Pilot Phase Prompt Review Rubric

Purpose: Ensure prompts are reusable, high-quality, non-duplicative, and ADDIE-aligned before agent consumption.

---

1. ADDIE Alignment (Required Gate)

Question:

Does this prompt clearly belong to the selected ADDIE phase?

Score	Criteria
2 – Clear	Prompt is unambiguously aligned to the stated ADDIE phase
1 – Partial	Some alignment, but overlaps with another phase
0 – Misaligned	Incorrect ADDIE phase

Reviewer Guidance

- *Design* → objectives, assessments, structure, strategy
- *Develop* → content creation, labs, scripts
- *Evaluate* → rubrics, metrics, feedback loops

Gate Rule (Pilot):

- Must score **≥1** to proceed
- Score of **0 = Reject**

---

2. Prompt Clarity & Structure

Question:

Is the prompt easy to understand and well structured for reuse?

Score	Criteria
2 – Clear	Instructions are explicit, structured, and concise
1 – Acceptable	Minor ambiguity but usable
0 – Poor	Confusing, verbose, or underspecified

Reviewer Checks

- Clear role/context
- Explicit task
- Expected output described
- No unnecessary filler

---

3. Reusability & Generalization

Question:

Can this prompt be reused across projects with minimal edits?

Score	Criteria
2 – High	Generic, parameterized, reusable
1 – Medium	Some hard-coded context
0 – Low	Too specific to a single scenario

Reviewer Checks

- Uses placeholders instead of hardcoded values
- Not tied to a single course/client unless justified

---

4. Similarity / Duplication Check (Manual)

Question:

Is this prompt materially different from existing approved prompts?

Result	Criteria
Pass	No near-duplicate found
Flag	Similar prompt exists, but this adds value
Fail	Near-duplicate with no meaningful difference

Reviewer Action

- *Pass* → continue
- *Flag* → note similarity and rationale
- *Fail* → reject or merge

Important

This is intentionally subjective in the pilot and becomes automated later.

5. Output Quality Expectation

Question:

If executed by a capable model, would this prompt produce useful, high-quality output?

Score	Criteria
2 – Strong	Likely to produce consistent, actionable output
1 – Moderate	Output usable but may vary
0 – Weak	Likely to produce vague or low-value output

6. Agent Suitability (Critical for Pilot)

Question:

Is this prompt safe and appropriate for agent-based retrieval?

Score	Criteria
2 – Yes	Safe, clear, reusable by an agent
1 – Conditional	Needs minor edits
0 – No	Should not be exposed via agent

Reviewer Checks

- No sensitive or internal-only language
- No reliance on private context
- No instructions that could confuse end users

---

7. Final Decision

Outcome	Criteria
Approve	No zeros AND reviewer confidence
Approve with Edits	Minor changes required
Reject	Any critical zero or duplication fail

Summary Scoring (Optional but Recommended)

Maximum Score: 12
Suggested Pilot Thresholds

- **10–12** → Approve
- **7–9** → Approve with edits
- **≤6** → Reject

In the pilot, **judgment > math**. The score supports consistency, not automation.

Google Sheets Column Mapping (Pilot-Ready)

ADDIE Alignment (0–2)
Clarity (0–2)
Reusability (0–2)
Similarity Check (Pass/Flag/Fail)
Output Quality (0–2)
Agent Suitability (0–2)
Reviewer Decision (Approve / Edit / Reject)
Reviewer Notes

Why This Rubric Is Strategic

- Matches future **automated gates** (Phase 2)
- Builds shared reviewer intuition
- Creates labeled data for ML later
- Protects agent trust early

One-Sentence Rule for Reviewers (Pilot)

If you would hesitate to hand this prompt to a junior colleague without explanation, it should not be approved for the agent.