

Rubric for Peer Commentary Video
NUR2 617

Theme	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1
Identification of strengths /5	Two specific strengths of the peer’s work are identified. Insightful, clear rationale offered for how these elements are understood to be strengths. 5/5	Two specific strengths of the peer’s work are identified. Less well-developed rationale offered for how these elements are understood to be strengths. 3/5	Two strengths of the teaching session are identified. Strengths lack specificity and are less linked to the particulars of the clinical note. Rationale is vague and poorly supported. 1/5
Offer a new hypothesis, ideas and/or question /5	Thoughtful, creative offering(s) that is clinically relevant and skillfully presented. Supported with excellent rationale. 5/5	Interesting offering(s) that is clinically relevant. Less well presented – rationale is less thought through. 3/5	Offering is clinically questionable or inappropriate. Rationale presented is unclear. 1/5
One thing learned from reading clinical note /5	The one thing learned is well-described. Links to own practice are thoughtful. 5/5	The one thing learned is less well-described and less well-linked to own practice. 3/5	General statement about the one thing learned; poorly linked to own practice. 1/5
Tone /5	Supportive tone that demonstrates an excellent ability to offer feedback to your peer in a respectful, purposeful and transparent manner. Tone demonstrates sensitivity to the peer’s challenge with the case. 5/5	Supportive tone that demonstrates an effort to offer feedback to your peer in a respectful manner. Less evidence of sensitivity to peer’s challenge with the case. 3/5	Very formal and/or didactic tone that demonstrates little sensitivity to peer’s challenge with the case. 1/5
Presentation & Organization /5	All format requirements respected; Ideas are very clearly and thoughtfully articulated and well-organized 5/5	All format requirements are respected. Ideas are less clearly and thoughtfully articulated and less well organized. 3/5	Some format requirements are not respected. Ideas are unclear and presented in a disorganized or confusing manner. 1/5