flawed, inconsistent or wholly inappropriate.
Evidence	Information is taken from a range of appropriate sources and analysed. A comprehensive synthesis of evidence is evident. Differing viewpoints of experts are critically evaluated.	Information is taken from appropriate sources and synthesis of evidence is evident. More than one viewpoint is discussed.	Information is presented but may not all be from appropriate sources and may not be synthesized effectively. Viewpoints of experts are not evaluated or discussed in any detail.	Information is not appropriately sourced and may not be synthesized. Expert viewpoints are not evaluated or discussed.
Presentation Skills	Content is organised and sequenced very effectively. Delivery (voice, eye contact, gesture, posture) is compelling and confident. Support materials very well-designed.	Content is organised and sequenced. Delivery (voice, eye contact, gesture, posture) is confident. Support material effective.	Content is generally organised. Delivery (voice, eye contact, gesture, posture) is clear but may lack confidence. Support materials are used but may add limited value or be poorly designed.	Content is not well organised. Delivery is not clear or effective. Support materials may be or poor or may not be used.

Adapted from: AAC&U Value Rubrics

Single Point Rubric - Example

In specific contexts, such as DCU's Challenge-Based Learning activities, [single point rubrics](#) may be more effective, particularly for peer feedback. Single point rubrics typically use the format below, only providing mastery level (excellent) performance descriptors for criteria.

Criteria	Feedback Areas for Improvement	Criteria Mastery Standards for Performance	Feedback Evidence of Exceeding Standards
Defining a Problem		Constructs a clear and insightful problem statement with evidence of all relevant contextual factors.	
Proposing a Solution		Develops a logical, consistent plan and recognizes consequences of solution and articulates reasons for choosing solution.	
Evidence		Information is taken from a range of appropriate sources and analysed. A comprehensive synthesis of evidence is evident. Differing viewpoints of experts are critically evaluated.	
Presentation Skills		Content is organised and sequenced very effectively. Delivery (voice, eye contact, gesture, posture) is compelling and confident. Support materials very well-designed.	

Adapted from: AAC&U Value Rubrics

A single point rubric intentionally facilitates greater exploration and freedom for learners in how they address a challenge. This type of rubric also facilitates greater individualisation of feedback. For tasks that are explicitly designed to foster creativity and innovation, single point rubrics may be a better choice.

Common problems with Rubrics

Being too vague

Rubrics are designed to reduce subjectivity and clarify expectations for learners and staff involved in marking and providing feedback. However, these positive effects are lost if a rubric does not define criteria effectively or provide clearly differentiated performance level descriptors. Rubrics should avoid the use of vague, ill-defined or abstract terminology (Nordrum et al., 2013, Ragupathi and Lee, 2020).

Care needs to be taken in rubric design. The **Rubric Builder** tool that follows can assist with this.

Being too specific

Rubrics can also be problematic if they are overly specific, as they may constrain students from responding to a task creatively (Boud and Falchikov, 2006, Ragupathi and Lee, 2020). Performance level descriptors should provide signposts for learners, but they are not exhaustive checklists and should allow for variability in how learners may respond to a task.

If this is a concern that you have in relation to a task that requires students to respond creatively or entails a high level of experimentation and innovation, consider using a single point rubric.

Rubric Builder Tool

This tool will help you to:

1. Determine what criteria you are assessing.
2. Differentiate between levels of achievement (excellent, good, sufficient & insufficient) under each criterion.
3. Write meaningful level descriptors for each criterion.

Following the steps in the rubric builder will allow you to generate a draft rubric. *It will require further refinement*, but it will give you a strong foundation.

N.B. It is good practice to request peer feedback from at least one colleague in your discipline area on any rubric prior to use with learners. You should leave sufficient time for this and be prepared to make further adjustments and 'fine tune' your rubric in response to their feedback.



Image Credit: freepik.com

Step 1 - Determining the Criteria

Evaluative criteria should always map clearly to the learning outcomes. This is because learners will demonstrate their achievement of those outcomes via the assessment task. There are two main ways to determine criteria (which will be listed on the left/vertical axis as per below). Which way is more appropriate will depend on the nature of your assessment task. Again, the [concept of constructive alignment](#) (Biggs, 2003) – ensuring close connection between learning outcomes, assessments and learning activities – is of critical importance. To start, it is recommended that you determine the fundamental task components and then consider possible crosscutting aspects i.e.

1. Determine Task Components
 - a. What are the basic components of the task?
 - b. Is there a set of distinct (but likely interdependent) things are you asking learners to do? For example, *design a set of slides + answer a question + deliver a timed oral presentation + answer questions about the presentation.*
2. Consider Crosscutting Aspects of Performance
 - a. What are the performance elements you are looking for across the entirety of the task?
 - b. Are these crosscutting and not easily associated with particular components? For example, *innovative thinking, synthesis of learning, artistic merit.*

	Excellent	Good	Sufficient	Insufficient
Criteria 1				
Criterion 2				
Criterion 3				
Criterion 4				

Although approach 1 is very common in higher education, you may work in a discipline area or facilitate a type of learning that is better suited to approach 2. If you are unsure, it is a good idea to discuss this with a colleague who is familiar with the subject area.

Example

Sample Assessment Task: Evaluation of the Sustainability of a Consumer Product.

Choose one of the consumer products from the list provided. Establish context for your evaluation by **identifying the uses and target market for the product**, drawing upon product marketing strategies, direct advertising and other relevant information. Undertake an **evaluation of the extent to which the product could be considered sustainable**. Draw upon the principles and sustainability assessment frameworks discussed in learning materials and classes throughout the semester. **Include evidence-based recommendations for improvement**. To complete this task, you can either write a **1500-word report OR deliver a 12 - 15 minute recorded presentation**. Both formats must include a reference list on the last page or slide (as appropriate).

For this sample task, we have used the *task component* strategy. We have decided that 4 relatively discrete analytic criteria will be used. These are based on the components of the sample task highlighted in bold above. In addition to identifying the criteria, we have also made clear in our assessment brief how each criterion is weighted as % of the overall grade. This provides additional information to learners that will help them direct their focus and energy toward the core components of the task.

	Excellent	Good	Sufficient	Insufficient
Identification of Product Use and Market				
Evaluation of Product Sustainability				
Recommendations for Improvement				
Clarity of Written <u>or</u> Oral Communication				

Your Turn

- What approach is most appropriate for your task?
- What might your criteria be?
- What would appropriate weightings (%) be for each criteria?

Step 2 - Writing the Performance Level Descriptors

This part of the rubric builder helps you to develop the performance level descriptors for your draft rubric quickly and in a systematic manner. It provides you with a range of prompts and stems to help you produce descriptions of different **aspects of performance**.

Determining Aspects of Performance

It's usually easiest to start with one extreme of performance, e.g., excellent.

Think: What does excellent look like in the context of this particular assessment task **at this level?**

- Does it involve a high level of accuracy? Or a high level of creativity? Or both?
- Does it require a good grasp of well-established foundational concepts? Or a demonstrated awareness of current and cutting-edge development in the discipline? Or both?
- Does it involve drawing upon extensive research? Or does it involve applied, experiential and experimental work? Or both?

In answering these questions, you are beginning to pinpoint the **aspects of performance** that are most relevant in the context of this particular task. **Note:** This will vary according to what level on the [National Framework of Qualifications](#) (NFQ) you are

teaching at and the stage of learning students are at within a particular module or programme. A good rubric will not just make levels of performance clear to learners, markers and other stakeholders. It will also make aspects of performance clear. Below is an indicative (not exhaustive!) list of aspects of performance to help prompt your thinking on this. Although they may all seem important, some will be more appropriate than others in the context of a specific task, NFQ level and learning objective. **Tip:** These should be aligned with your module learning outcomes. Remember that the learning outcomes in terms of performance are threshold.

Aspects of Performance

Accuracy	Relevance	Currency	Completeness
Speed	Style	Application	Integration
Synthesis	Creation	Evidence	Persuasiveness
Clarity	Appropriateness	Coherence	Breadth
Reasoning	Effectiveness	Innovation	Depth
Evaluation	Problem-solving	Analysis	Interpretation
Communication	Genre	Collaboration	Reflection

Example

We have selected the most relevant aspects of performance for our 4 criteria, based on the sample task introduced earlier and the learning outcomes for our module. You can see that this is limited to 2 – 3 aspects of performance per criterion and mapped on the rubric frame below.

Identification of Product Use and Market	Completeness Evidence
Evaluation of Product Sustainability	Application Analysis Evaluation
Recommendations for Improvement	Reasoning Evidence
Clarity of Written <u>or</u> Oral Communication	Communication Clarity

Your Turn

- Try selecting 2 - 3 aspects of performance that are most relevant and make a note of them under each of your 4 criteria (you might change these a bit later, and that's OK).
- Keep in mind that you may also need to add (or further define) aspects of performance that are core to your discipline/task that are not listed on the previous page. Use the aspects of performance as a guide when writing your performance descriptors.

Example

Excellent		
Identification of Product Use and Market	<p>Clearly identifies current and potential target markets and the intended (as well as any unintended) uses of the product.</p> <p>Draws upon evidence to identify markets, extending beyond direct advertising campaigns to include other relevant information gathered through secondary research. Sources are extensive and appropriately referenced.</p>	<p>Completeness Evidence</p>
Evaluation of Product Sustainability	<p>Draws upon and applies a range of sustainability principles and sustainability assessment frameworks appropriately to facilitate a comprehensive analysis of product.</p> <p>Presents a well-reasoned evaluation of product sustainability informed by analysis, product knowledge and sustainability principles.</p>	<p>Application Analysis Evaluation</p>
Recommendations for Improvement	<p>Makes logical, well-informed and realistic recommendations for improvement that are grounded in the evaluation presented.</p> <p>Demonstrates insight by acknowledging limitations inhibiting improvements specific to the product.</p>	<p>Reasoning Evidence</p>
Clarity of Written or Oral Communication	<p>Communication is well-organised and sequenced.</p> <p>Information is conveyed coherently and effectively. The reader/listener is able to easily comprehend the message. Terminology is used accurately and appropriately. Communication is free of noticeable errors (grammatical, spelling, pronunciation)</p>	<p>Communication Clarity</p>

Excellent

- Try writing your performance level descriptors at the level of excellent (you might modify these later, and that's OK).
- Use unequivocally positive statements (do not use ~~but/or/not~~)
- Use definite statements (do not use ~~may/might/will/can/would~~).

Some of the sentence stems below may help you get started.

Clearly demonstrates...

Utilizes X effectively to ...

Makes logical, well-reasoned ...

Comprehensively outlines...

Undertakes systematic analysis of...

Sets out well-informed, compelling...

Precisely identifies...

Presents a comprehensive evaluation of...

Includes extensive and current...

Effectively applies...

Applies Y framework appropriately...

Conveys complex X in an effective manner...

Correctly interprets...

Draws upon X effectively to...

Identifies Y with accuracy and precision...

Good

- Try writing your performance level descriptors at the level of good (you might modify these later, and that's OK).
- For the most part, continue use positive statements. You can also use some **or** statements to indicate that the work may have achieved one part of a descriptor statement or the other, but not necessarily both, e.g., “*applies sustainability principles **or** sustainability assessment frameworks to facilitate analysis*”.
- Use definite statements (do not use ~~may/might/will/can/would~~).
- Remove (or weaken the strength of) the adjectives and adverbs used to be less emphatic than you were when describing excellent performance.
- Where appropriate to do so, include qualifying adjectives, e.g., *some, occasional, generally, for the most part*.

You may wish to copy over your ‘excellent’ descriptors and edit/adapt them.

Some of the sentence stems and adverbs below may help you get started.

Demonstrates...

Refers to... or may ...

...accurately

Outlines...

Conveys...

...effectively

Identifies...

Analyses...

...clearly

Applies...

Evaluates...

...appropriately

Draws upon... or may ...

...for the most part

Sufficient

- Try writing your performance level descriptors at the level of sufficient (you might modify these later, and that's OK).
- Incorporate negative indicators (but/not) to communicate what has been achieved to earn a sufficient grade while also making clear what is lacking and has prevented the work from achieving a good or excellent grade, e.g., “*communication is effective **but** may contain noticeable errors*”. Incorporate variable **or** statements to indicate the different ways in which the work may be lacking, e.g., “*may not be highly specific to the product **or** may be somewhat superficial*”.
- Use negative statements of possibility (*may not use, may lack*).
- Any adjectives and adverbs used should indicate limitations, e.g., *somewhat superficial, not specific, lacks precision*.
- Where appropriate to do so, include qualifying adjectives, e.g., *some, occasional, generally, for the most part*.

You may wish to copy over your ‘good’ descriptors and edit/adapt them. Remember that at this level, a well-developed rubric is a useful tool to help convey to learners not only how they have (under)performed, but what they can do to improve on future tasks.

Some of the sentence stems in the box below may help you get started.

Identifies X but may not ... or may be...

Some X is included...

Limited references are made to Y...

Refers to a limited range of...

Some attempt is made to...

Achieves X but may lack Y or Z

Conveys message but may...

Generally uses X accurately, with some...

Includes X but may be superficial... or lack...

Occasional use of X

Insufficient

- Try writing your performance level descriptors at the level of insufficient (you might modify these later, and that's OK).
- Incorporate variable (**or**) and negative indicators (**but/not**) to communicate why the work has achieved an insufficient grade, e.g., “*inconsistently or inaccurately references information or does not reference sources of information*”.
- Incorporate variable **or** statements to indicate the different ways in which the work may be lacking, e.g., “*recommendations are not related to the evaluation or are unclear or missing*”.
- Use negative statements of possibility (*may not use, may lack*).
- Any adjectives and adverbs used should indicate failings, e.g., *insufficient, inaccurate, inconsistent, irrelevant, limited, superficial*.
- Where appropriate to do so, include qualifying adjectives, e.g., *some, occasional, generally, for the most part*.

You may wish to copy over your ‘sufficient’ descriptors and edit/adapt them. At this level, a well-developed rubric is a useful tool to help convey to learners not only how they have underperformed, but what they can do to improve on future tasks.

Some of the sentence stems in the box below may help you get started.

X is not included

Y is minimal or insufficient

X is not sufficiently contextualised...

X is unclear or missing altogether

Does not demonstrate correct application of Y

X does not reflect any attempt to Y

X is not accurately identified

Y lacks depth or has limited breadth

X does not provide Y

X is not relevant or related to Y

Once you have completed building your rubric, you should have a rubric that looks something like this. Further [sample rubrics](#) are available as starting points for you to consider in designing your own:

	Excellent	Good	Sufficient	Insufficient
Identification of Product Use and Market	<p>Clearly identifies current and potential target markets and the intended (as well as any unintended) uses of the product.</p> <p>Draws upon evidence to identify markets, extending beyond direct advertising campaigns to include other relevant information gathered through secondary research. Sources are extensive and appropriately referenced.</p>	<p>Identifies current target markets and the intended uses of the product.</p> <p>Draws upon evidence to identify markets and uses, extending beyond direct advertising campaigns to include other relevant information gathered through secondary research. Sources are appropriately referenced.</p>	<p>Identifies at least one target market and intended use of the product but may miss opportunities to include additional or alternative markets/uses. Refers to evidence to identify markets and uses, but this may be largely direct advertising campaigns. May not include substantial information. References sources of information.</p>	<p>Identification of target market and intended use of the product is inadequate, unclear or missing.</p> <p>Minimal or insufficient evidence provided. May be solely dependent on direct advertising campaigns. Inconsistently or inaccurately references information or does not reference sources of information</p>
Evaluation of Product Sustainability	<p>Draws upon and applies a range of sustainability principles and sustainability assessment frameworks appropriately to facilitate a comprehensive analysis of product.</p> <p>Presents a well-reasoned evaluation of product sustainability informed by analysis, product knowledge and sustainability principles.</p>	<p>Draws upon and applies sustainability principles or sustainability assessment frameworks to facilitate analysis of product.</p> <p>Presents an evaluation of product sustainability informed by analysis, product knowledge and sustainability principles.</p>	<p>Makes reference to sustainability principles or sustainability assessment frameworks. Some attempt is made to apply these to facilitate analysis of product.</p> <p>Presents an evaluation of product sustainability relevant to analysis. Some attempt is made to connect this to product knowledge and sustainability principles.</p>	<p>Limited or no reference to sustainability principles or sustainability assessment frameworks. Limited or no attempt to apply these to analysis of product.</p> <p>Evaluation of product sustainability may lack relevance to analysis or be inadequate or missing. Limited if any attempt is made to connect to product knowledge and sustainability principles.</p>

Recommendations for Improvement	<p>Makes logical, well-informed and realistic recommendations for improvement that are grounded in the evaluation presented.</p> <p>Demonstrates insight by acknowledging limitations inhibiting improvements specific to the product.</p>	<p>Makes realistic recommendations for improvement that are for the most part grounded in the evaluation presented.</p> <p>Acknowledges some limitations inhibiting improvements specific to the product.</p>	<p>Makes recommendations for improvement that are related to the evaluation presented.</p> <p>Limitations inhibiting improvements are indicated but may not be specific to the product or may be somewhat superficial.</p>	<p>Recommendations for improvement are not related to the evaluation presented or are unclear or missing.</p> <p>Limitations inhibiting improvements are not clearly indicated or are missing. May not be relevant to the product or may be very superficial.</p>
Clarity of Written or Oral Communication	<p>Communication is well-organised and sequenced.</p> <p>Information is conveyed coherently and effectively. The reader/listener is able to easily comprehend the message.</p> <p>Terminology is used accurately and appropriately.</p> <p>. Communication is free of noticeable errors (grammatical, spelling, pronunciation)</p>	<p>Communication is well-organised.</p> <p>Information is conveyed coherently. The reader/listener is able to easily comprehend the message.</p> <p>Terminology is used accurately.</p> <p>Communication is free of noticeable errors (grammatical, spelling, pronunciation)</p>	<p>Communication achieves intention but may lack organisation or flow.</p> <p>Information is conveyed so that the reader/listener is able to comprehend the message. Use of terminology may lack precision or appropriate terminology may not be used.</p> <p>Communication is effective but may contain noticeable errors.</p>	<p>Communication lacks organisation or flow.</p> <p>Reader/listener struggles to comprehend the message. Use of terminology may lack precision or appropriate terminology may not be used.</p> <p>May contain noticeable errors that impede communication.</p>

Getting Value from your Rubric in Class

After putting in the effort to develop a comprehensive rubric with clearly differentiated descriptors for levels of performance under each criterion, it's important to think about how you can get the most value from it as a teaching, learning and feedback tool. Consider if any of the following suggestions would be appropriate for your context and learners:

1. Include your rubric in the assessment brief so that learners receive detailed information about how they will be marked at the same time as they receive the task instructions. This offers a “pre-assessment narrative” that reduces ambiguity and anxiety (Ragupathi and Lee, 2020), and mitigates the impact of the hidden curriculum⁴ on non-traditional learners, promoting inclusion and diversity. This [joint resource](#) created by DCU's TEU and Counselling Service provides additional advice on *de-stressing* assessment.
2. Structure a class around introducing the assessment task and rubric.
 - a. First, introduce the task.
 - b. Second, introduce a rubric with the criteria identified but blank spaces where the performance level descriptors should be.
 - c. Third, put students in groups and ask them to work together to suggest what they think would be expected at the level of excellent (and if time permits, also at other levels).
 - d. Finally, introduce the actual rubric and discuss any differences between students' guesses and the official rubric to be used.

⁴ The hidden curriculum refers to the unwritten, unofficial rules, values and practices within institutions that learners from non-traditional academic backgrounds may struggle to decode.

3. Structure a class around applying the rubric to an exemplar.
 - a. First, introduce a sample attempt at a task that includes some flaws, quirks or common mistakes. Journal articles and real-world artefacts (advertising campaigns, products, buildings or designs) can be effective for this task (Blommel and Abate, 2007).
 - b. Second, put students in groups and ask them to agree a grade for the work.
 - c. Third, invite groups to present how they have graded the sample attempt and provide a justification for their marks.
 - d. Finally, provide your own grades and feedback, discussing any differences between your grade and the grades the students awarded.

4. Structure a peer feedback class around applying the rubric to a peer's draft or work in progress. Invite students to use the criteria in the rubric to apply judgements and produce further comments on the basis of these for peers. This provides a comfortable structure for students to work with as they undertake a peer feedback exercise and facilitate development of evaluative judgement (Nicol et al., 2014) (see also, assessment As learning). A [case study from DCU's School of Computing](#) which provides an example of this strategy in use is available on Loop.

Appendix I Using Logic and Language Patterns in Rubrics

If you wish to go deeper into rubric design, you may like to know that there are basic **logic and language patterns** that you can apply to indicate how performance levels (excellent, good, sufficient, insufficient) are differentiated. In the following sections, the use of these at each level of performance is explained and an example provided.

Excellent Performance

Logic pattern: Descriptors of performance at this level typically use an additive pattern of positive statements, e.g., A **and** B **and** C. The word ‘and’ may not always be used, but the relationship between the statements will be understood this way.

Language pattern: The language used to describe excellent performance is typically definite, e.g., ‘*the submission includes*’ and not ‘~~*the submission may include*~~’. It typically uses adjectives (e.g., *creative, detailed, logical*) and adverbs (e.g., *clearly, comprehensively, insightfully*) to strengthen the statements made.

	Excellent
Identification of Product Use and Market	Clearly identifies current and potential target markets and the intended (as well as any unintended) uses of the product. Draws upon evidence to identify markets, extending beyond direct advertising campaigns to include other relevant information gathered through secondary research. Sources are extensive and appropriately referenced.
Evaluation of Product Sustainability	Draws upon and applies a range of sustainability principles and sustainability assessment frameworks appropriately to facilitate a comprehensive analysis of product. Presents a well-reasoned evaluation of product sustainability informed by analysis, product knowledge and sustainability principles.
Recommendations for Improvement	Makes logical, well-informed and realistic recommendations for improvement that are grounded in the evaluation presented. Demonstrates insight by acknowledging limitations inhibiting improvements specific to the product.
Clarity of Written <u>or</u> Oral Communication	Communication is well-organised and sequenced. Information is conveyed coherently and effectively. The reader/listener is able to easily comprehend the message. Terminology is used accurately and appropriately. Communication is free of noticeable errors (grammatical, spelling, pronunciation)

Good Performance

Logic pattern: Descriptors of performance at this level typically use an additive pattern of positive statements (**and**) with some additional use of a variable indicator (**or**) to help indicate how the performance slipped below excellent.

Language pattern: The language used to describe good performance combines definite statements '*the submission includes*' with very limited use of moderately negative statements of possibility '*the submission may lack...*'. Less adjectives or adverbs are used and are typically employed to qualify a statement, e.g., *some, occasional, generally, for the most part,*

	Good
Identification of Product Use and Market	Identifies current target markets and the intended uses of the product. Draws upon evidence to identify markets and uses, extending beyond direct advertising campaigns to include other relevant information gathered through secondary research. Sources are appropriately referenced.
Evaluation of Product Sustainability	Draws upon and applies sustainability principles or sustainability assessment frameworks to facilitate analysis of product. Presents an evaluation of product sustainability informed by analysis, product knowledge and sustainability principles.
Recommendations for Improvement	Makes realistic recommendations for improvement that are for the most part grounded in the evaluation presented. Acknowledges some limitations inhibiting improvements specific to the product.
Clarity of Written <u>or</u> Oral Communication	Communication is well-organised. Information is conveyed coherently. The reader/listener is able to easily comprehend the message. Terminology is used accurately. Communication is free of noticeable errors (grammatical, spelling, pronunciation)

Sufficient Performance

Logic pattern: Descriptors of performance at this level typically use a pattern of variable statements (**or**) with some additional use of a negative indicator (**but/not**) to help define where the performance has slipped below good. It is important that performance level descriptors at this level provide an indication to the learner of the ways in which improvements can be made.

Language pattern: The language used to describe sufficient performance combines definite statements with negative indicators '*the submission includes X but does not Y*' with the use of negative statements of possibility '*the submission may lack X or may lack Y...*'.

	Sufficient
Identification of Product Use and Market	Identifies at least one target market and intended use of the product but may miss opportunities to include additional or alternative markets/uses. Refers to evidence to identify markets and uses, but this may be largely direct advertising campaigns. May not include substantial information. References sources of information.
Evaluation of Product Sustainability	Makes reference to sustainability principles or sustainability assessment frameworks. Some attempt is made to apply these to facilitate analysis of product. Presents an evaluation of product sustainability relevant to analysis. Some attempt is made to connect this to product knowledge and sustainability principles.
Recommendations for Improvement	Makes recommendations for improvement that are related to the evaluation presented. Limitations inhibiting improvements are indicated but may not be specific to the product or may be somewhat superficial.
Clarity of Written <u>or</u> Oral Communication	Communication achieves intention but may lack organisation or flow. Information is conveyed so that the reader/listener is able to comprehend the message. Use of terminology may lack precision or appropriate terminology may not be used. Communication is effective but may contain noticeable errors.

Insufficient Performance


Logic pattern: Descriptors of performance at this level typically use a pattern of statements with variable (**or**) and negative indicators (**but/not**) to help define where the performance has fallen below sufficient.

Language pattern: The language used to describe insufficient performance primarily uses definitive negative statements ‘*the submission does not Y*’ with the use of negative statements of possibility ‘*the submission may lack X or may lack Y...*’.

Identification of Product Use and Market 20%	
Identification of Product Use and Market	Identification of target market and intended use of the product is inadequate, unclear or missing. Minimal or insufficient evidence provided. May be solely dependent on direct advertising campaigns. Inconsistently or inaccurately references information or does not reference sources of information.
Evaluation of Product Sustainability	Limited or no reference to sustainability principles or sustainability assessment frameworks. Limited or no attempt is made to apply these to facilitate analysis of product. Evaluation of product sustainability may lack relevance to analysis or be inadequate or missing. Limited if any attempt is made to connect this to product knowledge and sustainability principles.
Recommendations for Improvement	Recommendations for improvement are not related to the evaluation presented or are unclear or missing. Limitations inhibiting improvements are not clearly indicated or are missing. May not be relevant to the product or may be very superficial.
Clarity of Written or Oral Communication	Communication lacks organisation or flow. Reader/listener struggles to comprehend the message. Use of terminology may lack precision or appropriate terminology may not be used. May contain noticeable errors that impede communication.

Further References

- ALLAN, B. & MAJERUS, T. Investigating the impact of co-developing an assessment rubric with foundation students on their perceptions of and engagement with feedback. Teaching and Learning Conference 2019, 2019. Advance HE.
- BIGGS, J. 2003. Aligning Teaching for Constructing Learning. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/255583992_Aligning_Teaching_for_Constructing_Learning
- BLOMMEL, M. L. & ABATE, M. A. 2007. A Rubric to Assess Critical Literature Evaluation Skills. *American journal of pharmaceutical education*, 71, 63.
- BOUD, D. & FALCHIKOV, N. 2006. Aligning Assessment with Long-Term Learning. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education - ASSESS EVAL HIGH EDUC*, 31, 399-413.
- BROOKHART, S. M. 2018. Appropriate Criteria: Key to Effective Rubrics. *Frontiers in Education*, 3.
- COCKETT, A. & JACKSON, C. 2018. The use of assessment rubrics to enhance feedback in higher education: An integrative literature review. *Nurse Educ Today*, 69, 8-13.
- DAWSON, P. 2015. Assessment rubrics: towards clearer and more replicable design, research and practice. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*.
- HACK, C. 2013. Using rubrics to improve marking reliability and to clarify good performance. In: ACADEMY, T. H. E. (ed.) *STEM Annual Conference*

- 
- NICOL, D., THOMSON, A. & BRESLIN, C. 2014. Rethinking feedback practices in higher education: a peer review perspective. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 39, 102-122.
- NORDRUM, L., EVANS, K. & GUSTAFSSON, M. 2013. Comparing student learning experiences of in-text commentary and rubric-articulated feedback: Strategies for formative assessment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 38.
- RAGUPATHI, K. & LEE, A. 2020. Beyond Fairness and Consistency in Grading: The Role of Rubrics in Higher Education. In: SANGER, C. S. & GLEASON, N. W. (eds.) *Diversity and Inclusion in Global Higher Education: Lessons from Across Asia*. Singapore: Springer Singapore.
- REDDY, Y. & ANDRADE, H. 2010. A review of rubric use in higher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education - ASSESS EVAL HIGH EDUC*, 35, 435-448.
- SUSKIE, L. 2018. *Assessing Student Learning: A Common Sense Guide, 3rd edition*.