

Example Rubrics for Peer Assessment Tool

Analytic Paper Rubric

A rubric for peer assessment of another's paper, or a self-assessment of a paper. *(Adapted from "Grading Rubric for Written Assignments" by South Nazarene University and from "Research Paper Rubric" by Rutgers University.)*

| Criteria | Exemplary (above average) | Satisfactory (average) | Needs Improvement (below average) |
|--------------------------------|---|---|--|
| Introduction/Thesis | Well-developed and clear thesis statement providing a focus for the paper. Introduction is engaging and thought-provoking. | Thesis statement is clear and focused. Introduction is interesting and provides direction for the rest of the paper | Thesis statement is not well-defined or focused. Introduction is weak and does not focus the rest of the paper |
| | 3 points | 2 points | 1 point |
| Organization | Writing shows clear organization with logical arrangement of ideas. Smooth flow ideas between paragraphs with connection to the central thesis. | Writing is coherent and logically organized with transitions used consistently throughout writing. Flow of ideas across writing is present. | Writing lacks logical organization and/or coherence. Lack of overall flow of ideas across writing. |
| | 3 points | 2 points | 1 point |
| Content Knowledge | Content is well-researched and indicates strong understanding of issues and synthesis of ideas. Evidences original thought and support for the topic. | Content is fairly well-researched. Indicates a good understanding of the issues and ideas are presented with sufficient evidence. | Content needs to be more researched and the ideas as presented demonstrates a lack of understanding of the issues. |
| | 3 points | 2 points | 1 point |
| Development/ Analysis | Main points are well- developed with high quality supporting details. Reveals high degree of critical thinking and in-depth analysis of the issues presented. | Main points are well- developed with quality supporting details. Some evidence of critical thinking and analysis is weaved into the points presented. | Main points lack detailed development. Ideas are vague with little evidence of critical thinking and analysis. |
| | 3 points | 2 points | 1 point |
| Grammar & Mechanics | Writing is free of distracting spelling, punctuation, and grammatical errors. Writing is professional and clarity of thought is present. | Writing has few spelling, punctuation, and grammatical errors allowing reader to follow ideas clearly. | Spelling, punctuation, and grammatical errors create distraction, making reading difficult. |
| | 3 points | 2 points | 1 point |
| Format & References | Meets all format and assignment requirements and evidences attention to detail. | Meets minimal format and assignment requirements. | Fails to follow format and assignment requirements. |
| | 3 points | 2 points | 1 point |

Analytic Presentation Rubric

A rubric for peer assessment of another presentation, or a self-assessment of a presentation. *(Adapted from "Grading Rubric for Written Assignments" by South Nazarene University and "Rubric for Formal Oral Communication in a Graduate Program" by California State University, Fresno.)*

| Criteria | Exemplary (above average) | Satisfactory (average) | Needs Improvement (below average) |
|--------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Organization | Presentation shows clear organization and high degree of attention to the logical sequencing of ideas. Establishes a good framework for the entire presentation. | Presentation is coherent and logically organized. Some ideas are not well-woven into the overall framework. | Presentation lacks logical organization and/or coherence. Lacks a strong framework for the presentation leading to some confusion about the ideas presented. |
| | 3 points | 2 points | 1 point |
| Content Knowledge | Content indicates synthesis of ideas, in-depth analysis and evidences original thought and support for the topic. Key concepts and theories are well-covered. | Content indicates original thinking and development of ideas with sufficient and firm evidence. Key concepts and theories are sufficiently covered. | Shows some original thinking and reasoning but most ideas are underdeveloped and unoriginal. Key concepts and ideas are not fully developed. |
| | 3 points | 2 points | 1 point |
| Development/ Analysis | Main points are well-developed with high quality and quantity support. Reveals high degree of critical thinking. Level of presentation is appropriate for the identified audience. | Main points are well developed with quality supporting details and quantity. Critical thinking is weaved into points. Level of presentation is generally appropriate for a wide audience. | Main points lack detailed development. Ideas are vague with little evidence of critical thinking. Level of presentation is inappropriate (either too elementary or too sophisticated) for the identified audience. |
| | 3 points | 2 points | 1 point |
| Grammar & Mechanics | Presentation is free of distracting spelling, punctuation, and grammatical errors. Lends to the smooth flow of ideas and capturing the essence of the presentation. | Presentation has few spelling, punctuation, and grammatical errors allowing reader to follow ideas clearly. | Spelling, punctuation, and grammatical errors create distraction, making listening and comprehending difficult. |
| | 3 points | 2 points | 1 point |
| Style | Shows outstanding style; rhetorical devices and tone used effectively; creative use of language, sentence structure and coordination. | Tone is appropriate and rhetorical devices used to enhance content; effective use of language, sentence structure, and composition. | Approaches appropriate usage of some variety in sentence patterns, diction, and rhetorical devices. Composition and/or word choice is inappropriate and/or distracting to content. |
| | 3 points | 2 points | 1 point |
| Format | Meets all formal and assignment requirements and evidences attention to detail. | Meets minimum format and assignment requirements. | Fails to follow format and assignment requirements. |
| | 3 points | 2 points | 1 point |

| | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|--|
| Delivery & Visual Aids | Presentation was well-paced and speakers are clearly comfortable in front of the audience and can be heard by all. Visual aids are effective and not distracting. Makes eye contact with the audience. Creative use of language and sentence structure. | Pacing is sometimes too fast or slow. The speakers seem slightly uncomfortable at times, and the audience occasionally has trouble hearing some of the speakers. Overall good use of visual aids. Makes eye contact with the audience most of the time. | Speakers seem uncomfortable and can be heard only if audience is very attentive. Much of the information presented is read with speakers making little or no eye contact with the audience. Visual aids are not effectively used to capture the essence of the presentation. |
| | 3 points | 2 points | 1 point |

Analytic Individual Group Project Participation Rubric

A rubric for peer assessment of a group's project participation by a group member (individual assessment of another individual group member, or self-assessment). *(Adapted from a peer evaluation form developed at Johns Hopkins University (October, 2006).)*

Instructions: Please select the option that best reflects the extent to which each statement describes the group member you're evaluating.

| Criteria | Always | Most of the time | Sometimes | Never |
|--|----------|------------------|-----------|----------|
| Attends group meetings regularly and arrives on time. | Always | Most of the time | Sometimes | Never |
| | 3 points | 2 points | 1 point | 0 points |
| Contributes meaningfully to group discussions. | Always | Most of the time | Sometimes | Never |
| | 3 points | 2 points | 1 point | 0 points |
| Completes group assignments on time. | Always | Most of the time | Sometimes | Never |
| | 3 points | 2 points | 1 point | 0 points |
| Prepares work in a quality manner. | Always | Most of the time | Sometimes | Never |
| | 3 points | 2 points | 1 point | 0 points |

| | | | | |
|---|----------|------------------|-----------|----------|
| Demonstrates a cooperative and supportive attitude. | Always | Most of the time | Sometimes | Never |
| | 3 points | 2 points | 1 point | 0 points |
| Contributes significantly to the success of the project. | Always | Most of the time | Sometimes | Never |
| | 3 points | 2 points | 1 point | 0 points |
| Demonstrates energy and enthusiasm. | Always | Most of the time | Sometimes | Never |
| | 3 points | 2 points | 1 point | 0 points |

Analytic Group Project Process Rubric

A rubric for peer assessment of a group's project process by a group member (individual assessment of a group unit). *(Adapted from Watson, W.E. & Michaelsen, L.K. (1988). Group interaction behaviors that affect performance on an intellectual task. Group and Organizational Studies. 13 (4), 495-516.)*

Instructions: Please select the option that best reflects the extent to which each statement describes your group.

| Criteria | Always | Most of the time | Sometimes | Never |
|--|---------------|-------------------------|------------------|--------------|
| We work together. | Always | Most of the time | Sometimes | Never |
| | 3 points | 2 points | 1 point | 0 points |
| Some group members take our work too lightly. | Always | Most of the time | Sometimes | Never |
| | 3 points | 2 points | 1 point | 0 points |
| We share high performance expectations. | Always | Most of the time | Sometimes | Never |
| | 3 points | 2 points | 1 point | 0 points |

| | | | | |
|---|----------|------------------|-----------|----------|
| Some group members do not share good ideas out of fear of what others might think. | Always | Most of the time | Sometimes | Never |
| | 3 points | 2 points | 1 point | 0 points |
| Some group members act like they know everything. | Always | Most of the time | Sometimes | Never |
| | 3 points | 2 points | 1 point | 0 points |
| One or two group members dominate discussions. | Always | Most of the time | Sometimes | Never |
| | 3 points | 2 points | 1 point | 0 points |
| We listen to each others' input. | Always | Most of the time | Sometimes | Never |
| | 3 points | 2 points | 1 point | 0 points |
| An atmosphere of trust exists in our group. | Always | Most of the time | Sometimes | Never |
| | 3 points | 2 points | 1 point | 0 points |
| We know what our responsibilities are. | Always | Most of the time | Sometimes | Never |
| | 3 points | 2 points | 1 point | 0 points |
| We are comfortable in the roles we play within the group. | Always | Most of the time | Sometimes | Never |
| | 3 points | 2 points | 1 point | 0 points |
| Group members feel free to give and receive both positive and negative feedback. | Always | Most of the time | Sometimes | Never |
| | 3 points | 2 points | 1 point | 0 points |

Analytic Critical Thinking Rubric

A rubric for assessing an individual's demonstration of learning. *(Adapted from "NEIU Critical Thinking Rubric" (revised on 10/23/06) and Washington State University's "Critical Thinking Project".)*

| Criteria | Exemplary | Proficient | Developing | No/Limited Proficiency |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| Identifies & explains Issues | Clearly identifies, summarizes, and explains main issues and identifies embedded or implicit issues, addressing their relationships to each other. | Identifies, summarizes, and briefly explains the main issues, but fails to mention any implicit issues. | Identifies main issues but does not summarize or explain them clearly or sufficiently. | Fails to identify, summarize, or explain the main problem or question. AND/OR Represents the issues inaccurately or inappropriately. |
| | 4 points | 3 points | 2 points | 1 point |
| Recognizes stakeholders and Contexts (i.e., cultural/social, educational, technological, political, scientific, economic, ethical, personal experience) | Correctly identifies the empirical and theoretical contexts relevant to the main stakeholders, and identifies minor stakeholders and contexts showing the tensions or conflicts of interest among them. | Correctly identifies the empirical and most theoretical contexts relevant to the main stakeholders. | Shows some general understanding of the influences of empirical and theoretical contexts on stakeholders, but does not identify any specific ones. | Fails to accurately identify and explain any empirical or theoretical contexts for the issues. OR Presents problems as having no connections to other conditions or contexts. |
| | 4 points | 3 points | 2 points | 1 point |
| Frames personal responses and acknowledges other perspectives | Formulates a clear personal point of view and addresses relevant perspectives successfully. | Formulates a clear personal point of view and considers some other perspectives. | Formulates a vague personal point of view and/or vague alternative points of view. | Fails to formulate a personal point of view and fails to consider other perspectives. |
| | 4 points | 3 points | 2 points | 1 point |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| Identifies & evaluates assumptions | Identifies and carefully evaluates the important assumptions. | Identifies and briefly evaluates the important assumptions. | Identifies some of the most important assumptions, but does not evaluate them for plausibility or clarity. | Fails to identify and evaluate any of the important assumptions behind the claims and recommendations made. |
| | 4 points | 3 points | 2 points | 1 point |
| Identifies & evaluates evidence | Correctly identifies and rigorously evaluates important evidence, successfully linking the evidence to theoretical concepts and frameworks while providing new or alternative data or information for consideration. | Correctly identifies important evidence, highlights its relative importance, and makes an attempt at linking evidence to theoretical concepts and frameworks. | Correctly identifies data and information that counts as evidence but fails to highlight its relative importance and/or link them with theoretical concepts and frameworks. | Fails to correctly identify data and information that counts as evidence for truth-claims AND/OR fails to evaluate its credibility. |
| | 4 points | 3 points | 2 points | 1 point |
| Identifies & evaluates implications <i>("What does this mean?")</i> | Identifies and thoroughly evaluates implications, conclusions, or consequences of the issue. | Identifies and briefly evaluates many implications, conclusions, or consequences of the issue. | Suggests some implications, conclusions, or consequences of the issue. | Fails to identify implications, conclusions, or consequences of the issue. |
| | 4 points | 3 points | 2 points | 1 point |

Holistic Paper Rubric

A rubric for peer assessment of another's paper, or a self-assessment of a paper. *(Adapted from "Grading Rubric for Written Assignments" by South Nazarene University and from "Research Paper Rubric" by Rutgers University.)*

| Criteria | Exemplary (above average) | Satisfactory (average) | Needs Improvement (below average) |
|--------------|---|---|--|
| Paper | Well-developed and clear thesis statement providing a focus for the paper. Displays a logical organization of ideas. Content is well-researched with a strong understanding of the issues and | Thesis statement is clear and focused. Displays a logical organization of ideas. Content is fairly well-researched with understanding of the issues and synthesis of ideas. Writing has few grammatical and | Thesis statement is not well-defined or focused. Lack of a clear organization of ideas. Content needs to be better researched and the ideas as presented demonstrates a lack of understanding of the issues. |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| | synthesis of ideas. Writing is free of grammatical and spelling errors. Displays clarity of thought. | spelling errors allowing readers to follow ideas clearly. | Grammatical and spelling errors create a distraction, making reading difficult. |
| | 3 points | 2 points | 1 point |

Holistic Presentation Rubric

A rubric for peer assessment of another's presentation, or a self-assessment of a presentation. *(Adapted from "Grading Rubric for Written Assignments" by South Nazarene University, "Rubric for Formal Oral Communication in a Graduate Program" by California State University, Fresno and from "Research Paper Rubric" by Rutgers University).*

| Criteria | Exemplary (above average) | Satisfactory (average) | Needs Improvement (below average) |
|--------------|---|--|---|
| Presentation | Presentation shows clear organization and high degree of attention to the logical sequencing of ideas. Content indicates synthesis of ideas with key concepts well-covered. Main points are well-developed revealing a high degree of critical thinking. Presentation is free of distracting spelling and grammatical errors and meets all assignment requirements. Presentation was well-paced and speakers are clearly comfortable in front of the audience and can be heard by all. Visual aids are effective and not distracting. Makes eye contact with the audience. Creative use of language and sentence structure. | Presentation is coherent and logically organized. Content indicates synthesis of ideas with key concepts sufficiently covered. Main points are well-developed displaying some degree of critical thinking. Presentation has few distracting spelling and grammatical errors and meets all assignment requirements. Pacing is sometimes not even. The speakers seem slightly uncomfortable at times, and the audience occasionally has trouble hearing some of the speakers. Overall good use of visual aids. Makes eye contact with the audience most of the time. | Presentation lacks logical organization and/or coherence. Content displays a lack of synthesis of ideas and key concepts are not fully developed. Main points lack detailed development with sparse reasoning and critical thinking. Spelling, punctuation, and grammatical errors create distraction, making listening and comprehending difficult. Fails to follow assignment requirements. Speakers seem uncomfortable and can be heard only if audience is very attentive. Little or no eye contact with the audience. Visual aids are not effectively used to capture the essence of the presentation. |
| | 3 points | 2 points | 1 point |

Holistic Individual Group Project Participation Rubric

A rubric for peer assessment of a group's project participation by a group member (individual assessment of another individual group member, or self-assessment). *(Adapted from a peer evaluation form developed at Johns Hopkins University (October, 2006).)*

Instructions: Please select the option that best reflects the extent to which each statement describes the indicated group member.

| Criteria | Always | Most of the time | Sometimes | Never |
|---|----------|------------------|-----------|----------|
| Demonstrates a cooperative and enthusiastic attitude by attending group meetings regularly, contributing to group discussions, and completing quality work on time. | Always | Most of the time | Sometimes | Never |
| | 3 points | 2 points | 1 point | 0 points |

Holistic Group Project Process Rubric

A rubric for peer assessment of a group's project process by a group member (individual assessment of a group unit). *(Adapted from Watson, W.E. & Michaelsen, L.K. (1988). Group interaction behaviors that affect performance on an intellectual task. Group and Organizational Studies. 13 (4), 495-516.)*

Instructions: Please select the option that best reflects the extent to which each statement describes your group.

| Criteria | Always | Most of the time | Sometimes | Never |
|---|----------|------------------|-----------|----------|
| We work together enthusiastically to complete quality work through setting shared expectations, sharing balanced workloads, and giving and receiving constructive feedback. | Always | Most of the time | Sometimes | Never |
| | 3 points | 2 points | 1 point | 0 points |

Holistic Critical Thinking Rubric

A rubric for assessing an individual's demonstration of learning. *(Adapted from Portland State University Studies Program Stevens, D. D., & Levi, A. J. (2005). Introduction to Rubrics. Sterling, VA: Stylus, pp. 122-123.)*

| Criteria | Exemplary | Advanced Proficiency | Proficient | Developing | Needs Development | No/Limited Proficiency |
|----------------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Demonstration of Learning | Consistently does all or almost all of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accurately interprets evidence, | Does most the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accurately interprets evidence, | Does most the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describes events, people, and places with some supporting | Does most of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Respond by retelling or graphically showing events or facts. | Does most the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Misinterprets evidence, statements, graphics, questions, etc. | Consistently does all or almost all of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Offers biased interpretations of |

| | | | | | | |
|----------|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| | <p>statements, graphics, questions, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies the salient arguments (reasons and claims) pro and con. • Thoughtfully analyzes and evaluates major alternative points of view. • Generates alternative explanations of phenomena or event. • Justifies key results and procedures, explains assumptions and reasons. • Fair-mindedly follows where evidence and reasons lead. • Makes ethical judgments. | <p>statements, graphics, questions, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thinks through issues by identifying relevant arguments (reasons and claims) pro and con. • Offers analysis and evaluation of obvious alternative points of view. • Generates alternative explanations of phenomena or event. • Justifies (by using) some results or procedures, explains reasons. • Fair-mindedly follows where evidence and reasons lead. | <p>details from the source.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make connections to sources, either personal or analytic. • Demonstrates a basic ability to analyze, interpret, and formulate inferences. • States or briefly includes more than one perspective in discussing literature, experiences, and points of view of others. • Takes some risks by occasionally questioning sources or by stating interpretations and predictions. • Demonstrates little evidence of rethinking or refinement of one's own perspective. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Makes personal connections or identifies connections within or between sources in a limited way. Is beginning to use appropriate evidence to back ideas. • Discusses literature, experiences, and points of view of others in terms of own experience. • Responds to sources at factual or literal level. • Includes little or no evidence of refinement of initial response or shift in dualistic thinking. • Demonstrates difficulty with organization and thinking is uneven. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fails to identify strong, relevant counter arguments. • Draws unwarranted or fallacious conclusions. • Justifies few results or procedures, seldom explains reasons. • Regardless of the evidence or reasons, maintains or defends views based on self-interest or preconceptions. | <p>evidence, statements, graphics, questions, information, or the</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • points of view of others. • Fails to identify or hastily dismisses strong, relevant counterarguments. • Ignores or superficially evaluates obvious alternative points of view. Argues using fallacious • or irrelevant reasons and unwarranted claims. • Does not justify results or procedures, nor explain reasons. • Exhibits close-mindedness or hostility to reason. |
| 6 points | 5 points | 4 points | 3 points | 2 points | 1 point | |