**RUBRIC CHECKLIST**

Evaluation rubrics are an evidence-based tool for creating more equitable review processes. Like all tools, however, their design and implementation matter much. Check your rubric against these standards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERFORMANCE LEVELS</th>
<th>CLEAR CRITERIA</th>
<th>INCLUSIVE EXCELLENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-5 levels are clearly defined to accommodate cognitive demands of evaluation and so applicant chances do not depend on which reviewer reads their file.</td>
<td>Aim for diverse criteria and provide a shared definition of each criterion or dimension of admissibility. Criteria may vary by disciplinary norms &amp; program goals.</td>
<td>Include criteria that are related to individual performance as well as competencies and knowledge that contribute to healthy, inclusive working and learning environments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBSERVABLE &amp; MEASURABLE</th>
<th>SCORING STRATEGY</th>
<th>ALIGNED TO APPLICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Each definition should be clear, distinct, and meaningful. Refer reviewers to specific information that is observable in applications for consistent review.</td>
<td>Each applicant should be rated on a scale of 1-3 or 1-5 for each criterion, with room for notes to explain evaluations. Set any weights in advance of distributing files.</td>
<td>The ideal is to link your application materials and prompts to the rubric so you have information about key qualities on all applicants.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYSTEMIC AWARENESS</th>
<th>RACISM CONSCIOUS</th>
<th>NORMED TO USERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keep in mind how your quality definitions may reinforce inequalities or privilege some groups. Consider applicants in the context of their opportunities and challenges.</td>
<td>Be mindful of how your definitions of excellence may be racialized by avoiding 1) criteria and definitions that lend themselves to biases and stereotypes and 2) criteria and definitions that institutionalize inequalities.</td>
<td>Provide training &amp; practice with the rubric before reviewing files. Committee members may independently rate the same 2 applications, then discuss scores, focusing on differences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Checklists, rating scales, & rubrics all delineate criteria, but they have different approaches to scoring (Brookhart, 2018).**

"Reliable scoring of performance assessments can be enhanced by the use of rubrics, especially if they are analytic, topic-specific, and complemented with exemplars and/or rater training" (Jonsson & Svingby, 2007).
RECALL THE
AIMS OF A RUBRIC
WHEN DESIGNING & REVIEWING YOUR OWN:

Transparency is enhanced when evaluation criteria and operationalizations are specified.

Fairness Current law requires that all applicants be evaluated on the same criteria.

Reliability across reviewers is more likely when they use protocols for evaluation.

Specificity about evaluation criteria reduces risks of implicit bias relative to unstructured judgment.

MISSION: We are a learning community that builds capacity for systemic change toward equity in graduate education via
- Training and resources on evidence-based, equity-minded practices;
- Coaching for change-ready organizations & leaders;
- Building infrastructure for faculty development;
- Conducting and translating research.

ADDITIONAL RESOURCES & RESEARCH:


