

Sample 1: Calculation Rubric

Given the following set of hypothetical conversions, convert 15.5 blaps to clorcks. You must use unit conversions to receive full credit for your answer. (6 points)

1 clorck = 15.5 quaps

1 splunk = 86.2 quaps

1 blap = 200 pleeps

1 garthog = 45 blaps

1 pleep = 18 splunks

10 manks = 27 garthogs

Correct Answer

$$15.5 \text{ Blaps} \left| \frac{200 \text{ Pleeps}}{1 \text{ Blap}} \right| \left| \frac{18 \text{ Splunks}}{1 \text{ Pleep}} \right| \left| \frac{86.2 \text{ Quaps}}{1 \text{ Splunk}} \right| \left| \frac{1 \text{ Clorck}}{15.5 \text{ Quaps}} \right| = 310,320 \text{ Clorcks}$$

Grading Criteria for the Assignment

6 points – set up problem correctly, unit conversions, correct answer

5 points – set up problem correctly, unit conversions, incorrect answer

4 points – set up problem correctly, no unit conversions, correct answer

4 points – set up problem with minor error, unit conversions, answer correct as set up

3 points – set up problem with minor error, no unit conversions, answer correct as set up

2 points – nice try!

0 points – blank answer

<http://www.saumag.edu/assessment/ClassroomAssessmentsMiniGrants/SchroederCHEM1013.htm>

Sample 2: Grading Guidelines Department of English and Foreign Languages

- A**
- Superior ideas and insights; clear and complex; witty or especially original
 - Purpose clear throughout (unity)
 - Expectations established and fulfilled very satisfactorily; satisfying closure (organization)
 - Ideas connected clearly and smoothly (coherence)
 - Superior development (concreteness and/or examples)
 - Superior audience adaptation
 - Writer seems to mean what is said; genuine involvement in subject responding to the assignment
 - Mature style; felicitous use of language
 - Relatively free of any errors distracting to literate readers

-
- B/C**
- Clear, maybe less insightful or complex than an A OR insightful or complex, but less clear than an A
 - Purpose clear throughout (unity)
 - Expectations established and fulfilled (organization)
 - Ideas connected clearly (coherence)
 - Good development with examples and support
 - Some audience adaptation and accommodation
 - Writer engaged with subject; adherence to assignment
 - Some sentence variety; appropriate diction
 - Relatively free of major errors

-
- C/D**
- Ideas somewhat clear, not complex or insightful
 - May include some information that detracts from central purpose
 - Some expectations established but not fulfilled (organization)
 - Ideas connected, but perhaps awkwardly (coherence)
 - Adequate development—only an example or two
 - Some audience adaptation—may shift audiences
 - Adherence to assignment; occasional sense of engagement of writer with subject
 - Adequate style
 - Some errors, but not so many that the writer seems to lack control of standard written English

-
- F**
- Ideas generally unclear
 - Purpose unclear; writer seems to be searching for a topic
 - Expectations generally not established or fulfilled
 - Disconnected ideas
 - Paper short and undeveloped
 - Audience adaptation seriously flawed
 - Not a response to the assignment
 - Primer style
 - So many errors that the writer seems to lack control of standard written English; the errors interfere with communication

Sample 3: Essay Rubric

Grading Criteria	Poor (1)	Below Average (2)	Average (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)
Organization	The essay is unclear with no organization.	The main points of the essay are ambiguous.	Writing has minimal organization and a basic thesis statement.	Writing follows a logical organization, but sometimes drifts from the thesis.	Writing is clear, logical, and very organized around a developed thesis.
Evidence	The essay does not attempt to use evidence to support thesis.	The evidence provided does not support thesis.	The use of evidence is minimal, but it does support thesis.	There is evidence to support almost every point.	Every point is clearly supported by strong evidence.
Analysis	The essay does not attempt to explain how the evidence relates to thesis.	The analysis of the evidence has no relation to the thesis.	The analysis of the evidence stretches its meaning to support thesis.	The analysis explains how the evidence supports the thesis in most cases.	The analysis shows a strong relationship between the evidence and the thesis.

<http://www.oic.id.ucsb.edu/TA/tips/rubric.html>

Sample 4: Presentation Grading Rubric

	Professional	Adequate	Needs Work	You're Fired
Content	Full grasp (more than needed) of material in initial presentation and in answering questions later	Solid presentation of material and answers all questions adequately but without elaboration	Less than a full grasp of the information revealed rudimentary presentation and answers to questions	No grasp of information some misinformation, and unable to answer questions accurately
Organization	Information presented in a logical interesting sequence that is easy for the audience to follow	Information is presented in a logical sequence that is easy for the audience to follow but a bit dull	Presentation jumps around a lot and is not easy to follow although it is possible	Audience cannot follow presentations because it follows no logical sequence
Visual Aids	Visuals explain and reinforce the rest of the presentation	Visuals relate to rest of presentation	Visuals are too few or not sufficiently related to the rest of the presentation	Visuals not used or are superfluous
English	No misspelled words or grammatical errors	No more than two misspelled words or grammatical errors	Three misspelled words or grammatical errors	Four or more misspelled words or grammatical errors
Elocution	Speaks clearly, correctly and precisely, loud enough for audience to hear and slowly enough for easy understanding	Speaks clearly, pronounces most words correctly, loud enough to be easily heard, and slow enough to be understood	Speaks unclearly, mispronounces many major terms, and speaks too softly or rapidly to be easily understood	Mumbles, mispronounces most important terms, and speaks too softly or rapidly to be understood at all
Eye Contact	Eye contact constant; minimal or no reading of notes	Eye contact maintained except when consulting notes, which is too often	Some eye contact but mostly reading from notes	No eye contact, reads from notes exclusively

Adapted from: Stevens, D. D. and Levi, A.J. (2005) *Introduction to rubrics: An assessment tool to save grading time, convey effective feedback and promote student learning*. Sterling, VA.: <http://utc.arizona.edu/resources/rubrics.html>

Sample 5: Grading Rubric for Community Prevention Plan

Description: Devise an OUTLINE on how you would go about planning a community prevention/wellness/health promotion program based on the discussion in class on Community Prevention Programs. The outline lists the steps you would take in order to engage in at least 3 clear steps-needs assessment, implementation, & evaluation. (Blackinton, 2007)

RATING SCALE	Needs Assessment	Intervention	Evaluation
Fully Met	<p>4/4-Needs assessment clearly includes all the information that would be obtained during PRIOR to developing the program. The outlines specifies how the assessments would be done, ie, surveying the intended population of school age parents for quality of life concerns regarding their children.</p> <p>-Needs assessment considers the needs of the potential participants (educational, health, resources, etc); resources (equipment, space, funding, personnel..), and content needs.</p> <p>-Needs assessment investigates similar programs/ideas</p>	<p>3/3-Outlines intervention, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Type (class, website, newsletter...) -Frequency of intervention -Feasible size of intervention (100 mailings, 30 participants in class...) -Content Topics-ie, an outline on topics in fall prevention might include: a) medical causes balance loss; b) environmental causes of falls, and c) falls and physical activity or inactivity. You do NOT have to include the actual content, just an outline. 	<p>3/3-Outlines clearly spells out HOW the program will be evaluated on 2 levels:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) outcomes: What will you measure and How will you determine if your objectives or goals would be met b) process: how would you decide if the processes worked (ie, flyers in mailboxes versus email invitation)
Partially Met	<p>2.5/4-Needs assessment outlines lacks either breadth (does not consider participants, resources, and content OR does not give enough clarity on how it would performed</p>	<p>1.5/3-Outline specifies the type, frequency, and size of intervention but the content outline is minimal. For example, states that fall prevention program will be 4 hours but does not outline enough topics to cover that time frame</p>	<p>1.5/3-Evaluation is included in the outline but it is EITHER a) too limited, does not consider what and how to measure, or b) only considers one of the two types of evaluation (process or outcome).</p>
Needs Improvement	<p>1/4-Needs assessment lacks both breadth AND depth. Limited, does not fully consider personnel, equipment, space, or materials for the intended project. D</p>	<p>.5/3-Outline is significantly lacking in detail, unable to determine what will be included</p>	<p>.5/3-Evaluation outline is BOTH limited in depth and also considers only outcome or process issues</p>

Sample 6: Rationale for Selection of Tests/Measures

Attributes	Criteria
Thoroughness of List of Test and Measures	<p>Fully Met (6)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. List includes a selection of tests/measures that represents more than one domain of the ICF model (impairment + activity + participation) b. List represents appropriate body systems (musculoskeletal, neuro...) c. Represents patient & therapist identified problems <p>Mostly Met (4.5) -Meets a-c above, although may have omitted 1-2 potential tests/measures that are important to the case. For example, balance exam omitted from pt who was unstable walking, but most other tests/measures provided</p> <p>Partially Met (3.5) -A majority of tests/measures were included, however there were notable absences either by system or domains of ICF model</p> <p>Not Met (1) -The list of tests/measures has major gaps that negatively impact patient care</p>
Psychometric Properties of Test/Measures (validity, reliability, specificity, minimal detectable change)	<p>Fully Met (6)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Identifies psychometric properties of the tool, such as validity and reliability and minimally important difference of the test from appropriate source(s) b. Sources are not limited to texts, includes some peer-reviewed articles c. Provides ranges for normal/abnormal values d. Psychometric properties may be used to provide part of rationale for selection (ie, if 2 balance measures are appropriate, why you would choose one over the other) <p>Mostly Met (4.5) -Psychometric properties provided consistently, some information occasionally lacking (normative values) or for 1-2 tests</p> <p>Partially Met (3.5) -Some of the items in a-d above were not present or inconsistently provided</p> <p>Not Met (1) -Psychometric properties described only superficially and inconsistently</p>
Rationale for selection of Tests/Measures	<p>Fully Met (6)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Rationale is appropriate and specific to the case b. Describes why it was chosen, NOT what it includes. For example, “Berg Balance Test-because it can predict fall risk and demonstrate change over time” <i>rather than</i>: The berg balance test to test balance. c. Describes how the findings from the test will influence physical therapy prognosis, interventions, or plan of care <p>Mostly Met (4.5) -One or more of the following is noted: rationale is occasionally vague or not specific to the case.</p> <p>Partially Met (3.5) -1 or more items from letters a-c is inconsistently applied</p> <p>Not Met (1) -Rationale was not clearly described in the majority of tests and measures</p>
Writing & Organization	<p>Fully Met (2) The paper is clearly written, organized, free of spelling/grammar errors; uses references to cite validity/reliability</p> <p>Partially Met (1) Paper has occasional errors or mild disorganization</p> <p>Not Met: (0) Writing and/or organization distracts from the paper</p>
TOTAL ___/20	

Tests & Measures Assignment

The purpose of this assignment is to prepare you to select tests/measures or outcomes for your patient with an appropriate rationale. You and a partner will be given a case study, and based on the case study, write a list of tests/measures that you will select along with a rationale for why they were selected.

Specifically, the paper should outline:

- Name of each test/measure that is appropriate to the case
- A brief synopsis as to whether it is a valid/reliable and clinically feasible measure for the patient, including normal values as appropriate (reference/cite literature for these values).
- Rationale as to *why* the test/measure/outcome is appropriate to the specific case. For example, how will it influence your diagnosis, prognosis, or plan of care? A rationale does NOT describe what something is, rather, it describes WHY you think it is important to the specific patient case.

Sample 7: Grading Rubric for Case Report Capstone Project Year 3

Component	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor
Introduction*	<p>(15 points)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The author builds a strong argument for the case, -argument is well organized, beginning broad & building to purpose -Includes critical analysis of literature that support a theoretical context -Importance of topic clearly defended -Purpose clearly developed & appropriate to case 	<p>(12 points)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The author builds an argument for the case, but it needs improvement in 1 of the following: -organization of argument -critical analysis of literature -theoretical context -clear purpose -appropriate purpose 	<p>(9 points)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The author builds an argument for the case, but it needs improvement in 2 or more of the following: -organization of argument -critical analysis of literature -theoretical context -clear purpose -appropriate purpose 	<p>(5 points)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Introduction is present and describes the purpose of the case study, however, it is lacking a well- organized argument, critical analysis of literature, theoretical context, and importance of topic
Case Description	<p>(10 points)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subject history is described -clearly -organized -chronologically Includes: -History presenting problem -Current complaints, precautions, onset date, pertinent diagnoses, medical history -Pertinent demographic, social, & environmental factors -Review of systems 	<p>(8 points)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subject history is described but needs improvement in 1 of the following: -organization -history problem -current complaint -medical history -demographics -social & environmental factors -review systems 	<p>(6 points)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subject history is described but needs improvement in 2 of the following: -organization -history problem -current complaint -medical history -demographics -social & environmental factor -review systems <p>OR: all components are addressed but lack depth across several areas</p>	<p>(3 points)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subject history is present, but is disorganized, and is missing at least half of the components described need improvement (3 or more components)

Examination	(15 points) -Uses Guide terminology for tests & measures -Tests/measures appropriate to case (provide rationale) -Operationally defined all tests -Describes validity & reliability of all measures -Thorough: addresses impairment, activity, & participation if possible	(12 points) -Follows all guidelines in column 1, however did not address validity/reliability of all tests/measures	(9 points) Lacking in 2 or more of the following: -Guide terminology -appropriate choice -operational definitions -validity & reliability -levels of disablement	(5 points) Lacking in 3 or more of the following: -Guide terminology -appropriate choice -operational definitions -validity & reliability -levels of disablement
Evaluation, Diagnosis, Prognosis	(10 points) -Evaluation summarizes problems from disablement perspective -Evaluation seeks to explain hypotheses on relationship between movement dysfunction & underlying causes -Diagnoses identifies 1 or more practice patterns from Guide-considers more than obvious -Prognosis is identified in terms of time and potential to achieve outcomes	(8 points) -Evaluation, diagnosis, & prognosis are appropriate & follow guidelines but may not have considered all possibilities (ie, excluded potential for prevention of..)	(6 points) -One of the components in evaluation, diagnosis, or prognosis is missing, OR -All components presented but lacking depth or specificity	(3 points) -Evaluation, diagnosis, and prognosis does not show clinical reasoning as evidenced by narrow focus, incomplete problem list, and limited diagnostic categories.

Intervention	(15 points) -Intervention gives enough detail so that it could be replicated -Presentation of interventions is presented well, using figures, tables, appendices -Rationale is presented and supported by exam findings and literature when appropriate -Discussed interventions that were excluded	(12 points) Missing 1 of the following: -enough detail -well presented -supported by exam findings & literature -interventions not chosen	(9 points) Missing 2 of the following: -enough detail -well presented -supported by exam findings & literature -interventions not chosen	(5 points) Interventions were described, but could not be replicated. This section is not organized well, and choice of interventions is not supported by a rationale (exam or literature.) Did not discuss what interventions were excluded
Outcomes	(15 points) -Outcomes aligned with initial exam & interventions -Address more than one level of disablement -Reflect measures taken across time -Well organized -Effective use of tables, graphs, or captions -Describes validity & reliability of measures not done previously	(12 points) Outcome section is missing 1 of the following: -alignment with exam & treatment -levels of disablement -time based -organized -effective use of tables	(9 points) Outcome section is missing 2 of the following: -alignment with exam & treatment -levels of disablement -time based -organized -effective use of tables	(5 points) Outcome section does not make sense in light of examination & treatment OR Does not address 3 or more criteria listed in column 1

Discussion	(15 points) -Relates findings to overall purpose of the case report -Explains findings based on theory or hunches -Compares results with finding in literature -Implications for future research & practice discussed -Discusses potential limitations of case report	(12 points) Missing one of the following: -relates findings to purpose -discusses findings based on theory or hunches -compares to past research -implications for future research and future practice -limitations of this case report	(9 points) Missing two of the following: -relates findings to purpose -discusses findings based on theory or hunches -compares to past research -implications for future research and future practice -limitations of this case report	(5 points) Discussion does not address 3 or more of the criteria listed in column 1
Abstract	5 points -Clearly and concisely highlights key points of manuscript -No more than 500 words	4 points -Minimal corrections recommended	2 points Several corrections recommended OR Exceeds word limit	1 point Major revisions needed
Writing Skills	No Deduction Well written manuscript free of spelling or grammatical errors. Formatting correct & consistent with APTA guidelines	-3 points Minor corrections made for spelling and/or grammar Format correct	-5 points Minor corrections made for spelling and/or grammar Formatting corrections needed	-8 points Many corrections needed for spelling, grammar, and formatting

Blackinton, 2008

Modified from McEwen, I. Writing Case Reports: A How-To-Manual For Clinicians, 2nd edition. Alexandria, Virginia: APTA; 2001.

Tests & Measures Assignment

The purpose of this assignment is to prepare you to select tests/measures or outcomes for your patient with an appropriate rationale. You and a partner will be given a case study, and based on the case study, write a list of tests/measures that you will select along with a rationale for why they were selected. Specifically, the paper should outline:

- Name of each test/measure that is appropriate to the case
- A brief synopsis as to whether it is a valid/reliable and clinically feasible measure for the patient, including normal values as appropriate (reference/cite literature for these values).
- Rationale as to *why* the test/measure/outcome is appropriate to the specific case. For example, how will it influence your diagnosis, prognosis, or plan of care? A rationale does NOT describe what something is, rather, it describes WHY you think it is important to the specific patient case.