

Grading Rubric for Draft and Final Lists of Interview Questions

Student: _____

Evaluator: _____

Date: _____

	1	2	3	4	5	Rating (0-5)	Weight	Rating x Weight
Organization	No logical sequencing of questions, redundant questions	Between 1 and 3	Questions presented in somewhat logical sequence	Between 3 and 5	Questions presented in logical, interesting sequence, no redundant questions			
Relevance	Many inappropriate questions	Between 1 and 3	Some inappropriate questions	Between 3 and 5	Questions are professional, clearly relevant to project goals			
Written Presentation	Many grammatical errors, incomplete sentences	Between 1 and 3	Good grammar, few errors	Between 3 and 5	Excellent grammar and sentence structure, no typographical errors			
Time Management	Inappropriate number of questions leading to poor timing	Between 1 and 3	Somewhat appropriate number of questions	Between 3 and 5	Appropriate number of questions, allowing for a reasonable appointment period			
Comments:						SUM (s)	N/A	
						Maximum (M) [5 * Sum of Weight]	N/A	N/A
						Percentage (100 x [Sum of Rating x Weight/Maximum])	N/A	N/A
						Letter Grade	N/A	N/A

Notes: 5 is the best rating, 1 worst. Weight indicates importance of assessment category and may be the same between categories. Note that the importance of time management varies drastically between draft and final question list. This rubric was developed based on those presented by Felder and Brent, 2010, and Meitzen, 2015.

Grading Rubric for Mock Interview

Student: _____

Evaluator: _____

Date: _____

	1	2	3	4	5	Rating (0-5)	Weight	Rating x Weight
Introduction	Did not ask for permission to record the interview; no introduction	N/A	N/A	N/A	Asked for permission to record the interview; professional introduction			
Organization	No logical sequencing of questions	Between 1 and 3	Questions presented in somewhat logical sequence	Between 3 and 5	Questions presented in logical, interesting sequence			
Relevance	Many inappropriate questions	Between 1 and 3	Some inappropriate questions	Between 3 and 5	Questions are appropriate, clearly relevant to project goals			
Delivery	Inaudible, not professional	Between 1 and 3	Moderately clear, somewhat animated	Between 3 and 5	Very clear, dynamic, professional			
Eye Contact	No eye contact	Between 1 and 3	Moderate eye contact with candidate	Between 3 and 5	Good eye contact with candidate			
Time Management	Inappropriate timing, over appointment period	N/A	N/A	N/A	Appropriate timing, ending within appointment period			
Comments:						SUM (s)	N/A	
						Maximum (M) [5 * Sum of Weight]	N/A	N/A
						Percentage (100 x [Sum of Rating x Weight/Maximum])	N/A	N/A
						Letter Grade	N/A	N/A

Notes: 5 is the best rating, 1 worst. Weight indicates importance of assessment category and may be the same between categories. This rubric was developed based on those presented by Felder and Brent, 2010, and Meitzen, 2015.

Grading Rubric for Final Reflection Essay

Student: _____

Evaluator: _____

Date: _____

	1	2	3	4	5	Rating (0-5)	Weight	Rating x Weight
Completeness	Many required parts missing or incomplete	Between 1 and 3	A few key parts missing or incomplete	Between 3 and 5	Essay complete -introduction -references to interviews -discussion of broader themes -clear identification and discussion of what was learned from the project			
Organization	No logical sequencing of information	Between 1 and 3	Information presented in somewhat logical sequence	Between 3 and 5	Information presented in logical, interesting sequence			
Relevance	Essay content not relevant to project goals	Between 1 and 3	Some inappropriate sections	Between 3 and 5	Clearly relevant to project goals			
Written Presentation	Many grammatical errors, incomplete sentences	Between 1 and 3	Good grammar, few errors	Between 3 and 5	Excellent grammar and sentence structure, no typographical errors			
Comments:						SUM (s)	N/A	
						Maximum (M) [5 * Sum of Weight]	N/A	N/A
						Percentage (100 x [Sum of Rating x Weight/Maximum])	N/A	N/A
						Letter Grade	N/A	N/A

Notes: 5 is the best rating, 1 worst. Weight indicates importance of assessment category and may be the same between categories. This rubric was developed based on those presented by Felder and Brent, 2010, and Meitzen, 2015.

Grading Rubric for Interview Transcription

Student: _____

Evaluator: _____

Date: _____

	1	2	3	4	5	Rating (0-5)	Weight	Rating x Weight
Completeness	Many parts of the interview missing or incomplete	Between 1 and 3	A few parts of the interview missing	Between 3 and 5	Entire interview transcribed			
Accuracy	Many portions not accurately transcribed	Between 1 and 3	Some portions not accurately transcribed	Between 3 and 5	Interview accurately transcribed			
Relevance	Interview content not relevant to project goals	Between 1 and 3	Some inappropriate sections	Between 3 and 5	Interview clearly relevant to project goals			
Written Presentation	Many grammatical errors, incomplete sentences	Between 1 and 3	Good grammar, few errors	Between 3 and 5	Excellent grammar and sentence structure, no typographical errors			
Time Management	Inappropriate timing, over appointment period	N/A	N/A	N/A	Appropriate timing, ending within appointment period or with consent of interviewed person			
Comments:						SUM (s)	N/A	
						Maximum (M) [5 * Sum of Weight]	N/A	N/A
						Percentage (100 x [Sum of Rating x Weight/Maximum])	N/A	N/A
						Letter Grade	N/A	N/A

Notes: 5 is the best rating, 1 worst. Weight indicates importance of assessment category and may be the same between categories. This rubric was developed based on those presented by Felder and Brent, 2010, and Meitzen, 2015.