



Oifig an Stiúirthóra Seirbhísí
Altranais & Cnáimhseachais

Office of Nursing &
Midwifery Services Director



Consortium of Centres of Nursing and Midwifery

Guide to Using Rubric for Grading Academic Work

Contents

1.0	Introduction	2
2.0	Definition and role of rubrics in assessments	2
3.0	Benefits of using rubrics in assessment.....	2
4.0	Role in enhancing learner achievement	3
5.0	Types of rubrics	4
6.0	Rubric for the grading academic work for QQI programmes	5
7.0	Aligning learning outcomes and assessment criteria with NFQ Levels	8
8.0	Reference List	14

1.0 Introduction

This guide has been developed to support Consortium of Centres of Nursing and Midwifery Education CCNME staff in the use of grading rubrics in learner assessment by addressing the following:

- Defining the role of rubric in assessment;
- Outlining the benefits of rubrics for staff and learners;
- Role in enhancing learner achievement;
- Using a rubric effectively.

2.0 Definition and role of rubrics in assessments

Rubrics are developed and used to assess and grade a learner's work by setting out aspirational qualities for each level that signify the achievement of standards (Bearman and Ajjawi, 2021). A rubric clearly identifies the expectations for the learner by describing criteria for work and performance levels across a continuum of quality (Arter and Chappuis, 2006; Brookhart, 2018). Therefore, a rubric both identifies the **criteria** that express what to look for in the work and performance level and the **descriptions** that exemplify what these criteria look like in work, at varying quality levels, from low to high. It is the presence of both appropriate criteria and performance level descriptions that distinguishes rubrics from other kinds of evaluation tools (Brookhart, 2018). These measurable assessment criteria and descriptions which are linked to measurable learning outcomes, combine to describe the standards against which a learner's work is assessed. This can help the learner conceptualise their learning goal, to understand what excellent work is and what constitutes poor work and appreciate what they need to improve on (Falchikov and Boud, 1989; Ragupathi and Lee, 2020). A seminal study by Popham (1997) determined that a rubric must comprise three essential features; evaluative criteria that determine quality of the work; quality definitions that provide detailed descriptions of skills and knowledge required of the learner to distinguish acceptable from unacceptable responses and a scoring strategy that employs a rating scale to interpret judgements, scoring holistically or analytically (Ragupathi and Lee, 2020).

3.0 Benefits of using rubrics in assessment

Rubrics support the process of both summative and formative assessments. They can be used as scoring rubrics to grade and evaluate but have a role in explaining the learning and teaching processes employed, when used as instructional rubrics. There are many benefits for staff and learners which include:

3.1 Helping staff to:

- Make explicit to learners the expectation of them and describe what learning looks like (Brookhart, 2018).
- Identify and focus on the key knowledge, skills and/or attributes to be developed within a module and employ assessments that establish achievement or not.

- Improve inter-assessor and intra-assessor reliability by applying the same performance criteria and standards in the grade descriptors to learner's work.
- Speed up the marking process and increase reliability in allocation of grades.
- Reduce the risk of bias by providing predetermined criteria with descriptors, ensuring that marking decisions are transparent, equitable, valid and reliable.
- Guide staff to focus on being learning and learner-centric rather than task-centric, while also supporting the mentorship of candidate/student staff as they develop their assessment skills (Ragupathi and Lee, 2020).
- Utilise learner feedback and concerns related to rubric criteria/ descriptors to reflect on learning outcomes, teaching strategies and learning activities, supporting continuous quality improvement (Jonsson and Svingby, 2007; Ragupathi and Lee, 2020).

3.2 Helping Learners to:

- Understand the criteria and standards that will be used to grade their assessment, representing transparency and fairness (Panadero and Jonsson, 2013).
- Support formative learning by identifying performance level based on clearly articulated criteria and standards for each grade level, and what is needed to improve (Hattie & Timperley, 2007).
- Align their work to the expectations within the rubric.
- Foster skills for independent learning and self-efficacy in the context of assessment (Andrade, 2010; Panadero and Jonsson, 2013).
- Self-assess performance against the rubric when planning and checking draft work.

4.0 Role in enhancing learner achievement

Involving learners in rubrics can help them to achieve a deeper understanding of what is expected of them, thereby reducing anxiety and supporting self-regulation, self-motivation and self-efficacy (Sambell and Brown, 2022). It is anticipated that CCNME Facilitators of Education and Assessors will utilise rubrics to foster dynamic learning activities that encourage dialogue, promote deep reflection and critical thinking among learners, and maximise opportunities for enhancing knowledge and skills, rather than solely focusing on achieving high grades. (Sambell and Brown, 2022). Rubrics are shared with learners to help educators communicate required standards and learners to learn (Jonsson, 2014). Evidence demonstrates the benefits of this approach as resulting in improved learner performance (Lipnevich *et al.*, 2014), the co-creation of what 'quality' looks like (O'Donovan *et al.*, 2004) and improve feedback processes and /faculty relationships (Jonsson and Panadero, 2022).

5.0 Types of rubrics

In developing a rubric for the purpose of grading learner academic work, the CCNME considered the following uses of rubric:

- As a scoring tool that identifies the different criteria relevant to an assignment, assessment, or learning outcome.
- To state the possible levels of achievement in a specific, clear, and objective way.
- To support staff to communicate expectations to learners and assess their work fairly, consistently and efficiently.
- To utilise as a tool for discussion and agreement at moderation of learner's work.

5.1 Analytic rubric

Analytic rubrics are used to determine the overall grade by assessing relative performance across a number of criteria (University of Reading, 2018). This approach divides the learning/ task into component parts, thereby providing greater levels of detail in each criterion of the grade descriptor. This has benefits for learners as it provides more detail regarding expectation, allows more structured and focused feedback, and supports grading reliability (Brookhart, 2018). Linking formative feedback to specific criteria and quality statements is beneficial. It provides an opportunity for improvement before the final submission for summative feedback.

Analytic rubrics are two-dimensional with discrete criteria and detailed descriptions for each criterion at each level i.e. a table/ matrix with levels of achievement as columns and assessment criteria as rows (Sambell and Brown, 2022). Different weights (value) can be applied to different criteria and a final grade reached by aggregating these weighted scores.

5.2 Holistic rubric

Holistic rubrics are used to provide an overall description of the learning activity/ task, and are based on identified achievement levels, which enables a holistic judgement of the assessment. This approach can support learners by adopting a broader expectation for the learning activity/ task, thereby allowing room for different interpretations. Once all criteria are considered simultaneously, only one decision on one scale is required (Brookhart, 2018). However, this can impact the capacity to provide detailed learner feedback on performance in each criterion, as assessment judgements are aggregate rather than related to discrete criteria (Sambell and Brown, 2022). This rubric is more suited in grading instances, where learning will not need to use feedback (Brookhart, 2018).

Holistic rubrics are primarily used as scoring rubrics, while analytic rubrics serve as instructional rubrics. Scoring rubrics provide objective and consistent assessments of learners' work, whereas instructional rubrics facilitate the transition from teacher-centred summative assessments to learner-centred formative assessments (Ragupathi and Lee, 2020).

Regardless of the rubric type, the inclusion of appropriate and substantive criteria is crucial for effective rubrics (Brookhart, 2018). We have chosen and adopted the following rubric as it meets the needs of the CCNME.

6.0 Rubric for the grading academic work for QQI programmes

Table 1: CCNME Rubric for the Grading of Academic Work for QQI programmes.

Table 1: CNME Rubric					
Criterion	70-100% Work of outstanding quality	60-69% Work of good quality	50-59% Satisfactory	40-49% (40% is a pass) Minimum standard of work	Less than 40% Insufficient standard of work
ORGANISATION Overall Presentation and academic language/writing (Sources and evidence) Literature sourcing and referencing adheres to the CCNME Referencing Guidelines.	Work planned with a clear structure. Content is logical and clearly developed. Theories/ aims/ objectives are clearly devised and formulated. Excellent use of literature, references and integration into work.	Work well-planned. Evidence of good structure with logical flow and minimal errors. Theories/ aims/ objectives are sufficiently developed and formulated. References with minimal errors.	Structure satisfactory. Some evidence of planning, structure, and content development. Theories/ aims/ objectives evident but lack clarity. Conclusion addressed but lacks accuracy. Satisfactory referencing needs to adhere to referencing guidelines.	Development of content is poor with minimum planning, structure, and definition of topic. Theories/ aims/ objectives are not clear. Minimum referencing.	Insufficient planning, structure, and definition of topic. Theories/ aims/ objectives are not stated. Assignment not logical. Insufficient referencing with non-adherence to required guidelines.
KNOWLEDGE Constructing meaning from oral, written, and graphic messages through interpreting, exemplifying, classifying, summarizing, inferring, comparing, and explaining.	Quality of evidence is systematically discussed. Objectivity evident throughout. Effectively compares a variety of views. Conclusion is thorough and accurately summarises work.	Convincing arguments presented with robust supportive evidence. Demonstrates evidence of interpretation and summarization. Expresses own views and argues convincingly using supportive literature.	Satisfactory presentation of evidence. Demonstrates a willingness to question own views and explore alternative interpretations. Objectivity mainly achieved with intermittent subjective remarks evident.	Evidence of knowledge yet there is minimal relevance to reading and/or research. Frequent evidence of subjective views and arguments.	Insufficient breadth of knowledge and evidence not discussed. Inability to analyse or interpret new knowledge. Evidence presented does not question or explore alternative views.
COMPREHENSION Logical and consistent understanding of key concepts.	Key concepts explored, defined, and applied. Work of outstanding quality presented, excellent understanding, concise, accurate and well-articulated.	Work of good quality presented with evidence of the key concepts explored and defined.	Some of the key concepts are identified, explored and defined.	Limited concepts presented with inadequate explanation.	Concepts unclear. Incoherent and difficult to understand.
APPLICATION Accurate application of theoretical knowledge to practice.	Extremely relevant with the implementation of theoretical frameworks. Application of principles for practice evident throughout.	Content of good quality with identified theoretical frameworks and principles for practice explored and applied.	Satisfactory content with some evidence of application of theoretical frameworks and principles for practice. Mainly accurate with some inconsistencies evident.	Minimum content with little evidence of application to practice.	Insufficient content with little or no evidence of application to practice.

Criterion	70-100% Work of outstanding quality	60-69% Work of good quality	50-59% Satisfactory	40-49% (40% is a pass) Minimum standard of work	Less than 40% Insufficient standard of work
ANALYSIS Comprehensiveness Breadth and Depth of evidence.	Creative reasoning and critical analysis of alternatives approaches and theories evident throughout the work. The ability to construct and build a coherent argument. Comprehensive use of up-to-date literature. Excellent ability to critically evaluate the literature.	Strong reasoning revealed throughout work with breadth and depth of evidence demonstrated. Clear critical awareness of alternative approaches / theoretical frameworks identified.	Persuasive explanation, evidenced with relevant points identified. Demonstrated awareness of possible criticisms and limitations throughout work. Satisfactory analysis demonstrated.	Partial but inconsistent reasoning identified with limited evidence demonstrated throughout work. Limited critical analysis demonstrated.	Inability to analyse and interpret evidence. Significant omissions of relevant details. Unclear explanations given. No critical perspective evident.
EVALUATION Making judgments based on criteria and standards through checking and critiquing.	Clearly identifies strengths and weaknesses, integration of key concepts, and draws conclusion with insightful discussion of impact of the identified topic.	Effective evidence with key conclusions and integration of key concepts. Identification of strengths and weaknesses and draws a conclusion.	Evidence and results are interpreted and linked with the literature. Satisfactory identification of strengths and weaknesses and the drawn conclusions.	Evidence and results are presented but not in a logical manner. Limited attempt to identify strengths and weaknesses or draw conclusions.	Evidence and results are not identified in a logical manner. Limitations and weaknesses are not identified or discussed. Insufficient attempt to draw conclusions. Limited evidence throughout.

Grading Guide	
70% + Work of outstanding quality	Clearly and concisely written and shows evidence of wide reading. Alternative views are well expressed and implications for practice are clearly discussed. The depth of evidence is appropriate for work at the required level.
60% -69% Work of good quality	Work shows a high standard of presentation and scholarly style. Understanding and interpretation of alternative perspectives is evident and balanced conclusions are drawn.
50%-59% Satisfactory	Satisfactory work showing evidence of sufficient use of sources, interpretation, application to practice and attempts to explore alternative views, and reflects on judgements made.
40%-49% Minimum standard	Minimum standard of work. Lacks some of the indicated requirements
Below 40% Insufficient standard	Insufficient standard of work. Lacks most of the requirements for the required level.

7.0 Aligning learning outcomes and assessment criteria with NFQ Levels

For a rubric to be effective, the learning outcomes for both the programme and module, as well as the assessment tasks and criteria, must be aligned with the appropriate NFQ level. Additionally, the criteria used to evaluate and grade the learner's performance should be clearly communicated to them.

When grading:

- A learner must meet the level of information as outlined for each of the 6 criteria.
- However a learner may be stronger in one criteria versus another, the rubric allows for detailed critique and constructive feedback.

Once a learner's criteria and range has been identified using the *Table 1A*, overall assignment mark/grade is assigned using the criteria weighting percentages in *Row 1*. Example below.

Example 1:

Learner is undertaking a written assignment at QQI Level 5 and has produced a 1500 word assignment and the marker identified the following criteria were achieved (see highlighted boxes in rubric table):

Calculation:

The overall mark can be calculated using the following simplified method:

- Add all percentages together
Then divide by 600 and multiply 100
$$85+75+68+59+59+59=\frac{406}{600}=0.675 \times 100= 67.5\%$$

This is a simple application of a rubric to gain an overall mark.

Exemplar of formal feedback:

Feedback should include a balanced evaluation of strengths and areas for improvement, specific examples to illustrate points, and actionable suggestions for enhancement.

Organisation: This category ranks the highest, with excellent formatting, grammar, clear layout, and effective signposting. The presentation of theories is strong, warranting a mark in the range of 85%. To achieve a higher mark, increase the level of critical thinking by questioning assumptions, evaluating evidence more rigorously, and presenting counterarguments. This will demonstrate a deeper engagement with the material.

Knowledge: While good, it does not quite match the sharpness of the organisation category, meriting a mark of 75%.

Comprehension: This area shows a slight decline, with clear information not consistently conveyed. The learner is close to achieving 70%, but currently stands at 68%.

Application, Analysis, and Evaluation: These criteria are met as per the highlighted boxes. There is evidence of effort in critical thinking, though it is somewhat limited at times, resulting in a mark of 59% for each.

Table 1A: CNME Rubric: Example 1					
Criterion	70-100% Work of outstanding quality	60-69% Work of good quality	50-59% Satisfactory	40-49% (40% is a pass) Minimum standard of work	Less than 40% Insufficient standard of work
ORGANISATION Overall Presentation and academic language/writing (Sources and evidence) Literature sourcing and referencing adheres to the CCNME Referencing Guidelines.	Work planned with a clear structure. Content is logical and clearly developed. Theories/ aims/ objectives are clearly devised and formulated. Excellent use of literature, references and integration into work.	Work well-planned. Evidence of good structure with logical flow and minimal errors. Theories/ aims/ objectives are sufficiently developed and formulated. References with minimal errors.	Structure satisfactory. Some evidence of planning, structure, and content development. Theories/ aims/ objectives evident but lack clarity. Conclusion addressed but lacks accuracy. Satisfactory referencing needs to adhere to referencing guidelines.	Development of content is poor with minimum planning, structure, and definition of topic. Theories/ aims/ objectives are not clear. Minimum referencing.	Insufficient planning, structure, and definition of topic. Theories/ aims/ objectives are not stated. Assignment not logical. Insufficient referencing with non-adherence to required guidelines.
KNOWLEDGE Constructing meaning from oral, written, and graphic messages through interpreting, exemplifying, classifying, summarizing, inferring, comparing, and explaining.	Quality of evidence is systematically discussed. Objectivity evident throughout. Effectively compares a variety of views. Conclusion is thorough and accurately summarises work.	Convincing arguments presented with robust supportive evidence. Demonstrates evidence of interpretation and summarization. Expresses own views and argues convincingly using supportive literature.	Satisfactory presentation of evidence. Demonstrates a willingness to question own views and explore alternative interpretations. Objectivity mainly achieved with intermittent subjective remarks evident.	Evidence of knowledge yet there is minimal relevance to reading and/or research. Frequent evidence of subjective views and arguments.	Insufficient breadth of knowledge and evidence not discussed. Inability to analyse or interpret new knowledge. Evidence presented does not question or explore alternative views.
COMPREHENSION Logical and consistent understanding of key concepts.	Key concepts explored, defined, and applied. Work of outstanding quality presented, excellent understanding, concise, accurate and well-articulated.	Work of good quality presented with evidence of the key concepts explored and defined.	Some of the key concepts are identified, explored and defined.	Limited concepts presented with inadequate explanation.	Concepts unclear. Incoherent and difficult to understand.

Criterion	70-100% Work of outstanding quality	60-69% Work of good quality	50-59% Satisfactory	40-49% (40% is a pass) Minimum standard of work	Less than 40% Insufficient standard of work
APPLICATION Accurate application of theoretical knowledge to practice.	Extremely relevant with the implementation of theoretical frameworks. Application of principles for practice evident throughout.	Content of good quality with identified theoretical frameworks and principles for practice explored and applied.	Satisfactory content with some evidence of application of theoretical frameworks and principles for practice. Mainly accurate with some inconsistencies evident.	Minimum content with little evidence of application to practice.	Insufficient content with little or no evidence of application to practice.
ANALYSIS Comprehensiveness Breadth and Depth of evidence.	Creative reasoning and critical analysis of alternatives approaches and theories evident throughout the work. The ability to construct and build a coherent argument. Comprehensive use of up-to-date literature. Excellent ability to critically evaluate the literature.	Strong reasoning revealed throughout work with breadth and depth of evidence demonstrated. Clear critical awareness of alternative approaches / theoretical frameworks identified.	Persuasive explanation, evidenced with relevant points identified. Demonstrated awareness of possible criticisms and limitations throughout work. Satisfactory analysis demonstrated.	Partial but inconsistent reasoning identified with limited evidence demonstrated throughout work. Limited critical analysis demonstrated.	Inability to analyse and interpret evidence. Significant omissions of relevant details. Unclear explanations given. No critical perspective evident.
EVALUATION Making judgments based on criteria and standards through checking and critiquing.	Clearly identifies strengths and weaknesses, integration of key concepts, and draws conclusion with insightful discussion of impact of the identified topic.	Effective evidence with key conclusions and integration of key concepts. Identification of strengths and weaknesses and draws a conclusion.	Evidence and results are interpreted and linked with the literature. Satisfactory identification of strengths and weaknesses and the drawn conclusions.	Evidence and results are presented but not in a logical manner. Limited attempt to identify strengths and weaknesses or draw conclusions.	Evidence and results are not identified in a logical manner. Limitations and weaknesses are not identified or discussed. Insufficient attempt to draw conclusions. Limited evidence throughout.

Grading Guide	
70% + Work of outstanding quality	Clearly and concisely written and shows evidence of wide reading. Alternative views are well expressed and implications for practice are clearly discussed. The depth of evidence is appropriate for work at the required level.
60% -69% Work of good quality	Work shows a high standard of presentation and scholarly style. Understanding and interpretation of alternative perspectives is evident and balanced conclusions are drawn.
50%-59% Satisfactory	Satisfactory work showing evidence of sufficient use of sources, interpretation, application to practice and attempts to explore alternative views, and reflects on judgements made.
40%-49% Minimum standard	Minimum standard of work. Lacks some of the indicated requirements
Below 40% Insufficient standard	Insufficient standard of work. Lacks most of the requirements for the required level.

For learners at a higher level, a more complex application can be used

Example 2:

Learner is undertaking a written assignment at QQI Level 8 and has produced a 2500-word assignment and the marker identified the following criteria were achieved see highlighted boxes in rubric *Table 1C*.

The overall mark can be calculated using the following complex method:

- Consider the percentage to be assigned per criteria and look at the weighting each category holds see *Table 1B*.

Exemplar:

Organisation: This category ranks the highest, with excellent formatting, grammar, clear layout, and effective signposting. The presentation of theories is strong, warranting a mark in the range of 85%. To achieve a higher mark, increase the level of critical thinking by questioning assumptions, evaluating evidence more rigorously, and presenting counterarguments. This will demonstrate a deeper engagement with the material.

Knowledge: While good, it does not quite match the sharpness of the Organisation category, meriting a mark of 75%.

Comprehension: This area shows a slight decline, with clear information not consistently conveyed. The learner is close to achieving 70%, but currently stands at 68%.

Application, Analysis, and Evaluation: These criteria are met as per the highlighted boxes. There is evidence of effort in critical thinking, though it is somewhat limited at times, resulting in a mark of 59% for each.

Table 1B: Calculation of percentage marks using weighting methodology					
CRITERION				ADD ALL MARKS	TOTAL
ORGANISATION Weighting of 10%.	10 divided 100 = 0.1 This gives organisation criterion a mark of 0.1.	To change the percentage of 85% into the marks	Multiply 85 by 0.1 = 8.5	8.5 Marks	65.35 % rounding to 65%
KNOWLEDGE Weighting of 15%.	15 divided 100 = 0.15 This gives knowledge criterion a mark of 0.15.	To change the percentage of 75% into the marks	Multiply 75 by 0.15 = 11.25	11.25 marks	
COMPREHENSION Weighting of 15%.	15 divided 100 = 0.15 This gives knowledge criterion a mark of 0.15.	To change the percentage of 68% into the marks	Multiply 68 by 0.15 = 10.2	10.2 marks	
APPLICATION Weighting of 20%.	20 divided 100 = 0.2 This gives knowledge criterion a mark of 0.2	To change the percentage of 59% into the marks	Multiply 59 by 0.2 = 11.8	11.8 marks	
ANALYSIS 20% Weighting of 20%.	20 divided 100 = 0.2 This gives knowledge criterion a mark of 0.2	To change the percentage of 59% into the marks	Multiply 59 by 0.2 = 11.8	11.8 marks	
EVALUATION 20% Weighting of 20%.	20 divided 100 = 0.2 This gives knowledge criterion a mark of 0.2	To change the percentage of 59% into the marks	Multiply 59 by 0.2 = 11.8	11.8 marks	

Table 1C: CNME Rubric: Example 2					
Criterion	70-100% Work of outstanding quality	60-69% Work of good quality	50-59% Satisfactory	40-49% (40% is a pass) Minimum standard of work	Less than 40% Insufficient standard of work
ORGANISATION - 10% Overall Presentation and academic language/writing (Sources and evidence) Literature sourcing and referencing adheres to the CCNME Referencing Guidelines.	Work planned with a clear structure. Content is logical and clearly developed. Theories/ aims/ objectives are clearly devised and formulated. Excellent use of literature, references and integration into work.	Work well-planned. Evidence of good structure with logical flow and minimal errors. Theories/ aims/ objectives are sufficiently developed and formulated. References with minimal errors.	Structure satisfactory. Some evidence of planning, structure, and content development. Theories/ aims/ objectives evident but lack clarity. Conclusion addressed but lacks accuracy. Satisfactory referencing needs to adhere to referencing guidelines.	Development of content is poor with minimum planning, structure, and definition of topic. Theories/ aims/ objectives are not clear. Minimum referencing.	Insufficient planning, structure, and definition of topic. Theories/ aims/ objectives are not stated. Assignment not logical. Insufficient referencing with non-adherence to required guidelines.
KNOWLEDGE - 15% Constructing meaning from oral, written, and graphic messages through interpreting, exemplifying, classifying, summarizing, inferring, comparing, and explaining.	Quality of evidence is systematically discussed. Objectivity evident throughout. Effectively compares a variety of views. Conclusion is thorough and accurately summarises work.	Convincing arguments presented with robust supportive evidence. Demonstrates evidence of interpretation and summarization. Expresses own views and argues convincingly using supportive literature.	Satisfactory presentation of evidence. Demonstrates a willingness to question own views and explore alternative interpretations. Objectivity mainly achieved with intermittent subjective remarks evident.	Evidence of knowledge yet there is minimal relevance to reading and/or research. Frequent evidence of subjective views and arguments.	Insufficient breadth of knowledge and evidence not discussed. Inability to analyse or interpret new knowledge. Evidence presented does not question or explore alternative views.
COMPREHENSION – 15% Logical and consistent understanding of key concepts.	Key concepts explored, defined, and applied. Work of outstanding quality presented, excellent understanding, concise, accurate and well-articulated.	Work of good quality presented with evidence of the key concepts explored and defined.	Some of the key concepts are identified, explored and defined.	Limited concepts presented with inadequate explanation.	Concepts unclear. Incoherent and difficult to understand.

Criterion	70-100% Work of outstanding quality	60-69% Work of good quality	50-59% Satisfactory	40-49% (40% is a pass) Minimum standard of work	Less than 40% Insufficient standard of work
APPLICATION – 20% Accurate application of theoretical knowledge to practice.	Extremely relevant with the implementation of theoretical frameworks. Application of principles for practice evident throughout.	Content of good quality with identified theoretical frameworks and principles for practice explored and applied.	Satisfactory content with some evidence of application of theoretical frameworks and principles for practice. Mainly accurate with some inconsistencies evident.	Minimum content with little evidence of application to practice.	Insufficient content with little or no evidence of application to practice.
ANALYSIS – 20% Comprehensiveness Breadth and Depth of evidence.	Creative reasoning and critical analysis of alternatives approaches and theories evident throughout the work. The ability to construct and build a coherent argument. Comprehensive use of up-to-date literature. Excellent ability to critically evaluate the literature.	Strong reasoning revealed throughout work with breadth and depth of evidence demonstrated. Clear critical awareness of alternative approaches / theoretical frameworks identified.	Persuasive explanation, evidenced with relevant points identified. Demonstrated awareness of possible criticisms and limitations throughout work. Satisfactory analysis demonstrated.	Partial but inconsistent reasoning identified with limited evidence demonstrated throughout work. Limited critical analysis demonstrated.	Inability to analyse and interpret evidence. Significant omissions of relevant details. Unclear explanations given. No critical perspective evident.
EVALUATION – 20% Making judgments based on criteria and standards through checking and critiquing.	Clearly identifies strengths and weaknesses, integration of key concepts, and draws conclusion with insightful discussion of impact of the identified topic.	Effective evidence with key conclusions and integration of key concepts. Identification of strengths and weaknesses and draws a conclusion.	Evidence and results are interpreted and linked with the literature. Satisfactory identification of strengths and weaknesses and the drawn conclusions.	Evidence and results are presented but not in a logical manner. Limited attempt to identify strengths and weaknesses or draw conclusions.	Evidence and results are not identified in a logical manner. Limitations and weaknesses are not identified or discussed. Insufficient attempt to draw conclusions. Limited evidence throughout.

8.0 Reference List

Andrade, H. L. (2010) "Students as the definitive source of formative assessment: academic self-assessment and the self-regulation of learning," in Andrade, H. L. and Cizek, G. J. (eds.) *Handbook of Formative Assessment*. New York: Routledge, pp. 90–105.

Arter, J. A., and Chappuis, J. (2006) *Creating and Recognizing Quality Rubrics*. Boston: Pearson.

Bearman, M., and Ajjawi, R., (2018) 'From "seeing through" to "seeing with": Assessment criteria and the myths of transparency'. *Frontiers in Education*, 3(96). Available at <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2018.00096>

Brookhart, S. M. (2013) *How to Create and Use Rubrics for Formative Assessment and Grading*. Alexandria: ASCD.

Brookhart, S.M. (2018) 'Appropriate Criteria: Key to Effective Rubrics'. *Frontiers in Education*, 3(22). Available at <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2018.00022>

Falchikov, N., and Boud, D. (1989) 'Student self-assessment in higher education: a meta-analysis'. *Review of Educational Research*, 59, pp. 395–430. Available at <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543059004395>

Hattie, J., and Timperley, H. (2007) 'The power of feedback'. *Review of Educational Research*, 77, pp.81–112. Available at <https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487>

Huba, M. E., and Freed, J. E. (2000) *Learner-Centered Assessment on College Campuses: Shifting the Focus from Teaching to Learning*. Needham Heights: Allyn and Bacon.

Jonsson, A., and Svingby, G. (2007) 'The use of scoring rubrics: Reliability, validity and educational consequences'. *Educational Research Review*, 2, 130–144. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2007.05.002>

Jonsson, A. and Pandadero, E. (2022) 'A critical review of the arguments against the use of rubrics'. Paper delivered in the Symposium 'The Use of Rubrics – Benefits and Limitations of Transparency in Assessment'. *EARLI Joint SIG1 and SIG4 Conference*, Cadiz, Spain, June 28, 2022. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2020.100329>

Lipnevich, A.A., McCallen, L.N., Miles, K.P., and Smith, J.K. (2014) 'Mind the gap! Students' use of exemplars and detailed rubrics as formative assessment'. *Instructional Science*, 42(4), pp.539-559. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-013-9299-0>

O'Donovan, B., Price, M. and Rust, C. (2004) 'Know what I mean? Enhancing student understanding of assessment standards and criteria'. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 9(3), pp. 325-335. Available at <https://doi:10.1080/1356251042000216642>

Panadero, E., and Jonsson, A. (2013) 'The use of scoring rubrics for formative assessment purposes revisited: a review'. *Educational Research Review* 9, pp.129–144. Available at <https://doi:10.1016/j.edurev.2013.01.002>

Popham, W. J. (1997) "What's Wrong—And What's Right—With Rubrics." *Educational Leadership*, 55(2), pp. 72–75. Available at <https://ascd.org/el/articles/whats-wrong-and-whats-right-with-rubrics>

Ragupathi, K., and Lee, A. (2022) 'Beyond fairness and consistency in grading: The role of rubrics in higher education' in Sanger, C.S. and Gleeson N.W. (eds.) *Diversity and Inclusion in Global Higher Education: Lessons from Across Asia*. Editors Palgrave Macmillan, pp.73-95. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-15-1628-3>

Sambell, K. and Brown, S. (2022) *Using Rubrics to Promote Learning. A Maynooth University 'Assess for Success' Guide*. Maynooth: Maynooth University.

University of Reading (2018) *Guidance on how to design and use rubrics*. Academic Development and Enhancement Team. Reading: University of Reading: