

Figure A.1: Metarubric for Assessing Creativity Rubrics

DIMENSION	1—DEVELOPING	2—PROGRESSING	3—PROFICIENT	4—EXEMPLARY
Research Basis	The rubric is based on intuition or hunches and has little basis in research, as evidenced by the promotion of practices that are contrary to research. For example, the rubric might encourage brainstorming without filtering or criticism.	The rubric includes some elements based in research and some other elements that are speculative, outdated, or not based on research.	The rubric reflects current research on the relationship between student actions and creative results.	The rubric reflects the latest and best research, including clear citations that other teachers, parents, or students can use to better understand the rubric writer's reasoning.
Multi-disciplinary Perspective	The rubric focuses narrowly on subjects and ideas within a single discipline and explicitly punishes or dissuades students from using sources or media from other disciplines.	The rubric allows students to explore projects using an individualized, interdisciplinary approach, but does not clearly promote that approach.	The rubric specifically encourages and rewards an interdisciplinary perspective.	The rubric encourages students to expand the scope of their work, through an iterative process, to include ideas and perspectives from three or more different disciplines and sources.
Source Material	The rubric expects students to be completely original and punishes the use of outside material for inspiration or use.	The rubric allows students to consider outside sources but makes no special note of the process.	The rubric encourages the use of a variety of digital, print, and personal sources to form the basis of the creative product for the current project.	The rubric requires the use of external sources and the identification of ideas from other sources on which the current project is based.
Clarity of Guidelines	The rubric contains ambiguous language, which makes the difference between rubric levels unclear to students and inconsistently applied by teachers.	The rubric is expressed in language that is inaccessible to students. It may be clear to the teacher, but the obscurity and complexity of the language make the rubric of little use as a feedback tool.	The rubric guidelines clearly specify the criteria and performance levels by which the students are evaluated. The teacher has evidence that at least two different evaluators have used the rubric to come to very similar conclusions about student performance.	The rubric is clear and specific in how it distinguishes each performance level. A group of teachers, including those from different grade levels and from outside the subject discipline, applied the rubric to an anonymous piece of student work and came to very similar conclusions.

Continued →

DIMENSION	1—DEVELOPING	2—PROGRESSING	3—PROFICIENT	4—EXEMPLARY
Product Specification	The rubric calls for the creation of a work product, but the requirements are ambiguous or absent, and differences among performance levels are unclear. The teacher values process to the exclusion of product.	The rubric requires the creation of a work product, but there is no objective feedback that leads to improved product development through the submission of multiple drafts.	The rubric requires the teacher to objectively evaluate the student's work product using a clear assessment rubric.	The rubric requires the teacher to objectively evaluate the student's work product using a clear assessment rubric. There is evidence that students can, independently and in groups, use the rubric to revise and improve the product.
Process Specification	The rubric's process requirements are ambiguous, and differences among performance levels are not clear.	The rubric's process requirements are inconsistent, and students have difficulty using the rubric to improve their work.	The rubric has clear process requirements, and students can differentiate performance levels based on the rubric.	The rubric not only evaluates the end product but also student work through every step of the process. As a result of this feedback, there is evidence that students are improving their methods, processes, and products.
Collaboration	The rubric requires students to work in complete isolation, without the aid or feedback of other students or teachers. Getting hints, suggestions, or ideas from other students is strictly forbidden.	The rubric allows for collaborative or group work, but it includes no guidelines for evaluating the process of collaboration.	The rubric requires a portion of the project to be group based. It establishes clear guidelines as to how group collaboration works and how students share responsibilities for the process and product.	The rubric establishes guidelines for collaboration, including specifying which elements of the team product are the work of individual students, the work of two or three students, and the work of the entire team. It is clear from the rubric that great performance is a combination of work by individuals, pairs, and larger teams.
Practice and Error	The rubric promotes one-thought attempts at performance. The ideal submission is error free and done right the first time it is submitted to the teacher.	The rubric allows for redrafting work products that are not acceptable on the first attempt.	The rubric requires multiple drafts of work products, with students using the rubric to improve performance.	The rubric requires multiple drafts, and there is clear evidence that students learn from their mistakes. The ideal work is never error free but full of learning that results from a virtuous cycle of error, feedback, reflection, and improvement.

Source: Adapted from Reeves, 2015, pp. 44–46.

References

Reeves, D. (2015). *Inspiring creativity and innovation in K–12*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.