SkillsCommons Curation Rubric

Version August 2017
Release Candidate 1

Quality Categories	Criteria	Highest Quality, Level 4 Can be used as is; few to no changes are required for reuse. 4 points
Production	**Writing & Language**	Content is clearly, thoroughly, and consistently written incorporating standard langauge, grammar, and writing conventions. No issues with terminology and language use.
	Media	Charts, images, photos, videos, objects, and other media can easily be easily viewed and reused without loss of fidelity.
	Links & External References	Links within courses are effectively embedded in accordance with current standards and consistently work properly.
	Flexibility & Editability	Content is effectively structured and/or chunked to enable easy use and editing of content and/or assessment blocks by others.
Usability	**Content Preview**	Previewing content is effectively and efficiently facilitated by commonly used formats (including a URL in the Additional Public Access to Material) without additional steps such as creating an account, logging in, etc.
	Accessibility	Content provides visual contrast, captioning, provisions for customized accommodations and other accessibility features that effectively support learners with disabilities. States and conforms to accessibility standards.
	Navigation	Content is clearly labeled and page flow is laid out in a consistent manner so that the learner pathway reflects step by step movement through the course.
Standards & Practices	**Course Design & Presentation**	Courses design is coherent and consistent throughout the program, reflecting the standards found in QOLT, QM, or other commonly-adopted course quality standards and practices.
	Standards & Competency Alignment	Alignment of competencies with national, state, or professional agency standards are clearly stated and effectively provided. References to standards are specific and alignments clear to non-specialist viewers.
	Credential Level	Credential level and credit equivalencies are clearly and effectively provided and stated.

Good Quality, Level 3	Moderate Quality, Level 2
Can be used as is; minor issues exist, however they don't affect reuse. **3 points**	Needs some improvement before the material can be reused. **2 points**
Content is written with minor gaps in clarity, thoroughness, consistency, language, grammar and/or writing conventions. Terminology and/or language use is appropriate for the material.	Content is written with major gaps in clarity, thoroughness, consistency, language, grammar and/or writing conventions. Terminology and/or language use may be inappropriate within the context of the material.
Charts, images, photos, videos, objects, and other media can be viewed and reused with minor gaps in ease of reuse or fidelity.	Charts, images, photos, videos, objects, and other media have viewing issues and have major gaps in ease of reuse or fidelity.
Links are embedded with minor gaps in effectiveness and work most of the time.	Links are embedded, but have major gaps in effectiveness thus limiting successful access.
Content is structured and/or chunked to enable editing and use by others with minor gaps in effectiveness or ease.	Content is marginally structured and/or chunked to enable use by others with major gaps in effectiveness or ease.
Previewing content is facilitated with minor gaps in effectiveness or efficiency. Minor issues are encountered, but don't significantly limit the preview of material.	Previewing content is facilitated with major gaps in effectiveness or efficiency. Significant barriers are encountered that limit the ability to preview the most of the material. Still able to get a sense of the content.
Accessibility features are present with minor gaps in effectiveness; claims being accessible without reference to specific standards.	Accessibility features are present with major gaps in effectiveness and conformance. Obvious issues are encountered.
Labeling and page flow shows a learner pathway with minor gaps in clarity or consistency. Navigation is largely clear.	Labeling and page flow for a defined learner pathway is unclear; major gaps in clarity or consistency. Navigation is inconsistent confusing.
Course design reflects course quality standards with minor gaps in coherence or consistency.	Course design marginally reflects course quality standards with major gaps in coherence or consistency.
Alignment of competencies with national, state or professional agency standards are provided with minor gaps in clarity or effectiveness. References to standards may be general in nature, but clear enough for a non-specialist viewer to understand alignment.	Alignment of competencies with national, state or professional agency standards are implied or minimally stated with major gaps in clarity or effectiveness. Non-specialist viewer should still be able to get a sense of the alignment.
Credential level and credits are provided with minor gaps in clarity or effectiveness. Statement of level may be general in nature.	Credential level and credits are provided with major gaps in clarity or effectiveness. Stated level is implied.

Poor Quality, Level 1 Requires significant improvement or changes before reuse; or unable to assess the criteria. **1 point**	Does not apply, Level 0 The criteria does not appear to apply to the content. **0 points**
Content requires significant editing for clarity, thoroughness, and/or consistency; grammatical issues limit reuse; and/or writing conventions are unclear or confusing. Terminology and/or language use may be an issue regardless of context.	Does not apply.
Charts, images, photos, videos, objects, and other media have significant quality issues that affect viewing, reusability and fidelity.	Does not apply.
Links are embedded with major gaps in effectiveness and consistency thus rendering the material largely unusable without applying significant effort or work-arounds.	Does not apply.
The majority of the content is not structured or chunked in a manner that enables editing and use by others; major gaps in effectiveness and ease that clearly limits reuse.	Does not apply.
Previewing content is not possible or is severely limited to be of any meaningful value.	Does not apply.
Accessibility features are largely absent; material does not conform to accessbility standards.	Does not apply.
Lacks consistent or coherent learner pathway labeling and page flow. Pathyway is confusing, unclear or does not exist. Navigation is unclear and/or difficult.	Does not apply.
Course design does not incorporate course quality standards; lacks coherence and consistency.	Does not apply.
Alignment of competencies with agency standards are minimally provided or do not appear to exist; significant gaps in clarity and effectiveness that raise concerns of subject matter applicability or quality to a non-specialist viewer.	Does not apply.
Credential level and credits are minimally referenced, not implied and/or not stated.	Does not apply.