

### Sample #12: Rubric for Critiquing Music (Grades 7–12)

Criterion	Indicator	Rating	Rationale (use words and phrases from the <i>Rubric for Rubrics</i> )
Coverage/ Organization	1A: Covers the Right Content	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The criteria seem to reflect important characteristics of critique at the secondary level.</li> </ul>
	1B: Criteria Are Well Organized	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The three criteria appear to cover different important dimensions of performance, but we have some questions. Should “the student demonstrates understanding of the relationships between elements” in <i>Conceptual Understanding</i> really be part of <i>Critique</i>? Should “ideas are unambiguous and fully explained” in <i>Conceptual Understanding</i> really be in <i>Presentation</i>? Might the descriptors in <i>Conceptual Understanding</i> profitably be grouped into three statements: use of terminology; use of examples; and discrimination among musical sounds, gestures, or techniques? Such grouping would also make the relationship between levels clearer (see Clarity 2B: Levels Parallel).</li> </ul>
	1C: Number of Levels Fits Targets and Uses	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Five levels are appropriate for the complexity of the targets.</li> </ul>
Clarity	2A: Levels Defined Well	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most of the wording is descriptive, but there is some use of vague terms like “unambiguous” and “fully.”</li> </ul>
	2B: Levels Parallel	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The levels are mostly parallel, but there are a few inconsistencies. For example, in <i>Presentation</i>, “voice” is present at levels 1 and 5, but missing at level 3. The discernment of parallelism in <i>Conceptual Understanding</i> would be assisted by grouping descriptors at each level into the three categories noted above.</li> </ul>