

## **DO's and DON'T's of Designing Scoring Rubrics**

Assessment descriptions need to provide enough information about the assessment activity(ies) that reviewers can clearly see the behavioral expectations of candidates. Specific instructions to candidates should detail the component parts on which the assessment will be judged. Cross-reference the component parts with specific ELCC standard elements (e.g., 3.2 or 4.1)

Scoring guide rubrics should show clear measures for tracking candidate progress towards achieving mastery of specific ELCC standard elements and other assessment components outlined in the assessment description.

Assessment scoring rubric columns should not be too vague or leave much opportunity for broad interpretation. The first column of the rubrics should list the assessment component parts outlined in the description of the assessment. Then, criteria measures should be listed within each of the different levels (e.g., “Target” or “Proficient”) to show how each level of performance expectation will be determined. Some of these criteria measures should align to specific ELCC standard sub-elements (e.g., 3.2 a, b, c).

Since one of the purposes of rubrics is to measure how well candidates are performing on a particular standard element (e.g., 2.4 not 2.4a) you may think about grouping criteria measure expectations outlined in the standard sub-elements together into one performance expectation for an element (e.g., 4.3 a, b, c instead of 4.3 a or 4.3 c).

**DO NOT GROUP** standard elements together into one performance measure (e.g., Standard 1.0, 2.0, or 4.1, 3.2, 2.1, 5.1, etc.) as it is impossible to determine how well a candidate is achieving mastery on any one standard element (e.g., 2.2 versus 4.1).

There may be other performance measures (e.g., level of writing, quality of research, etc.) that have nothing to do with the ELCC standards but should none the less be included in a scoring rubric as they are component parts of a particular assessment. These should be listed as separate performance measures. This will tie the scoring rubric with the activity outlined in the assessment description.

Aggregated data results will need to be tabulated and collected on the criteria measures that relate to specific ELCC standard elements (e.g., 4.1 or 3.2, etc.).

**For Example: Scoring Guide Rubric                      Levels of Quality Definition**

Assignment Performance Measure	“Target” Definition 4 points (equals A)	“Proficient” Definition 3 points (equals B)
List assignment expectation that would align to standard – not the standard itself. (ELCC Standard 3.2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· criteria measure (3.2a)</li> <li>· criteria measure (3.2b)</li> <li>· criteria measure (3.3c)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· criteria measure (3.2a)</li> <li>· criteria measure (3.2c)</li> </ul>
Quality of Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· criteria measure</li> <li>· criteria measure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· criteria measure</li> </ul>
Level of Writing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· criteria measure</li> <li>· criteria measure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· criteria measure</li> </ul>

**Resources:** Please see “Scoring rubric development: validity and reliability.” Moskal, Barbara M. & Jon A. Leydens at <http://pareonline.net/getvn.asp?v=7&n=10> and “Scoring rubrics: What, when, and how?” Moskal, B.M. (2000). *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 7(3) [online: <http://pareonline.net/getvn.asp?v=7&n=3>]. Also, Stiggins, R.J. (1999) “Evaluating classroom assessment training in teacher education programs.” *Educational Measurements: Issues and Practice*, 18(1), 23-27 and Knecht, R., Moskal, B. & Pavelich, M. (2000). *The Design Report Rubric: Measuring and Tracking Growth through Success*. Proceedings of the Annual Meeting American Society