Selke, M. J. G., 1955. (2013).
Rubric assessment goes to college:
Objective, comprehensive evaluation of student work.
Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

5

Rubric Design

Analytic Rubrics

In this chapter, the ten steps of rubric design will be introduced using a performance example that will be familiar to most readers. This will be, at least in part, a print narrative version of a process that has been used to present the basics of rubric assessment to undergraduate or graduate students. Many of them approached the class sessions in which rubric assessment would be addressed with varying degrees of ennui. After all, they had seen rubrics before and could tell 'em when they see 'em. They had also made up their minds whether they liked them or disliked them based on the rubrics they had already encountered and how they were used or misused.

Former students had been promised that the session on rubrics would be "tasteful" and nonboring. If they didn't learn anything new in the first half of the class, they were welcome to skip the second half. The same promise holds true for the reader. This chapter will be "tasteful" (if not tasty) and nonboring. If something new is not learned by the start of the fifth step of analytic rubric design, skip the rest of this chapter and go on to chapter 6. A word of warning though: maybe the author's students were just being polite—nope, not likely, as they were overscheduled undergrads and tired graduate students taking three-hour evening classes—but a student has never bailed out at the halfway point.

DESIGNING AN ANALYTIC RUBRIC

The working example in this chapter is a nonacademic example, and readers will need to assemble some materials—or imagine they are assembled—to fully experience said example. Unless this chapter is being read well before

noon, the reader is on a strict diet, or is one of the few people who truly hates what is about to be discussed, the real items will be preferred to the imagined versions. Put the book down and go get, purchase, or purloin whatever is needed to construct the perfect ice cream sundae.

No, this is not a joke. Yes, this will have something to do with rubrics. Now get thee to a kitchen or grocery store or both. To make the process more fun and more "real world" (as in rubric-design-by-committee), take along a small group of family, friends, or students. This will only be helpful if they agree to participate in the rubric-building phase of the experience too, not just in the sundae-consumption phase.

Step 1. All set? Good. Just so we all get the scoop, so to speak, the assessment task before us is to describe the perfect ice cream sundae. Although some assembly—that is, some process—is obviously required, a final product will be assessed rather than a performance process. There may be instances where both product and process are assessed in the same set of rubrics, but individual rubrics usually assess one or the other.

Step 2. The next step involves asking the key question: Is a rubric an effective, efficient option for this assessment purpose? Well—has a product or process been clearly identified? Yes: check. Are we dealing with simple or modified dichotomous components? No—there are myriad options available here. Walk into any commercial establishment that specializes in ice cream sundaes if verification is needed. Are the variables expressed in terms of limited response questions with a set of possible responses provided and one correct answer expected? Or how about limited response questions with no possible responses provided and one correct answer expected? No and no. A generated list whether ranked or unranked? Also negative. Open-ended responses with no one correct answer? Not unless the respondent is anti–ice cream, missing the sense of taste—or missing the sense of frivolity not usually associated with reading an academic book. So, therefore, is a rubric a viable option for this assessment task? Yes.

Step 3. Having decided that a rubric can and will be used to help describe the relative levels of excellence contributing to the perfect ice cream sundae, should this be done with a holistic or an analytic rubric? The underlying question is this: Would focusing on one specific component per strand (analytic rubric) or multiple components per strand (holistic rubric) better serve the purposes of the assessment task?

Probably a focus on specific components per strand, using an analytic design, would be the best bet for describing the components of the perfect ice cream sundae. The separate components can be identified, and there are not so many that the analytic approach to the assessment task would become unmanageable. In addition, the resulting rubric will be able to be used multiple

times to assess individual products, in this case potentially many ice cream sundaes. Just as a check-and-balance procedure, however, the completed analytic rubric will be converted to a holistic rubric for comparison purposes later on in this chapter.

Step 4. Now the bulk of the work begins. Take a blank 8.5 x 11-inch piece of paper or open a new blank document on a laptop or electronic word processing gadget of choice. Draft a table with five columns and, for now, ten rows. Rows can always be deleted if you find they are not needed. This will result in a rubric template as in table 5.1, with four columns for value descriptors and one column, the one on the far left, for strand components.

Why use four columns for descriptors? The rubric could have been designed with three or five columns as well. (Two would be too few because it would result in a de facto dichotomous checklist.) Three-column rubrics work well for assessment tasks without much need to show increments of developmental continuity. They are also a good match for assessment tasks when components of products or performances are readily identifiable as good, bad, or somewhere in between.

The author has been a traditional fan of the five-column rubric because it permits designers to identify some middle ground. That being said, sometimes the middle ground provides an easy out, an opportunity to straddle the fence when making an assessment decision. With a four-column rubric, room is provided for developmental variation. However, with an even number of columns, the assessor needs to come down on one side or the other of the good or not-so-good midpoint.

Another common addition is a column for a score of zero to account for the possibility of components being omitted completely or present in such basic or poorly demonstrated form they do not yet merit rubric points. Designing a column for "zero" to be the fifth column in a five-column rubric can provide a

Table 5.1. A Basic Analytic Rubric Template

	Descriptor	*Descriptor*	*Descriptor*	*Descriptor*
Component				
Component				
Component				
Component				
Component				
Component				
Component				
Component				
Component				

good compromise when a design team is having difficulty choosing between a four-column or five-column rubric.

Examples of rubrics that use more than five column levels are rather uncommon. If a rubric is composed of more than five columns, it usually addresses performance tasks that span multiple years and several developmental phases in students' professional training.

The most practical suggestion regarding how to determine the appropriate number of columns is to make your best guess and begin drafting the rubric. If trouble is encountered while devising language for one of the columns *and* everything that needs to be assessed is being addressed in the columns that have been completed, omit a column. If too much information is being forced into one of the existing columns, try inserting an additional column.

Going back to step four, title the top of the far left column "Components." Decide upon the component criteria to be assessed: the components of an ice cream sundae. Do not be surprised if this is not as easy as anticipated. It may generate some debate if a collaborative process is being attempted. Working toward consensus or compromise may be necessary if you are not drafting the rubric on your own. Add a title for the rubric while you are at it. When this has been done with a class, the result has typically been something like the initial rubric draft in table 5.2.

The reader's rubric-in-progress may look a bit different because different elements may have been identified as vital to the perfect ice cream sundae or may have been named differently. Please work with what you have drafted and do not change it to conform to the hypothetical example provided. (Delete any remaining blank rows. They can always be re-added if needed.) Some of the elements included in the example may have been omitted from yours and that is ok too.

For example, this author fully believes that the perfect sundae is the classic turtle sundae, which consists simply of three scoops of vanilla ice cream, hot fudge sauce, caramel sauce, whole roasted and slightly salted pecans, optional dairy whipped cream, and a cherry. This exquisite concoction is ever

Table 5.2. Rubric Sample: The Perfect Ice Cream Sundae

Components
Whipped topping
Fruit topping
Crunchy topping
Sauce/pourable topping
Ice cream
Container

so flawlessly executed by Kopp's Frozen Custard in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. (No, they are not paying the author for this endorsement. However, if they'd like to, the author would be an amenable spokesperson—provided the compensation were to be in kind.) However, other sundae consumers may not reach sundae nirvana unless the ice cream can hardly be seen under all the layers of toppings and sprinkles and fruit.

It is your prerogative, indeed your responsibility as the designer of a rubric, to set the criteria to be assessed and the levels of excellence to be met. In actual application, strand descriptors tend to be more specific contrasted with those in the example provided in table 5.2, which were purposely designed to be inclusive.

The "pourable topping" descriptor could mean anything from chocolate sauce to melted peanut butter. The "crunchy topping" category includes sprinkles, crushed nuts, seeds, toffee bits, cookie pieces, and so on. Fruit topping could include strawberries or pineapple, apple chunks or banana slices. Whipped topping could include everything from dairy whipped cream to a frothy gelatinous mix in a fruit flavor. (If it was initially decided not to construct a sundae but only to read about it, are you getting hungry and changing your mind yet?)

In addition to degree of specificity, considerations regarding quality or quantity need to be addressed. In some rubric strands, the cell descriptors are actually quantity-structured and focus on "more is better," or perhaps in the case of some types of error, "less is better." A variation on that theme takes an additive approach, starting with a basic skill or demonstrated competency and showing how its enactment becomes more sophisticated as it is developed across the span of the rubric strand. (Additive rubric strands are discussed in chapter 7.)

Given that this rubric is about food, each of the strands could be subdivided into a section addressing quantity as well as a section pertaining to quality. In our example, the quantity-quality issue was circumvented by the disclaimer (note) at the bottom of the rubric, which stated the deliberate choice to avoid issues pertaining to quantity and address only those of quality (see table 5.6 later on).

As the reader may have observed by this point, the entire process of rubric design, with its many considerations, is challenging enough when undertaken independently. When it is collaboratively undertaken, and there are multiple designers with their figurative or literal hands on the rubric, the challenges of a task that would appear to be quite simple—identifying rubric strands—can quickly surface and compound.

For example, if the bottom element in our example rubric—the container—is omitted, the ice cream sundae comes apart. "Yes," a rubric designer might

say, “but it doesn’t really belong as a rubric strand because it is not part of the sundae, it is not edible.” “Oh yeah?” a student, family member, or colleague may counter. “Well what if the container is a waffle bowl, how about that?”

And so the conversation/debate/argument begins. This is amusing when assessing an ice cream treat. It is much less so when assessing work that will be part of the basis for determining a course grade—or for that matter, for determining whether or not a student will be a candidate for a degree or a professional license.

When a course instructor designs a rubric strand or any other part of the rubric for purposes of course-related assessment, this debate is avoided. That in itself, however, is a two-sided coin because then the rubric designer’s own thinking is not challenged. Any potential holes in the fabric of your rubric may not be readily identified until it is distributed to a classroom full of students. If there are discrepancies at this point, students will be only too willing to find them, whether or not they point them out to the instructor.

As has become a running refrain in this book, be sure whatever strands are identified can be easily understood. Rubric strands also need to fit every assessment task the rubric will be used to address, and there should not be any assessment tasks that will have unaddressed components. If a component is left unaddressed by conscious choice, that’s fine. However, it diminishes the credibility of the rubric as an assessment tool if a key component goes unaddressed because a strand is accidentally left out of the rubric.

Step 5. The next step is easier than the former and involves providing the numerical ratings or other scoring system, if any is to be used, and selecting the column descriptors. Numerical ratings are necessary only if the rubric levels achieved will need to be converted into a numerical score for formative or summative assessment purposes of any kind.

Just for practice, let’s say a national competition for the perfect ice cream sundae is underway and the rubric currently being designed might be used to help select the winner. In this case, numbers may be needed as column headings, so start by giving the best column a rating of 4 and working down from there. Include the resulting total number of possible points for the entire rubric beside the title of the rubric as in table 5.3.

Why not 0-1-2-3? Some designers of rubrics feel that a zero in a column is never appropriate and the only way a strand criterion can rate a zero is if it is omitted completely. When a column heading of zero is included, the language of the cells in the “zero” column can be crafted to align with omission of the element. There is no right or wrong answer in and of itself as far as the use of zero is concerned.

Whether or not a zero is included, the rating scale used for the column headings needs to fit the assessment structure and purpose. In this particular

Table 5.3. Rubric Sample: The Perfect Ice Cream Sundae (24 Possible Points)

Ratings:	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*
Components:				
Whipped topping				
Fruit topping				
Crunchy topping				
Sauce/pourable topping				
Ice cream				
Container				

assessment example, no matter how badly the criteria in the rubric strands are represented, they will be present. Therefore, I chose to make a rating of 1 the lowest possible score rather than a zero.

Why not 4-3-2-1? Must rubrics be designed with the strongest elements on the right side of the rubric? No. This too is personal preference. Just be sure students understand the rating scale so they don't panic if they glance at a scored rubric and mentally juxtapose the scores.

For that matter, must the highest score be the best? Or can the score closest to a 1 *be* number one? It could—again, just about anything is possible if students understand the rating system and know what to expect. There are no numerical reasons why this could not work.

However, rating systems wherein the highest accumulation of points translates to the better grade are more frequently used. They are also easier to convert to letter-grade systems and to combine with point totals from other kinds of assessments in addition to rubrics when using multiple forms of assessment in the same course or semester. Finally, systems in which higher scores are assigned to better products or performances are usually more readily understood by students, including international students.

While scores for column headings are being addressed, what about the practice of providing a range of scores for each column, as in table 5.4? Some rubric designers claim this provides flexibility. Others believe it goes too far in the direction of making ratings subjective to the extent of raising concerns about equity and fairness. This is precisely the kind of issue rubrics are intended to prevent. If the same rubric cell description could be rated a 3 or a 4, how could the difference be defended except on the grounds of subjective

Table 5.4. Rubric Sample: The Perfect Ice Cream Sundae

Ratings:	*1–2*	*3–4*	*5–6*	*7–8*

criteria or subjectively applied criteria? This problem is only compounded if wider ranges of scores are assigned to column headings.

If rubric designers choose to do either in the name of flexibility, it is their right. However, they need to be aware that the resulting rubric scores are at least somewhat inherently subjective. They are also not as legally defensible as an assessment measure. This may be one reason some mainstream campus course assessment software does not provide the option of including a range of scores on rubric columns.

When designing rubrics, the column headings are often limited to a numerical score. However, if column descriptor terms are desired, this is the time to add them. Craft column headings that are positive, neutral, or nonpunitive in nature and that align with the numerical rating of the column. That is simple to do with the column on the far right; it just takes a little more thought as one moves toward the left.

When working with four-column or five-column rubrics, it is often helpful to consider the highest-value column an outlier. When this approach is taken, not many students should be expected to achieve this level. If they do, that's great, but top scores on all strands of all rubrics for class projects should not be an expectation for an A in a course.

This outlier column heading may be something like "exemplary," "outstanding," or "exceeds expectations." The next column in, the 3 column in the example, should be attainable by the solid A students in the class and some of the B students.

When four-level rubrics are used for the purpose of assessments associated with state licensing organizations or professional association key evidence portfolios, a 3 is the level of performance expected to demonstrate an acceptable level of competence. Examples of column headings would be "high quality," "excellent," or "competent."

The second column from the left in a four-column rubric is often the hardest to name. Work in this column may be assessed as work in progress, as coming along nicely but not quite there yet, or as just not cutting it. The latter mindset will produce column headings such as "struggling," "not yet achieving," or "meets minimal expectations." A more positive, work-in-progress approach would favor headings such as "developing," "approaching good quality," or "working to meet expectations."

The column on the far left, while clearly not a column where students want their work rated, needs to be clearly labeled yet respectful. Examples in common usage include "unsatisfactory," "needs improvement," and "does not yet meet expectations." With all of this in mind, these labels may be used for further developing the rubric in table 5.5.

This should go without saying, but as long as the issue has come up, this is being said anyway: When designing rubrics or any other form of assess-

Table 5.5. Rubric Sample: The Perfect Ice Cream Sundae (24 Possible Points)

Ratings:	*1—Needs Improvement*	*2—Approaching Good Quality*	*3—High Quality*	*4—Outstanding*
Components:				
Whipped topping				
Fruit topping				
Crunchy topping				
Sauce/pourable topping				
Ice cream				
Container				

ment, it is essential to use respectful language. The author recently saw a rubric strand where the criterion was something along the lines of "amount of support a student needed from the professor." This seemed a rather unusual criterion upon which to rate a student in the first place. The language in one of the cells in the left-hand column read "student is a parasite."

We all have moments of frustration or episodes of late-night humor, but this kind of demeaning terminology does not belong in an assessment rubric. (This rubric appeared in an article in a professional journal. Neither the source nor the profession is being identified here with the intent of not embarrassing the authors.)

This should also go without saying, but again it is being said anyway because these errors have been observed so often when rubrics are designed: It is essential to use correct spelling, capitalization, grammar, style mechanics, terminology, and punctuation when drafting rubric language. If any abbreviations are used, beyond the most common or basic, provide a key at the bottom of the rubric. If in doubt, err on the side of too much clarity and provide the key.

Every interaction with students—whether in person, on paper, or online—is an opportunity to model expected professional behavior. It is respectful as well as professionally responsible to provide print communication at the same level or better than what is expected from students. This is especially the case if the printed material is important enough to convey expectations for the assessment of course-related performances or products.

Step 6. This is the most challenging of the ten steps: writing the observable assessment criteria for each cell. Cells are composed of the intersections of criteria down the left margin rows with ratings across the top columns. Start with the outside columns and work your way in.

It is easy to describe a component at its best and at its worst. The areas in between are more difficult to define in just a few words. Remember to decide up front how any issues of quantity and quality will be addressed.

Omit all nonessential words. If you find the word *and* is being used a lot when working across a row, it may mean that these criteria will need to be split in two. Another row may be needed to accommodate more than one criterion. Work to maintain consistency in phrasing each of the cells in the strand while moving across the row.

Use language that focuses on the performance task or rubric strand component, not on the performer. One of the inherent strengths of a rubric is that it does just that, puts an objective focus on the work to be accomplished. Rubric usage can take some of the fuel away from the fires of perceived favoritism, "personality conflict," and gender or ethnic bias.

For example, there is a world of difference between a rubric cell that reads, "The student's paper was poorly written with more than seven APA errors," and a rubric cell that simply states, ">7 APA errors." One is punitive; the other states objective fact.

A small detail? "Semantics"? Perhaps. But the more objective versions tend to be easier to write and take up less space in a rubric cell. So whenever possible and practical, why not pull references to students out of the rubric language and focus on the work instead? The students will know the rubric is being used to assess their work without mention of their student status in the rubric cells.

Remember that "observable" is a key concept. "Student believes/feels/thinks" does not describe an observable behavior. However, what students do as a *result* of those beliefs, feelings, or thoughts can be described and can be observed.

Before looking at the example work for step six, try drafting the outside rubric columns. If this has not already been done, it seriously may help to literally or mentally construct an ice cream sundae at this point. Get some "hands on" experience, describe what is being tasted—or what the reader wishes were being tasted—and try drafting the far right column as the ice cream creation is being savored. When some language has been drafted, imagine the worst ice cream sundae ever experienced or heard about and take a run at the far left column. What one version of this would look like is in table 5.6.

Examine the consistency in phrasing from one column to the other. Does punctuation fall in the same or similar places? Are the same kinds of elements described, using consistent language to refer to them while moving across the columns in each strand? The author gave in to subjective commentary on the container strand (and, for that matter, on the footnote) but would not do this if it were a serious rubric to describe a student performance or product. It was only done because the rubric in the example is a lighthearted one being used to demonstrate the basic steps in rubric construction. Revise the working self-constructed draft as necessary. Feel free to borrow ideas or cells/rows from the rubric drafts provided.

Table 5.6. Rubric Sample: The Perfect Ice Cream Sundae (24 Possible Points)

Ratings:	*1—Needs Improvement*	*2—Approaching Good Quality*	*3—High Quality*	*4—Outstanding*
Components:				
Whipped topping	Sour taste or runny, separating			Sweet, light, holds soft swirls
Fruit topping	Spoiled, moldy, or cloudy juice			Looks fresh cut; clear, sweet juice
Crunchy topping	Soggy, stale			Crisp, flavorful
Sauce/pourable topping	Tastes odd, not thick			Bold, sweet taste; thick
Ice cream	Gritty or freezer burned; odd taste			Smooth, silky; creamy taste
Container	Doesn't support the sundae—what a mess!			Supports and compliments the sundae—edible too!

Please note: Size of the sundaes, whether one scoop or a quart, is purely an individual preference. This rubric focuses on quality aspects by intentional design, taking a gourmet rather than gourmand approach to this culinary topic and assessment process.

Ready to finish up? Try drafting the middle two columns. This will probably be more challenging than drafting the outer two columns. That's usually the case, even for experienced rubric designers. If it is found some of the language in the cells for the outer two columns needs to be revised when drafting the inner two columns, that's ok. It is not unusual. See what has been developed as a full draft and then compare and contrast it with the example in table 5.7. This completed rubric follows all of the steps and demonstrates all of the suggested pointers for rubric development.

Step 7. The seventh step would be to add headings within the rubric, if desired, to group the criteria for purposes of easier viewing or scoring. This is optional in the case of analytic rubrics but is often needed for holistic rubrics given the more inclusive, comprehensive nature of the cells. The ice cream rubric is compact enough that headings or subheadings are not necessary and would serve no organizational purpose.

Step 8. The eighth step provides rubric designers with a means for giving one or more of the strands or, if headings are used, one or more of the sections greater or lesser emphasis than the remaining strands or sections. This is often helpful when determining the composite score for the performance

Table 5.7. Rubric Sample: The Perfect Ice Cream Sundae (24 Possible Points)

Ratings:	*1—Needs Improvement*	*2—Approaching Good Quality*	*3—High Quality*	*4—Outstanding*
Components:				
Whipped topping	Sour taste or runny, separating	Bland or loses shape quickly	Sweet; light, soft, droopy swirls	Sweet, light, holds soft swirls
Fruit topping	Spoiled, moldy, or cloudy juice	No longer fresh, tangy juice	Looks recently cut; clear, sweet juice	Looks fresh cut; clear, sweet juice
Crunchy topping	Soggy, stale	Getting soft, losing flavor	Almost crisp, good flavor	Crisp, flavorful
Sauce/ pourable topping	Tastes odd, not thick	Bland taste, lumpy	Sweet taste, smooth	Bold, sweet taste; thick and smooth
Ice cream	Gritty or freezer burned; odd taste	Uneven texture, adequate taste	Smooth, creamy taste	Smooth, silky; creamy dairy taste
Container	Doesn't support the sundae	Sundae is leaking through in a few places	Supports the sundae effectively	Supports and compliments the sundae—may be edible too!

Please note: Size of the sundae, whether one scoop or half a dozen, is purely an individual preference. This rubric focuses on quality aspects by intentional design, taking a gourmet rather than gourmand approach to this culinary topic and assessment process.

or product. This is done by assigning weightings, if desired. It may be easier to demonstrate than to explain.

In the example of the ice cream rubric as it exists in table 5.7, there are 24 possible points that can be earned. This is the case if every one of the six components is rated "outstanding" and therefore earns 4 points. To demonstrate the use of weightings, return to the hypothetical premise that the rubric is being used as part of a national competition to give an award for the perfect ice cream sundae.

Take that a step further by imagining that a company that is a national advocate of eating more ice cream is underwriting the competition. It is understandable that the hypothetical underwriter of this competition would want to put more emphasis on the ice cream component being adjudicated as part of the perfect sundae. To meet that assessment need, the designer or implementer of the rubric could choose to "weight the ice cream strand double."

This is indicated by placing "(x2)" in the component descriptor cell on the far left column of the rubric. Count whatever score that strand is awarded

Table 5.8. Rubric Sample: The Perfect Sundae Made with Ice Cream (24 Possible Points)

Ratings:	*1—Needs Improvement*	*2—Approaching Good Quality*	*3—High Quality*	*4—Outstanding*
Components:				
Whipped topping	Sour taste or runny, separating	Bland or loses shape quickly	Sweet; light, soft, droopy swirls	Sweet, light, holds soft swirls
Fruit topping	Spoiled, moldy, or cloudy juice	No longer fresh, tangy juice	Looks recently cut; clear, sweet juice	Looks fresh cut; clear, sweet juice
Crunchy topping	Soggy, stale	Getting soft, losing flavor	Almost crisp, good flavor	Crisp, flavorful
Sauce/ pourable topping	Tastes odd, not thick	Bland taste, lumpy	Sweet taste, smooth	Bold, sweet taste; thick and smooth
Ice cream (x2)	Gritty or freezer burned; odd taste	Uneven texture, adequate taste	Smooth, creamy taste	Smooth, silky; creamy dairy taste
Container	Doesn't support the sundae	Sundae is leaking through in a few places	Supports the sundae effectively	Supports and compliments the sundae—may be edible too!

Please note: Size of the sundae, whether one scoop or half a dozen, is purely an individual preference. This rubric focuses on quality aspects by intentional design, taking a gourmet rather than gourmand approach to this culinary topic and assessment process.

twice. This will increase the number of possible composite points that can be earned on the rubric to 28, as indicated in the revised version of the rubric in table 5.8.

It is also possible to deal with strand weights by making them worth only half of the default value by placing "(x.50)" in the strand descriptor cell. (See table 11.9 for an example.) Any ratio may be used for weighting purposes as long as it accurately represents the importance of the strand components to the overall product or performance. It must then be accurately factored into the scoring system for the rubric in which it is used.

Step 9. The ninth step involves piloting the finished rubric by using it to assess additional products—that is, additional ice cream sundaes. This can be done by the rubric designer or by anyone else enlisted to assist in this endeavor. Bribery may be effective here: the carrot of being able to design and/or devour an ice cream sundae may be well worth the stick of having to use the recently drafted rubric to assess it.

It may be found, as alluded to previously, that different people have different ideas about what criteria belong down the left-hand side of the rubric as well as what descriptive language belongs in the cells. That is to be expected. What readers want to find out from the piloting process is whether or not the rubric designed is applicable in every anticipated performance task assessment situation for which the rubric was developed.

Step 10. If it appears this is the case, based on piloting the rubric, take the tenth and final step. Move to full implementation and use the newly designed rubric for its intended purpose. If unanticipated gaps in applicability are found, despite a good-faith attempt to pilot the rubric, revise the rubric and keep revising it until the problems are solved.

Earlier in the chapter it was promised to provide a copy of the rubric in holistic form. This assessment rubric quite clearly belongs in the analytic realm for all the reasons stated in the third chapter, but look at the same rubric

Table 5.9. Converting an Analytic to a Holistic Rubric: The Perfect Ice Cream Sundae

Ratings:	*1—Needs Improvement*	*2—Approaching Good Quality*	*3—High Quality*	*4—Outstanding*
Components: Whipped topping, Fruit topping, Crunchy topping Sauce, Ice cream, Container	Topping tastes sour; is runny, separating. Fruit spoiled or moldy, cloudy juice. Soggy, stale topping. Sauce tastes odd or spoiled. Ice cream is gritty or freezer burned, odd taste. Container doesn't support the sundae.	Topping tastes bland, loses shape quickly. Fruit no longer fresh, tangy juice. Topping getting soft, losing flavor. Sauce tastes bland is lumpy. Ice cream has uneven texture, adequate taste. Sundae is leaking through in a few places.	Topping is sweet; light, soft, droopy swirls. Fruit looks recently cut with clear, sweet juice. Topping almost crisp with good flavor. Sauce tastes sweet, is smooth. Ice cream smooth and creamy. Container supports the sundae effectively.	Topping is sweet, light, holds soft swirls. Fruit looks fresh cut with clear sweet juice. Topping crisp and flavorful. Sauce has bold, sweet taste; thick and smooth. Ice cream is smooth, silky, with creamy dairy taste. Container supports and compliments the sundae—may be edible too!

Please note: Size of the sundae, whether one scoop or half a dozen, is purely an individual preference. This rubric focuses on quality aspects by intentional design, taking a gourmet rather than gourmand approach to this culinary topic and assessment process.

in a holistic format to better understand why that is the case (see table 5.9). A simple direct-conversion holistic version of the analytic rubric could still work. However, it would take much longer to use, would not permit one of the individual strands to be weighted, and would involve a lot more deliberation to arrive at a final defensible score.

Before going on to the process of designing a holistic rubric in the next chapter, the steps followed for designing the analytic rubric will be summarized and reviewed. The ten steps for the development of an analytic rubric may be found in the key considerations for this chapter.

KEY CONSIDERATIONS: THE 10 STEPS IN ANALYTIC RUBRIC DEVELOPMENT

Step 1: Identify the goal of the assessment task and if it involves processes or products or both.
Step 2: Be sure a rubric is an effective, efficient assessment option.
Step 3: Determine if an analytic rubric is the best fit for your assessment task.
Step 4: Determine the row/strand components to be assessed.
Step 5: Select the number of columns and their descriptors and/or numerical ratings.
Step 6: Draft the observable assessment criteria for each cell in every strand.
Step 7: Decide whether or not headings would be helpful to organize the rubric.
Step 8: Add weightings, if appropriate to augment column numerical ratings.
Step 9: Pilot the rubric and revise as needed.
Step 10: Implement the rubric in practice.