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**Table 3.2.** Course Evaluation Blueprint Example

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective** | **Exam** | **Participation** | **Presentation**  | **Project/Paper** | **Other** |
| Objective 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Objective 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Objective 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Objective 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Objective 5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Objective 6 |  |  |  |  |  |

Form 3.1: Peer Evaluation

Group Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Student Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

This peer evaluation will allow you to evaluate the quality of each group member’s contribution to the completion of a group assignment. Please evaluate your peers’ performance and quality of work by writing in the number that best describes how well each member participated in this group activity. Please use the following rating system:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 0 | Frequently not present for planning sessions OR did not contribute effectively OR was counterproductive to the work of the group |
| 1 | Contributions were less than most other members of the group |
| 2 | Contributions were equal to most other members of the group |
| 3 | Contributions exceeded other members of the group |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Names** | **Self** | **Name** | **Name** | **Name** | **Name** |
| 1. Participated in describing the work to be accomplished. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Participated in decision making related to the group work. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Contributed quality content to the group work product. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Completed assignments by specified deadlines. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. Worked collaboratively and collegially with other group members. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. Exhibited professional behaviors (i.e., prompt, courteous, constructive, and respectful) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Comments to substantiate high or low scores and identification of students’ major contribution. |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Table 4.1.** An Analytic Rubric for an Evidence-Based Practice Project Paper

| **Criterion (Points Possible)** | **Does Not Meet Expectation** | **Nearly Meets Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Score and Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **≤ 3.5** | **3.5** | **4** | **5** |  |
| APA (5)Title page, headings, citations, reference page, font, layout, margins | Major problems with implementation of APA in title page, headings, citations, and/or reference page. Font, layout, and/or margins do not adhere to APA format. | Missing 3–5 APA elements in title page, headings, citations, reference page, font, layout, and/or margins. | Missing 1–2 APA elements in title page, headings, citations, reference page, font, layout, and/or margins. | Fulfills APA criteria in title page, headings, citations, and/or reference page. Font, layout, and/or margins adhere to APA format. |  |
|  | **≤ 3.5** | **3.5** | **4** | **5** |  |
| Introduction and Conclusion (5) | Incomplete or unfocused purpose statement. There is no clear introduction of the main topic and/or the structure of the paper is missing and/or there is no summary in the conclusion.  | The introduction states the purpose but does not adequately preview the structure of the paper. The conclusion is not effective in summarizing the contents of the paper. | The introduction clearly states the paper’s purpose in a single sentence. The introduction states the main topic and previews the structure of the paper. The conclusion summarizes the contents of the paper. | The introduction clearly and concisely states the paper’s purpose in a single sentence that is engaging and thought provoking. The introduction states the main topic and previews the structure of the paper. The conclusion effectively summarizes the contents of the paper. |  |
|  | **≤ 3.5** | **3.5** | **4** | **5** |  |
| Body: PICOT (5) | The clinical question is not in PICOT format. The elements of the question are not operationally defined or described.  | The clinical question is not in PICOT format and/or the operational definitions/descriptions are poorly developed or confusing.  | The PICOT question is succinctly stated but operational definitions/descriptions of the elements of the question are poorly developed.  | PICOT question is succinctly stated and includes operational definitions/thorough descriptions of unique qualities of the population, description of the intervention being evaluated and the comparison, and the expected outcome(s) being evaluated. Timing is included if appropriate.  |  |
|  | **≤ 7** | **8** | **9** | **10** |  |
| Body: Significance of the problem (10) | The significance of the problem is not developed through the use of current, scientific evidence. No discussion of legal, ethical, quality, or safety implications. | The significance of the problem is minimally developed with few current scientific references related to incidence and significance. Minimal or no discussion of legal, ethical, quality, or safety implications. | The significance of the problem is developed with information regarding incidence supported by current, scientific evidence. There is limited description of impact on patient/family, health care providers, institution, and health care system. Discussion of legal, ethical, quality, and safety implications is present but limited.  | The significance of the problem is established through current scientific evidence regarding incidence and descriptions of the impact on patient/family, health care providers, institution, and health care system. There is a thorough discussion of legal and ethical implications as well as discussion of the impact on quality or safety. |  |
|  | **≤ 7** | **8** | **9** | **10** |  |
| Body: Search strategy and results (10) | The search strategy is poorly described. There is no explanation of the logic for this process. Poor description of the search results; reasons for exclusion of articles from pool of articles found not described. | The search strategy is incompletely described with omission of search words/terms, databases used, and/or inclusion and exclusion criteria. Explanation of the logic for this process is limited. The description of the search results including number and type of articles found through each database and reasons for exclusion of articles from pool of articles found described but limited. | The search strategy is described including search words/terms used, databases used, inclusion and exclusion criteria. Explanation of the logic for this process is brief. There is a description of the search results including number and type of articles found through each database and reasons for exclusion of articles from pool of articles found is described. | The search strategy is thoroughly described including search words/terms used, databases used, inclusion and exclusion criteria and thorough explanation of the logic for this process. There is a thorough description of the search results including number and type of articles found through each database and reasons for exclusion of articles from pool of articles found is described. |  |
|  | **≤ 10** | **11–12** | **13–14** | **15** |  |
| Body: Critical appraisal of the literature (15) | The summary lists existing evidence related to the PICOT question but does not address the quantity, quality, or consistency of the evidence. | The summary of the existing evidence related to PICOT question that addresses the number and type of studies but poor attention to the quality of the studies. | There is a summary of the existing evidence related to PICOT question that addresses the quantity, quality, and consistency of the evidence. | There is an exemplary summary of the existing evidence related to the PICOT with attention to the strength of the evidence (quality, quantity, consistency). |  |
|  | **≤ 3.5** | **3.5** | **4** | **5** |  |
| Body: Summary statement (5) | There is a brief and/or noncohesive narrative summary of the evidence. There is no conclusive statement of the results of the systematic review or the statement does not answer the PICOT question.  | The narrative summary of the evidence includes a conclusive statement of the results of the systematic review and does answer the PICOT question but the conclusive statement is not based on the highest level of evidence found. | The narrative summary of the evidence includes a conclusive statement of the results of the systematic review that answers the PICOT question with more weight given to research evidence. | The narrative summary of the evidence is succinct and includes a logical conclusive statement of the results of the systematic review. The summary statement answers the PICOT question with more weight given to research evidence.  |  |
|  | **≤ 7** | **8** | **9** | **10** |  |
| Body: Clinical recommendations (10) | There is no clear description of a clinical recommendation or proposed practice change or there is no linkage between the proposed practice change and the presented summary. | There is a limited description of the clinical recommendation and proposed practice change; the proposed practice change is not supported by the presented evidence summary.  | This is a description of the clinical recommendation and the proposed practice change and it flows logically from the evidence presented.  | This is a clear and complete description of the clinical recommendation and the proposed practice change and it flows logically from the evidence presented.  |  |
|  | **≤ 7** | **8** | **9** | **10** |  |
| Body: Planned change process (10) | There is no identification of a change model. There is little or no discussion of barriers and facilitators of change or evaluation process. | The choice of change model is illogical in relation to the recommended change process. The model is not used to describe recommended steps in planned change process. There is limited discussion of the barriers and facilitators of change or the evaluation process. | The choice of change model is logical in relation to recommended change process. The change model is used to describe the recommended steps in the planned change process. There is a discussion of barriers and facilitators of change and evaluation process. | The choice of change model is logical in relation to recommended change process. The change model is used to describe the recommended steps in the planned change process and the steps are specific to the setting/institution in which the change is planned. There is an extensive discussion of barriers and facilitators of change that are specific to the change setting/institution. There is a description of criteria for evaluation and process for evaluation. |  |
|  | **≤ 10** | **11–12** | **13–14** | **15** |  |
| Appendix: Evidence table (15) | Includes fewer than 8 articles; articles are poorly evaluated and summarized and most are incorrectly graded. Grading scale is not described and/or referenced. | Includes at least 8 articles with at least 6 of them primary research articles; articles are briefly evaluated and summarized and most are correctly graded. Grading scale is described and referenced. | Includes at least 10 articles with at least 8 primary research articles; all articles are satisfactorily evaluated and summarized and correctly graded. Grading scale is described and referenced. | Includes 10–15 articles with at least 10 primary research articles; all articles are thoroughly evaluated and summarized and correctly graded. Grading scale is described and referenced. |  |
|  | **≤ 3.5** | **3.5** | **4** | **5** |  |
| Mechanics/usage (5) | Numerous and distracting errors in punctuation, capitalization, spelling, sentence structure and word usage.  | Many errors in punctuation, capitalization, spelling, sentence structure and word usage.  | Almost no errors in punctuation, capitalization, spelling, sentence structure and word usage.  | No errors in punctuation, capitalization and spelling. No errors in sentence structure or word usage.  |  |
| **Total points possible: 100** | **Score and summary comments:** |

**Table 4.3.** Weighting of Criteria

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criterion** | **Weight or Percentage for This Criterion** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| Total Points: | 100% |

**Table 4.4.** Rubric Template

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion** | **Does Not Meet Expectations** | **Nearly MeetsExpectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Student Points for This Criterion** |
| \_\_\_\_ (Number of points possible for this criterion) | < \_\_ points (≤ 70% of points for this criterion) | \_\_ – \_\_ points (71%–80% of points for this criterion) | \_\_ – \_\_ points (81%–90% of points for this criterion) | \_\_ – \_\_ points (91%–100% of points for this criterion) |  |
|  | Description of unacceptable demonstration of achievement of the criterion | Description of marginally acceptable demonstration of achievement of the criterion | Description of good but not exceptional demonstration of achievement of the criterion | Description of exemplary demonstration of achievement of the criterion |  |
| \_\_\_\_ (Number of points possible for this criterion) | < \_\_ points (≤ 70% of points for this criterion) | \_\_ – \_\_ points (71%–80% of points for this criterion) | \_\_ – \_\_ points (81%–90% of points for this criterion) | \_\_ – \_\_ points (91%–100% of points for this criterion) |  |
|  | Description of unacceptable demonstration of achievement of the criterion | Description of marginally acceptable demonstration of achievement of the criterion | Description of acceptable but not exceptional demonstration of achievement of the criterion | Description of exemplary demonstration of achievement of the criterion |  |
| \_\_\_\_\_ (Number of points possible for this criterion) | < \_\_ points (≤ 70% of points for this criterion) | \_\_ – \_\_ points (71%–80% of points for this criterion) | \_\_-\_\_ points (81%–90% of points for this criterion) | \_\_-\_\_ points (91%–100% of points for this criterion) |  |
|  | Description of unacceptable demonstration of achievement of the criterion | Description of marginally acceptable demonstration of achievement of the criterion | Description of acceptable but not exceptional demonstration of achievement of the criterion | Description of exemplary demonstration of achievement of the criterion |  |
| \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (Number of points possible for this criterion) | < \_\_ points (≤ 70% of points for this criterion) | \_\_-\_\_ points (71%–80% of points for this criterion) | \_\_-\_\_ points (81%–90% of points for this criterion) | \_\_-\_\_ points (91%–100% of points for this criterion) |  |
|  | Description of unacceptable demonstration of achievement of the criterion | Description of marginally acceptable demonstration of achievement of the criterion | Description of acceptable but not exceptional demonstration of achievement of the criterion | Description of exemplary demonstration of achievement of the criterion |  |
| \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (Number of points possible for this criterion) | < \_\_ points (≤ 70% of points for this criterion) | \_\_-\_\_ points (71%–80% of points for this criterion) | \_\_-\_\_ points (81%–90% of points for this criterion) | \_\_-\_\_ points (91%–100% of points for this criterion) |  |
|  | Description of unacceptable demonstration of achievement of the criterion | Description of marginally acceptable demonstration of achievement of the criterion | Description of acceptable but not exceptional demonstration of achievement of the criterion | Description of exemplary demonstration of achievement of the criterion |  |
| \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (Number of points possible for this criterion) | < \_\_ points (≤ 70% of points for this criterion) | \_\_-\_\_ points (71%–80% of points for this criterion) | \_\_-\_\_ points (81%–90% of points for this criterion) | \_\_-\_\_ points (91%–100% of points for this criterion) |  |
|  | Description of unacceptable demonstration of achievement of the criterion | Description of marginally acceptable demonstration of achievement of the criterion | Description of acceptable but not exceptional demonstration of achievement of the criterion | Description of exemplary demonstration of achievement of the criterion |  |
| **Total points possible: 100** | **Score and summary comments:** |

**Table 6.3.** Modifiable Scoring Rubric for a Paper Assignment

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criterion (Points Possible) | Does Not Meet Expectation | Nearly Meets Expectations | Meets Expectations | Exceeds Expectations | Score and Comments |
|  | **≤ 7** | **8** | **9** | **10** |  |
| APA (10)Title pageHeadingsCitations (if references required)Reference page (if references required)Font, layout, margins | Major problems with implementation of APA style in title page, headings, citations, and/or reference page. Font, layout, and/or margins do not adhere to APA format, which affect overall flow and readability of the paper. | Several errors in title page, headings, citations, reference page, font, layout, and/or margins that are minimal distractions but do not affect overall flow and readability of the paper. | Minimal APA errors in title page, headings, citations, reference page, font, layout, and/or margins that do not distract from the content or readability of the paper.  | Consistent adherence to APA criteria in title page, headings, citations, and/or reference page. Font, layout, and/or margins adhere to APA format. |  |
|  | **< 3.5** | **3.5** | **4** | **5** |  |
| Introduction (5) | Incomplete or unfocused purpose statement. There is no clear introduction of main topic and/or the structure of the paper is missing.  | The introduction does state the paper’s purpose but is convoluted and not engaging. The introduction does not clearly state the topic or preview the structure and content of the paper. | The introduction states the paper’s purpose in a single sentence but fails to be engaging. The introduction states the main topic but does not adequately preview the structure of the paper. | The introduction clearly and concisely states the paper’s purpose in a single sentence that is engaging and thought provoking. The introduction clearly describes and states the main topic and previews the structure and content of the paper. |  |
|  | **< 3.5** | **3.5** | **4** | **5** |  |
| Organization/structure (5) | No evidence of structure or organization.Ideas are not fully developed. Minimal use of transitions throughout the paper. | Logical organization, but some ideas are not fully or consistently developed. Transitions are awkward at times but the flow is adequately maintained. | Writer demonstrates logical sequencing of ideas through well-developed paragraphs; transitions are typically used to enhance organization. | Writer demonstrates logical and subtle sequencing of ideas through well-developed paragraphs; transitions are used to enhance organization.  |  |
|  | **≤ 39** | **40–44** | **44–59** | **50–55** |  |
| Body of paper: required content includes \_\_\_\_\_ (55) | Much of required content is not developed and the state of clinical evidence is not addressed.  | Most required content is developed with background and the current state of the clinical evidence. | Required content is thoughtfully and systematically developed with background and the current state of the clinical evidence. | All required content is thoughtfully and systematically developed and relevant with background and the current state of the clinical evidence.  |  |
|  | **< 3.5** | **3.5** | **4** | **5** |  |
| Conclusion (5) | There is no conclusion. | The conclusion summarizes the contents of the paper. | The conclusion summarizes the contents of the paper but does not effectively summarize the significant conclusions in an interesting manner. | The conclusion reviews the main points of the paper and clearly and effectively summarizes significant conclusions in an interesting manner. |  |
|  | **≤ 7** | **8** | **9** | **10** |  |
| References (if required) (10) | Based on less than five nonresearch references; liberal use of .com websites  | Based on five to seven references with less than three research references and/or use of some .com websites. | Based on eight to ten references with at least three research references; only websites used were .org, .edu, or .gov. | Based on more than ten references with at least three research references; only websites used were .org, .edu, or .gov. |  |
|  | **≤ 7** | **8** | **9** | **10** |  |
| Mechanics/usage (10) | Numerous errors in punctuation, capitalization, spelling, sentence structure, or word usage with significant impact on the content and detracts from the paper. | Several errors in punctuation, capitalization, spelling, sentence structure, or word usage with minimal impact on or distraction from the content of the paper. | Few errors in punctuation, capitalization, spelling, sentence structure or word usage which do not impact or distract from the content of the paper. | No errors in punctuation, capitalization or spelling. No errors in sentence structure or word usage.  |  |
| Total points possible: 100 | **Score and summary comments:** |

**Table 7.2.** Modifiable Scoring Rubric for a Presentation Assignment

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criterion (Points Possible) | Does Not Meet Expectation | Nearly Meets Expectations | Meets Expectations | Exceeds Expectations | Score and Comments |
|  | **≤ 14** | **15–16** | **17–18** | **19–20** |  |
| Instructional Plan (20) (If Graduate Course) | Multiple weaknesses in instructional plan and objectives not achieved through presentation or instructional plan not submitted by deadline prior to presentation. | Multiple weaknesses in instructional plan or objectives not achieved through presentation. | Objectives not in learned-focused objective form or content outline brief, teaching-learning strategies not identified, evaluation method not identified, presentation was not consistent with plan, or objectives not achieved through presentation. | Objectives in proper form; appropriate content and teaching/learning strategies identified; appropriate evaluation method identified; presentation delivered as planned and objectives achieved. |  |
|  | **< 3.5** | **3.5** | **4** | **5** |  |
| Introduction (5) | Failed to greet audience or introduce self, or qualifications or reason for interest in topic. Did not identify objectives or areas to be discussed. | Failed to greet audience or introduce self, qualifications, or reason for interest in topic. Introduced topic and areas to be discussed but not in objective form. | Greeted the audience. Introduced self but did not identify qualifications or reason for interest. Reviewed objectives in learner-focused measurable form. | Greeted the audience. Introduced self and qualifications to speak on topic. Explained reason for interest in topic. Reviewed objectives listed in learner-focused measureable form. |  |
|  | **≤ 14** | **15–16** | **17–18** | **19–20** |  |
| Discussion of assigned topic with required content (20) (list required content here) | Discussion omitted more than one area of required content. Lack of even basic knowledge of topic evident through presentation and responses to questions. Presentation jumps from topic to topic and impossible to follow. | Discussion did include required content but superficial and/or several inaccuracies noted. Omission of at least one area of required content. Superficial knowledge of topic evident through presentation and responses to questions. Presentation is disorganized and difficult to follow. | Discussion of assigned topic with required content at appropriate depth and detail. Some minor inaccuracies noted. Knowledge of topic is evident through presentation and responses to questions. Presentation is organized. | Exemplary discussion of assigned topic with required content at appropriate depth, detail, and accuracy. Extensive knowledge of topic is clearly evident through presentation and responses to questions. Presentation is organized in an interesting and logical sequence. |  |
|  | **≤ 14** | **15–16** | **17–18** | **19–20** |  |
| Use of scientific evidence (20) | No discussion of the scientific evidence. References list fewer than five references. Multiple errors in APA citations and references. | Limited discussion of scientific evidence related to topic. References list includes at least five to seven references with fewer than three of these research studies. More than two errors in APA citations and references. | Good discussion of scientific evidence related to topic. Reference list includes at least eight references with at least three of these good quality research studies. No more than two errors in APA citations or references. | Exemplary discussion of the scientific evidence related to topic. Reference list includes at least 10 references with at least five good-quality research studies cited. No errors in APA citations or references. |  |
|  | **< 3.5** | **3.5** | **4** | **5** |  |
| Conclusion/summary (5) | No conclusion or summary. Did not invite questions. | Brief summary with no conclusion or recommendations. Did not invite questions. | Summary of what was discussed but no recommendations given. Invited questions. | Summary of what was discussed and conclusion with recommendations. Invited questions. |  |
|  | **≤ 7** | **8** | **9** | **10** |  |
| Verbal and nonverbal presentation (10) | Casual attire. Frequent pauses, lots of uhs, hmmms, or you knows, or monotone. Speech is too soft, too loud, too fast, or too slow. Limited vocabulary and frequent mispronunciations. Use of slang or profanity. Almost exclusively reading from slides or notes. Does not look at audience, move, or smile. Distracting mannerisms. More than 20% over time limit. | Casual attire. Hesitancy, some uhs, hmmms, or you knows. Limited variation in intonation. Speech is too soft, too loud, too fast, or too slow. Limited vocabulary and more than two mispronunciations. Use of slang or profanity. Frequently reads from slides or notes. Rarely looks at audience. Stiff body movements. Does not smile. More than 10% over time limit. | Professional attire. No hesitancy or uhs, hmmms, or you knows. Does vary intonation and speech is of appropriate loudness and speed. Good vocabulary and no more than one or two mispronunciations. No use of slang or profanity. Uses notes minimally and does not read from slides. Occasionally looks at audience members. Uses some hand gestures. Smiles when appropriate. No more than 10% over time limit. | Professional attire. Enthusiastic and engaging. Speech is fluid with clear enunciation. Uses voice to communicate interest by varying intonation and appropriate loudness and speed. Excellent vocabulary with no mispronunciations. No use of slang or profanity. No reading from slides. Establishes eye contact with audience; scans room. Natural hand gestures. Smiles when appropriate. Adheres to time limit. |  |
|  | **≤ 7** | **8** | **9** | **10** |  |
| Visual presentation (10) | Many errors in spelling, word usage, or punctuation. Font selection and/or size inappropriate. Use of distracting colors or visuals. Demonstrates no creativity. | More than two errors in spelling, word usage, or punctuation. Font selection and/or size inappropriate. Distracting colors or poor contrast. Distracting visuals or inadequate visuals. Demonstrates little creativity. | No more than two errors in spelling, word usage, or punctuation. Font size and/or selection appropriate on some slides. Good use of color and contrast. Demonstrates only moderate creativity. | No errors in spelling, word usage, or punctuation. Font size and/or selection appropriate. Good use of color and contrast. Appropriate use of visuals. Demonstrates exemplary creativity. |  |
|  | **≤ 7** | **8** | **9** | **10** |  |
| Use of active teaching strategies and audience involvement (10) | Speaker reads or speaks continuously with no active learning strategies or audience involvement. | Minimal audience involvement or use of active learning strategies. | Effective use of active learning strategies and audience involvement. | Exemplary use of active learning strategies and audience involvement with methods such as questioning, clickers and/or poll questions, and/or case studies. |  |
| Total points possible: 100 | **Score and summary comments:** |

**Table 8.2.** Modifiable Grading Rubric for Participation

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria (Points Possible) | Does Not Meet Expectation | Nearly Meets Expectations | Meets Expectations | Exceeds Expectations | Score and Comments |
|  | < 18 | 18–20 | 21–23 | 24–25 |  |
| Evidence of preparation for class (25) | * Frequently no evidence of preparation
 | * Usually demonstrates evidence of preparation
 | * Consistently demonstrates evidence of preparation
 | * Consistently demonstrates evidence of exceptional preparation by reading beyond required readings
 |  |
|  | < 18 | 18–20 | 21–23 | 24–25 |  |
| Demonstration of knowledge/reasoning during class | * Lack of knowledge impairs ability to reason
* Frequently expresses opinion without grounds
 | * Some knowledge gaps limit ability to reason
* Occasionally expresses opinions without grounds
 | * Synthesis of core knowledge with ability to make and defend a scholarly argument
* Rarely expresses opinions without grounds
 | * Superior synthesis of core knowledge with ability to make and defend a scholarly argument
* Never expresses opinions without grounds
 |  |
|  | < 18 | 18–20 | 21–23 | 24–25 |  |
| Contribution during class session (25) | * Silent most of the time
 | * Minimal contribution or dominates the conversation or unable to communicate clearly
 | * Regular participation without dominating the conversation
* Communicates clearly
* Occasionally engages other students with ideas, questions, and constructive feedback
 | * Regular and exceptional participation with provision of insight and thoughts that advance the discussion
* Communicates effectively
* Consistently engages other students with ideas, questions, and constructive feedback
 |  |
|  | < 18 | 18–20 | 21–23 | 24–25 |  |
| Demonstration of respect, responsibility, accountability, and leadership during class (25) | * Frequently late for class
* Rude, disruptive, dominating, and/or inconsiderate/disrespectful of others
 | * Frequently late
* Frequently disruptive, dominating, and/or disrespectful of others’ opinions
* Inattentive listener
* Marginally participative team member
 | * Rarely late
* Usually caring, respectful, and encouraging to others
* Usually good listener
* Actively listens
* Excellent team member and occasionally serves as a leader while encouraging and appreciating the contributions of others
 | * Always on time
* Consistently caring, respectful, and encouraging of others
* Consistently active listener
* Excellent team member and consistently serves as a leader while encouraging and appreciating the contributions of others
 |  |
| Total points possible: 100 | **Score and summary comments:** |

**Table 9.1.** Modifiable Scoring rubric for Discussion board assignment

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Category (Points Possible)  | Poor  | Fair  | Good  | Excellent  | Score and Comments  |
|  | **0**  | **8**  | **9**  | **10**  |  |
| Met expectation for frequency of contributions (10)  | The student did not post at all.  | Student participated in \_\_\_\_ primary posts and \_\_\_\_ secondary responses  | Student participated in \_\_\_\_ primary posts and \_\_\_\_ secondary responses  | Student participated in \_\_\_\_ primary posts and \_\_\_\_ secondary responses  |  |
|  | **≤ 21**  | **22–24**  | **25–27**  | **28–30**  |  |
| Accuracy of facts and evidence of critical thinking (30)  | No referenced facts are reported or are inaccurately reported. Response contains misinformation and/or inaccurate thinking related to the case.  | Most referenced facts are reported accurately. Response demonstrates limited knowledge of content and no critical thinking related to the case.  | Almost all referenced facts are reported accurately. Response shows knowledge of content but limited critical thinking to the case.  | All referenced facts are reported accurately. Response shows substantive knowledge of content and demonstrates significant critical thinking related to the question or case.  |  |
|  | **≤ 14**  | **15–16**  | **17–18**  | **19–20**  |  |
| Sources (20)  | Based solely on personal opinion or lay literature. Multiple errors in APA citations and references.  | References limited to textbooks or commercial (e.g., .com) websites. Several errors in APA citations and references.  | Multiple references including material from professional journals and noncommercial (e.g., .gov, .edu, .org) websites. Only one or two minor errors in APA citations or references.  | Multiple references including material from professional journals and noncommercial (e.g., .gov, .edu, .org) websites. At least one research article included in references. No errors in APA citations or references. |  |
|  | **≤ 14**  | **15–16**  | **17–18**  | **19–20**  |  |
| Voice (20)  | The writer has not tried to transform the information in a personal way. The ideas and the way they are expressed seem to belong to someone else.  | The writer relates some of his or her own knowledge or experience, but it adds nothing to the discussion of the topic.  | The writer seems to be drawing on knowledge or experience, but there is some lack of ownership of the topic.  | The writer seems to be writing from knowledge or experience. The author has taken the ideas and made them "his or her own.”  |  |
|  | **≤ 14**  | **15–16**  | **17–18**  | **19–20**  |  |
| Grammar and spelling (20)  | The writer makes more than four errors in spelling, word usage, sentence structure, grammar, or punctuation that distract the reader from the content.  | The writer makes three or four errors in spelling, word usage, sentence structure, grammar, or punctuation that distract the reader from the content.  | The writer makes one or two errors in spelling, word usage, sentence structure, grammar, or punctuation that distract the reader from the content.  | The writer makes no errors in spelling, word usage, sentence structure, grammar, or punctuation that distract the reader from the content.  |  |
| Total points possible: 100  | **Score and summary comments:**  |

**Table 10.3.** Modifiable Rubric for a Reflective Journal

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criterion (Points Possible)  | Does Not Meet Expectations  | Nearly Meets Expectations  | Meets Expectations  | Exceeds Expectations  | Score and Comments  |
|  | **≤ 7**  | **8**  | **9**  | **10**  |  |
| Description of the experience (10)  | Journal provides description of the learning experience as vague or disorganized or a significant aspect of the learning experience is not clearly identified.  | Journal provides a description of the learning experience with a few gaps in detail that impact clarity; at least one significant aspect of the experience is identified.  | Journal provides adequate description of the learning experience and identifies and describes significant aspects of the experience in a clear, organized, logical manner.  | Journal provides a detailed description of the learning experience in a clear, succinct, organized, and logical manner and identifies and describes significant aspects of the learning.  |  |
|  | **≤ 7**  | **8**  | **9**  | **10**  |  |
| Description of thoughts and feelings (10)  | Journal superficially describes a thought or feeling associated with specific aspects of the learning experience.  | Journal describes a thought and feeling associated with specific aspects of the learning experience.  | Journal describes several positive and negative thoughts and feelings and how they persist or change throughout the learning experience.  | Journal describes a full range (i.e., positive and negative) of thoughts and feelings and how they persist or change throughout the learning experience.  |  |
|  | **≤ 14**  | **15–16**  | **17–18**  | **19–20**  |  |
| Evaluation (20)  | Journal identifies how well the experience went but with minimal connection with thoughts or feelings to the overall experience, or fails to include identification of own strength or weakness in the experience.  | Journal identifies how well the experience went, incorporating the impact of thoughts or feelings and identification of own strength and weakness impacting the experience.  | Journal includes discussion of how well the experience went, incorporating the ongoing impact of thoughts and feelings and discussion of own strengths and weaknesses and how they impacted the overall experience.  | Journal includes exploration of how well the experience went, incorporating the ongoing impact of various thoughts and feelings identified, making specific connections to the overall experience, and includes a detailed discussion of own strengths and weaknesses and how they impacted the experience.  |  |
|  | **≤ 14**  | **15–16**  | **17–18**  | **19–20**  |  |
| Analysis (20)  | Journal includes minimal self-reflection.  | Journal includes self-reflection and discussion of at least one possible rationale for why the experience went the way it did.  | Journal includes self-reflection and discussion of possible rationales for why the experience went the way it did; includes discussion of several factors (i.e., positive and negative) that may have contributed to the experience; journal includes limited discussion of other possible interpretations.  | Journal includes self-reflection and discussion of possible rationales for why the experience went the way it did; includes thorough exploration of a wide variety of factors (i.e., positive and negative) that may have contributed to the experience; journal includes exploration of other possible interpretations.  |  |
|  | **≤ 14**  | **15–16**  | **17–18**  | **19–20**  |  |
| Conclusions/learning (20)  | Learning is not clearly identified or discussed and there is failure to identify how learning can be applied in future situations.  | Learning and application to a future situation is clearly identified with minimal discussion.  | Learning and application to future situations is clearly identified and discussed.  | Learning and application to a variety of future situations is clearly and thoroughly identified and discussed.  |  |
|  | **≤ 10**  | **11–12**  | **13–14**  | **15**  |  |
| Action plan (15)  | Action plan identified is broad and nonspecific.  | Journal identifies a specific action to be taken to support learning but no time frame identified.  | Journal identifies specific action steps to be taken to support learning and identifies a timeline for completion.  | Journal identifies specific actions to be taken to support learning and a detailed strategy for completion with specific resources identified.  |  |
|  | **< 3.5**  | **3.5**  | **4**  | **5**  |  |
| Legibility, grammar, and spelling (5)  | Journal is illegible or includes many errors in spelling, word usage, sentence structure, grammar, or punctuation that distract the reader from the content.  | Journal is legible with several errors in spelling, word usage, sentence structure, grammar, or punctuation that distract the reader from the content.  | Journal is legible with only minor errors in spelling, word usage, sentence structure, grammar, or punctuation that do not distract the reader from the content.  | Journal is legible with no errors in spelling, word usage, sentence structure, grammar, or punctuation that distract the reader from the content.  |  |
| Total points possible: 100  | **Score and summary comments:**  |

|  |
| --- |
| Table 11.3. Modifiable Scoring Rubric #1 for a Case Study assignment |
| Demonstration of Deeper Understanding and Cognitive Skills |
| Criterion  | **Does Not Meet Expectations**  | **Nearly Meets Expectations**  | **Meets Expectations**  | **Exceeds Expectations**  | **Score and Comments**  |
|  | **≤ 14**  | **15–16**  | **17–18**  | **19–20**  |  |
| Identification of the main issues/problems  | Unable to identify, label, and understand relevant main issues and/or problems  | Identifies, labels, and understands all but 3 or 4 relevant main issues and/or problems  | Identifies, labels, and understands all but 1 or 2 relevant main issues and/or problems  | Identifies, labels, and understands all relevant main issues and/or problems  |  |
|  | **≤ 14**  | **15–16**  | **17–18**  | **19–20**  | **Score and Comments** |
| Analysis of issues  | Incomplete analysis of the problems/questions presented in the case  | Superficial analysis of some of the problems/questions presented in the case  | Thorough analysis of most of the problems/questions presented in the case  | Insightful and thorough analysis of all the programs/questions presented in the case  |  |
|  | **≤ 14**  | **15–16**  | **17–18**  | **19–20**  | **Score and Comments** |
| Linkage of course readings and other resources to problem/question  | Incomplete or no inquiry into problems/questions with clearly documented linkages to the material read in class, other assigned resources, previously gained knowledge, and/or outside resources  | Limited inquiry into the problems/questions with clearly documented linkages to the material read in class, or other assigned resources, previously gained knowledge, or out-side resources  | Good inquiry into the problems/questions with clearly documented linkages to the material read in class, and/or other assigned resources, previously gained knowledge, and/or outside resources  | Excellent inquiry into the problems/questions with clearly documented link-ages to the material read in class, other assigned resources, previously gained knowledge, and outside resources  |  |
|  | **≤ 14**  | **15–16**  | **17–18**  | **19–20**  | **Score and Comments** |
| Effective response and/or solutions to case study questions  | Each response is incorrect, or poorly written, or unreferenced, and irrelevant to question(s) or problem(s) presented  | Each response is minimally correct, or well-written, or appropriately referenced, or irrelevant to question(s) or problem(s) presented  | Each response is mostly correct, and/or well-written, and/or appropriately referenced, and/or relevant to question(s) and/or problem(s) presented  | Each response is correct, well-written, appropriately referenced, and relevant to question(s) or problem(s) presented  |  |
|  | **≤ 14**  | **15–16**  | **17–18**  | **19–20**  | **Score and Comments** |
| Formatting, spelling, grammar  | Multiple errors in APA citations and references. There are multiple mechanical errors such as spelling, formatting, and grammar  | May have some errors in APA citations and references. There are some mechanical errors such as spelling, formatting, or grammar  | Minimum errors in APA citation and references. There are minimal mechanical errors such as spelling, and/or formatting, and/or grammar  | No errors in APA citations or references. There are no mechanical errors such as spelling, formatting, and grammar  |  |
| Total points possible: 100  | **Score and summary comments:**  |

**Table** **11.4.** Modifiable Scoring Rubric #2 for a Case Study assignment

|  |
| --- |
| Question #1: (Restate the Question) |
|  | **≤ 14**  | **15–16**  | **17–18**  | **19–20**  | **Comments**  |
| Effective response and/or solutions to case study questions  | Each response is incorrect, or poorly written, or unreferenced, and irrelevant to question(s) or problem(s) presented  | Each response is minimally correct, or well-written, or appropriately referenced, or irrelevant to question(s) or problem(s) presented  | Each response is mostly correct, and/or well-written, and/or appropriately referenced, and relevant to question(s) and/or problem(s) presented  | Each response is correct, well-written, appropriately referenced, and relevant to question(s) or problem(s) presented  |  |
| Total points possible: 20/question  | **Score and summary comments:**  |

|  |
| --- |
| Table 11.5. Modifiable Scoring Rubric #3 for a Case Study assignment Using the Nursing Process |
| Demonstration of Deeper Understanding and Cognitive Skills |
| Criterion  | **Does Not Meet Expectations**  | **Nearly Meets Expectations**  | **Meets Expectations**  | **Exceeds Expectations**  | **Score and Comments**  |
|  | **≤ 7** | **8** | **9** | **10** |  |
| Interview assessment (10) includes subjective and historical data that support nursing diagnosis  | Correctly identifies two clear, specific, and relevant interview (subjective) data points. Data are unorganized, and relevance to nursing diagnosis is unclear.  | Correctly identifies three clear, specific, and relevant interview (subjective) data points. Data are marginally organized, and relevance to nursing diagnosis is unclear.  | Correctly identifies four clear, specific, and relevant interview (subjective) data points. All data are organized and/or are mostly related to a nursing diagnosis.  | Correctly identifies five clear, specific and relevant interview (subjective) data points. All data are organized and are related to a nursing diagnosis.  |  |
|  | **≤ 7** | **8** | **9** | **10** |  |
| Physical assessment (10) includes objective data that support nursing diagnosis  | Correctly identifies two clear, specific, and relevant physical (objective) data points. Data are unorganized, and relevance to nursing diagnosis is unclear.  | Correctly identifies three clear, specific, and relevant physical (objective) data points. Data are marginally organized, and relevance to nursing diagnosis is unclear.  | Correctly identifies four clear, specific, and relevant physical (objective) data points. All data are organized and/or are mostly related to a nursing diagnosis.  | Correctly identifies five clear, specific, and relevant physical (objective) data points. All data are organized and are related to a nursing diagnosis.  |  |
|  | **≤ 7** | **8** | **9** | **10** |  |
| Nursing diagnosis (10) Includes relevant NANDA-approved diagnoses written in proper form (includes stem, related to (RT), and as evidenced by (AEB)  | Diagnoses are not NANDA approved, appropriate for patient, or not prioritized. Diagnosis may not be clearly supported by assessment data.  | Properly identifies two or fewer nursing diagnoses that are clearly supported by the data, and reflect accurate clinical judgment. They may not be appropriate for the patient, well prioritized, NANDA approved, or written in correct format.  | Properly identifies three or fewer nursing diagnoses that are clearly supported by the data, and reflect accurate clinical judgment. They are appropriate for the patient, well prioritized, NANDA approved, and written in correct format.  | Properly identifies four or more nursing diagnoses that are clearly supported by the data and reflect accurate clinical judgment. They are appropriate for the patient, well prioritized, NANDA approved, and written in correct format.  |  |
|  | **≤ 7** | **8** | **9** | **10** |  |
| Outcomes /planning (10) including patient and family short- and long-term goals based upon the diagnosis. Goals must be patient focused, realistic, and have clear measurable criteria with a target date/time.  | Goal portion is incomplete or completely unrelated to the nursing diagnosis.  | Two or fewer short- and long-term goals are identified. Goals may not relate to the nursing diagnosis, may not be written in a patient-focused manner, or are unrealistic. Each goal is missing clear criteria for measurement and a time frame for evaluation.  | Three short- and long-term goals are identified that clearly relate to the nursing diagnosis, are written in a patient-focused manner, and are realistic. Each goal contains clear criteria for measurement and a time frame for evaluation.  | At least four short- and long-term goals are identified that clearly relate to the nursing diagnosis, are written in a patient-focused manner, and are realistic. Each goal contains clear criteria for measurement and a time frame for evaluation.  |  |
|  | **≤ 7** | **8** | **9** | **10** |  |
| Implementation (10) nursing interventions or actions that directly relate to the etiology of the nursing diagnosis and the patient goal and desired outcome. Each intervention must include referenced rationale (including source and page number if applicable) | Interventions are unclear or do not clearly focus on the etiology of the nursing diagnosis or relate to the patient goals outcomes. Rationales provided do not demonstrate an understanding of the purpose of the interventions or no references are provided. | Identifies fewer than three specific interventions for each outcome criterion related to the etiology of the nursing diagnosis. Not all interventions may be specific. Rationalizations are included but they may be weak, or references are incomplete or from sources that may not be reliable. | Identifies fewer than three specific interventions for each outcome criterion in order to help the patient/family reach the desired goal. | Identifies at least three specific interventions for each outcome criterion in order to help the patient/family reach the desired goal. |  |
|  | **≤ 7** | **8** | **9** | **10** |  |
| Evaluation (10) outlines the methods to be used in evaluating outcome criteria, expectations for goals being met, and what would determine that goal is met, partially met, or unmet. Explain how the plan of care would be revised or continued in each case, including a new realistic evaluation date/time.  | Evaluations portion is incomplete or does not relate to diagnosis, goal statement, or interventions.  | Evaluation portion does not consistently contain data that are listed as criteria in goal statement. May also not describe goal as met, partially met, or not met. May also not include revision or new evaluation date/time.  | Clearly states how each outcome would be evaluated. Able to correctly identify criteria for goal being met, partially met, or unmet. Identifies revisions for care plan but may not include accurate rationale for revision, or references may be from sources that may not be reliable, or a new date is not provided for reevaluation.  | Evaluation portion contains data that are listed as criteria in goal statement and lists expectations for meeting the goal. Clear explanation of criteria for goals being met, partially met, or not met. Includes plan for continuation or revision, clearly referenced rationale for revisions from reliable sources, and a new evaluation date/time.  |  |
|  | **≤ 7** | **8** | **9** | **10** |  |
| Identification of the main issues/problems (10)  | Unable to identify, label, and under-stand relevant main issues and/or problems  | Identifies, labels, and understands all but three or four relevant main issues and/or problems  | Identifies, labels, and understands all but one or two relevant main issues and/or problems  | Identifies, labels, and understands *all* relevant main issues and/or problems  |  |
|  | **≤ 7** | **8** | **9** | **10** |  |
| Analysis of issues (10) | Incomplete analysis of the problems/questions presented in the case | Superficial analysis of some of the problems/questions presented in the case | Thorough analysis of most of the problems/questions presented in the case | Insightful and thorough analysis of all the programs/questions presented in the case |  |
|  | **< 3.5** | **3.5** | **4** | **5** |  |
| Linkage of course readings and other resources to problem/question (5) | Incomplete or no-inquiry into problems/questions with clearly documented linkages to the material read in class, other assigned resources, previously gained knowledge, and/or outside resources | Limited inquiry into the problems/questions with clearly documented linkages to the material read in class, or other assigned resources, previously gained knowledge, or outside resources | Good inquiry into the problems/questions with clearly documented linkages to the material read in class, and/or other assigned resources, previously gained knowledge, and/or outside resources | Excellent inquiry into the problems/questions with clearly documented linkages to the material read in class, other assigned resources, previously gained knowledge, and outside resources |  |
|  | **< 3.5** | **3.5** | **4** | **5** | **Score/Comments** |
| Effective response and/or solutions to case study questions (5) | Each response is incorrect, or poorly written, or unreferenced, and irrelevant to question(s) or problem(s) presented | Each response is minimally correct, well-written or appropriately referenced, or irrelevant to question(s) or problem(s) presented | Each response is mostly correct, or well-written, or appropriately referenced, and relevant to question(s) or problem(s) presented | Each response is correct, well-written, appropriately referenced, and relevant to question(s) or problem(s) presented |  |
|  | **< 7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **Score/Comments** |
| Formatting, spelling, grammar (10) | Multiple errors in APA citations and references. There are multiple mechanical errors such as spelling, formatting, and grammar. | May have some errors in APA citations and references. There are some mechanical errors such as spelling, formatting, and grammar. | Minimum errors in APA citation and references. There are minimal mechanical errors such as spelling, formatting, and grammar. | No errors in APA citations or references. There are no mechanical errors such as spelling, formatting, and grammar. |  |
| Total points possible: 100  | **Score and summary comments:**  |

**Table 12.1.** Modifiable Scoring rubric for Concept Map assignment

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criterion (Points Possible)  | Does Not Meet Expectations  | Nearly Meets Expectations  | Meets Expectations  | Exceeds Expectations  | Score and Comments  |
|  | **≤ 14**  | **15–16**  | **17–18**  | **19–20**  |  |
| Accuracy (20)  | The map includes many minor or major errors or misconceptions. Inaccurate on many key concepts.  | The map contains several minor errors or at least one major error or misconception but is accurate on most key concepts.  | The map contains only a few minor errors but is accurate on all key concepts.  | The map contains no errors or misconceptions.  |  |
|  | **≤ 14**  | **15–16**  | **17–18**  | **19–20**  |  |
| Comprehensiveness (20)  | The map demonstrates only superficial knowledge of the topic. The map contains hardly any key concepts, and those that are presented are not developed.  | The map demonstrates moderate knowledge of the topic. The map contains only a few key concepts and those presented are weakly developed.  | The map demonstrates good knowledge of the topic. The map contains most key concepts but does not demonstrate complex thinking.  | The map demonstrates in-depth knowledge of the topic. The map contains all key concepts. Complex thinking about the central concept is evident.  |  |
|  | **≤ 14**  | **15–16**  | **17–18**  | **19–20**  |  |
| Organization and structure (20)  | The map is generally linear or disorganized. The map fails to demonstrate connections among concepts. It is difficult to identify the central concept. The map is difficult to read.  | The map is nonlinear but the concepts and links are difficult to follow. The map demonstrates only a few connections among concepts. Many linking words are omitted or inappropriate. Most of the map is difficult to read.  | The map is nonlinear. The concepts and links are easy to follow and understand. The map demonstrates most connections among concepts. A few linking words are omitted or inappropriate. Most of the map is clearly legible.  | The map is nonlinear and treelike. Concepts and links are easy to follow and understand. The map demonstrates all appropriate connections among concepts and linking words accurately describe relationships. The map is clearly legible.  |  |
|  | **≤ 14**  | **15–16**  | **17–18**  | **19–20**  |  |
| Sources (20)  | The concept map is based solely on personal opinion, lay literature, or commercial websites. There are multiple errors in APA citations and references.  | The concept map is based on references limited to textbooks or commercial (e.g., .com) websites. There are several errors in APA citations and references.  | The concept map is based on multiple references, including material from professional journals and noncommercial (e.g., .gov, .edu, .org) websites. At least two current research articles are included in references. There are only one or two minor errors in APA citations or references.  | The concept map is based on multiple (more than 10) references, including material from professional journals and noncommercial (e.g., .gov, .edu, .org) websites. Multiple current research articles are included in references. There are no errors in APA citations or references.  |  |
|  | **≤ 14**  | **15–16**  | **17–18**  | **19–20**  |  |
| Creativity (20)  | The concept map shows limited or no creativity.  | The concept map illustrates minimal creativity in layout, use of shapes, use of color, or interconnectedness. Color is used primarily for aesthetics rather than clarity.  | The concept map illustrates creativity in layout, use of shapes, use of color, and interconnectedness. Color is used to improve clarity.  | The concept map illustrates creativity in layout, use of shapes, use of color, and interconnectedness. Color is used to improve clarity. Appropriate visual and/or audio embeds enhance concept map.  |  |
| Total points possible: 100 | **Score and summary comments:**  |

**Table 13.2.** Modifiable Scoring Rubric for Poster assignment

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criterion (Points Possible)  | Does Not Meet Expectations  | Nearly Meets Expectations  | Meets Expectations  | Exceeds Expectations  | Score and Comments  |
|  | **≤ 7**  | **8** | **9** | **10** |  |
| Layout/organization (10)  | Information is displayed in a disorganized manner. Appropriate headings are not used. Sections of the poster are not separated by space with no text or graphics. There is no sequence to the display of information. Title and author and affiliations are omitted.  | Information is displayed in a somewhat disorganized manner. Some appropriate headings used. Sections of the poster are poorly separated by space with no text or graphics. There is no sequence to the display of information. Title or author or author affiliations are omitted.  | Information is displayed in a somewhat organized manner. Appropriate headings are used. Sections of the poster are separated by space with no text or graphics. There is a sequence to the display of information but it is not immediately obvious. Title and author and affiliations are evident.  | Information is displayed in an organized manner. Appropriate headings are used. Sections of the poster are separated by space with no text or graphics. There is an obvious sequence to the display of information. Title, author, and affiliations are clearly evident.  |  |
|  | **≤ 28**  | **29–32**  | **33–36**  | **37–40**  |  |
| Content discussion of assigned topic With required content (40) (*List required content here*)  | Poster omitted required content. Lack of even basic knowledge of topic evident through poster. Poster is of no educational benefit.  | Poster did include required content but superficial and/or several inaccuracies noted. Superficial knowledge of the topic evident through poster. Poster is of little educational benefit.  | Poster of assigned topic with required content at appropriate depth and detail. Some minor inaccuracies noted. Knowledge of the topic is evident through poster. Poster is educational for others.  | Exemplary poster of assigned topic with required content at appropriate depth, detail, and accuracy within the space restrictions of a poster. Extensive knowledge of the topic is clearly evident through poster. Poster is educational for others.  |  |
|  | **≤ 14**  | **15–16**  | **17–18**  | **19–20**  |  |
| Use of scientific evidence (20)  | No discussion of the scientific evidence. References listed fewer than five references. Multiple errors in American Psychological Association (APA) citations and references.  | Limited discussion of scientific evidence related to topic. References list includes at least five to seven references with fewer than three of these research studies. More than two errors in APA citations and references.  | Good discussion of scientific evidence related to topic. Reference list includes at least eight references with at least three of these high-quality research studies. No more than two errors in APA citations or references.  | Exemplary discussion of the scientific evidence related to topic. Reference list includes at least 10 references with at least five high-quality research studies cited. No errors in APA citations or references.  |  |
|  | **≤ 14**  | **15–16**  | **17–18**  | **19–20**  |  |
| Visual presentation (20)  | Many errors in spelling, word usage, or punctuation. Font selection and/or size inappropriate. Use of distracting colors or visuals. Distracting graphics or inadequate graphics. No creativity demonstrated. Text is not legible at five feet if physical poster or on 19-inch monitor at 18 inches if computer format.  | More than two errors in spelling, word usage, or punctuation. Font selection and/or size inappropriate. Distracting colors or poor contrast. Distracting graphics or inadequate graphics. Little creativity demonstrated. Only some text is legible at five feet if physical poster or on 19-inch monitor at 18 inches if computer format.  | No more than two errors in spelling, word usage, or punctuation. Font size and/or selection appropriate. Good use of color and contrast. Use of graphics slightly less than or more than appropriate. Some creativity. Most of text is legible at five feet if physical poster or on 19-inch monitor at 18 inches if computer format.  | No errors in spelling, word usage, or punctuation. Font size and/or selection appropriate. Good use of color and contrast. Appropriate use of only relevant graphics. Exemplary creativity demonstrated. Text is legible at five feet if physical poster or on 19-inch monitor at 18 inches if computer format.  |  |
|  | **≤ 7**  | **8**  | **9**  | **10**  |  |
| Poster presentation (10) (if verbal presentation included; if not, add these points to content)  | Casual attire. Student failed to introduce self and reason for interest in topic. Frequent pauses, lots of uhs, hmmms, or you knows, or monotone. Speech is too soft, too loud, too fast, or too slow. Limited vocabulary and frequent mispronunciations. Use of slang or profanity. Almost exclusively reading from poster or notes. Does not look at audience, move, or smile. Distracting mannerisms. More than 20% over time limit.  | Casual attire. Student introduced self but omitted reason for interest in topic. Hesitancy, some uhs, hmmms, or you knows. Limited variation in intonation. Speech is too soft, too loud, too fast, or too slow. Limited vocabulary and more than two mispronunciations. Use of slang or profanity. Frequently reads from poster or notes. Rarely looks at audience. Stiff body movements. Does not smile. More than 10% over time limit.  | Professional attire. Student introduced self and reason for interest in topic. No hesitancy or uhs, hmmms, or you knows. Does vary intonation and speech is of appropriate loudness and speed. Good vocabulary and no more than 1–2 mispronunciations. No use of slang or profanity. Uses notes minimally and does not read from poster. Occasionally looks at audience members. Uses some hand gestures. Smiles when appropriate. No more than 10% over time limit.  | Professional attire. Student introduced self and reason for interest in topic. Enthusiastic and engaging. Speech is fluid with clear enunciation. Uses voice to communicate interest by varying intonation and appropriate loudness and speed. Excellent vocabulary with no mispronunciations. No use of slang or profanity. No reading from poster. Establishes eye contact with audience; scans room. Natural hand gestures. Smiles when appropriate. Adheres to time limit.  |  |
| Total points possible: 100 | **Score and summary comments:**  |

**Table 14.1.** Modifiable Scoring Rubric for a Portfolio assignment

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criterion (Points Possible)  | Does Not Meet Expectations  | Nearly Meets Expectations  | Meets Expectations  | Exceeds Expectations  | Score and Comments  |
|  | **≤ 10**  | **11–12**  | **13–14** | **15** |  |
| Portfolio organization and structure (15)  | **Hard copy**: The documents are not bound or the binder is too large or small for the contents or there are documents in the binder that are not secured. One or more of the required sections are missing or disorganized. The table of contents is missing.  | **Hard copy:** The documents are all secured in an appropriately sized binder that allows the reader to easily review the contents. All of the required sections are present but there is some disorganization with some documents being misfiled. The table of contents is incomplete or does not adequately direct the reviewer to the appropriate section.  | **Hard copy:** The documents are all secured in an appropriately sized binder that allows the reader to easily review the contents. All of the required sections are present with at least one piece of supporting documentation in each. The table of contents is organized and directs the reviewer to the appropriate section.  | **Hard copy**: The documents are all secured in an appropriately sized binder that allows the reader to easily review the contents. All of the required sections are separated by tabbed dividers that are clearly labeled, and contain multiple sources of supporting documentation. The table of contents is organized and directs the reviewer to the appropriate section. Protective sheet covers are used on documents throughout the portfolio.  |  |
|  | **E-portfolio:** The main page is inaccessible or difficult to access. One or more of the required sections are missing or the reviewer is unable to access required sections. Many sections lack supportive documentation.  | **E-portfolio:** The main page is easily accessed. All of the required sections are clearly identified and accessible. One or more of the sections are lacking any supportive documentation within the section.  | **E-portfolio:** The main page is easily accessed. All required sections are clearly identified and accessible with minimal acceptable documentation included in each section.  | **E-portfolio:** The main page is easily accessed. All required sections are clearly identified, accessible, and the pages are well developed with multiple sources of supportive documentation provided in each.  |  |
|  | **≤ 7** | **8**  | **9** | **10** |  |
| Student information (10)  | Significant student information is missing such as student name, picture, and name of school or expected graduation date leading to difficulty identifying the student, or the student contact information is incomplete or missing, or personal interests are presented in an unprofessional manner.  | Most of the student information required is present but does not include one or more the following: student name, picture, name of school, expected graduation date, or method for contacting the student. The missing information does not interfere with being able to clearly identify the student or personal interests are provided in an unprofessional manner.  | All student information required is clear and complete, including student name, picture, name of school, and expected graduation date. A method for contacting the student is provided. A personal interest is provided in a professional manner.  | All student information is clear and complete, including student name, professional picture, name of school, and expected graduation date. Several methods of contacting the student are provided. Personal interests are provided in a professional manner, which enhances the portfolio.  |  |
|  | **≤ 10**  | **11–12**  | **13–14**  | **15**  |  |
| Resume/curriculum vitae (CV) (15)  | The student’s CV is not provided or the student’s CV has substantial unexplained gaps and misspellings. The content of the CV is disorganized and incomplete. The CV does not have a professional appearance.  | The student’s CV has minor gaps or misspellings. The CV contains information about education and work history, although the presentation of the information is disorganized. Overall, the CV lacks a professional appearance.  | The student’s CV is complete and organized at a basic level with education and work history included. Information is slightly inconsistent in presentation in that some is succinct and other information is a bit excessive and this detracts slightly from the overall professional appearance.  | The student’s CV is complete and organized with education, work history, and accomplishments clearly and succinctly presented. The CV has a professional appearance.  |  |
|  | **≤ 7**  | **8**  | **9**  | **10**  |  |
| Professional documents (10)  | No cover letter is included or the cover letter is unprofessional in appearance, content, or writing or the student fails to identify an interest in a specific position. The student does not identify contact information or a professional reference.  | The cover letter is casual without attention to business format. The student identifies an interest in a position and provides one means of being contacted. The student provides one professional reference.  | The cover letter is clearly written in business format and identifies interest in a specific position. The student provides two means of being contacted. The student provides two professional references.  | The cover letter is engaging and clearly written in business format, and the student succinctly identifies interest in a specific position and explains why. The student provides several means to be contacted. The student provides three or more professional references.  |  |
|  | **≤ 7**  | **8**  | **9**  | **10**  |  |
| Career path (10)  | The student’s career path is unclear and professional interests are vague or nonexisting. There are no supportive data for potential interests provided. The student Identifies one type of professional contact or one place for potential employment.  | The student’s career path and interests are generic, with limited supporting information about the general career path. Identifies one professional contact with contact information, or identifies one place for potential employment with contact information provided.  | The student’s career path and interests are outlined and the student provides supporting information regarding the career path and required preparation. The student provides one professional contact with contact information and one place for potential employment with contact information.  | The student’s career path and interests are identified and described with supporting information regarding the career path and required preparation. The student provides two or more professional contacts with contact information and two or more places for potential employment with contact information.  |  |
|  | **< 14**  | **15–16**  | **17–18**  | **19–20**  |  |
| Course syllabus and student work products with reflections (20)  | Copies of less than half of the syllabi from courses taken to date are included or less than half of the work product(s) and evaluations are included or there is limited to no self-reflections on learning regarding the work products presented.  | A copy of most syllabi from courses taken to date are included and followed by some required work product(s) with evaluation and self-reflection from the assignments or self-reflections from several work products are missing.  | A copy of each syllabus from all courses taken to date is included and followed by the required work product(s) with evaluation and self-reflection from the assignments. Self-reflections minimally address what the student learned through the experience and future application.  | A copy of each syllabus from all courses taken to date is included and followed by the required work product(s) with evaluation and self-reflection from the assignments. Self-reflections address in detail what the student learned through completing the assignment and how it will be applied in the future.  |  |
|  | **≤ 7**  | **8**  | **9**  | **10**  |  |
| Self-assessment (10)  | Little to no self-assessment is evident. The student self-identifies a strength or a weakness. The competency list developed is incomplete. A plan for personal/professional development is lacking or underdeveloped.  | The student identifies a strength and a weakness. Provides a list of competencies with minimal gaps. A plan for personal/professional development is briefly outlined with at least one strategy identified to address the weakness.  | The student describes at least two strengths, two weaknesses, and provides a list of competencies. A plan for personal/professional development is outlined with at least several strategies identified to address each weakness and utilize strengths.  | The student explores multiple strengths and weaknesses and provides a list and description of competencies. A detailed plan for personal/professional development is identified with multiple strategies identified to address weaknesses and utilize strengths.  |  |
|  | **≤ 7**  | **8**  | **9**  | **10**  |  |
| Professionalism and creativity (10)  | There are multiple spelling and punctuation errors that impact readability. The font size and/or style are inconsistent and impair readability. Color contrasts appear random and detract from the portfolio continuity and professional appearance. The visuals support the written information less than half of the time.  | There are several minor spelling/punctuation errors that do not impact readability. The font size and/or style are inconsistent throughout the portfolio. Color contrasts are used inconsistently and detract from continuity. The visuals support written information a majority of the time, but not all are professional in appearance.  | There are minimal errors in spelling, word usage, or punctuation that do not impact readability. The font size and/or style are appropriate. There is a good use of color and contrast. The visuals support written information on most pages.  | There are no errors in spelling, word usage, or punctuation. The font size and/or style are appropriate. There is a good use of color and contrast throughout. The visuals support and enhance the written information.  |  |
| Total points possible: 100 | **Score and summary comments:**  |