

Practical examples for teachers

Related content: M4-T2-MLC1 – Designing Transparent Evaluation Criteria and Rubrics with AI

Exercise 1 – for the teacher’s own learning

Objective: to design an outcome-based analytic rubric for one of your practical tasks with AI support, and to check it for alignment, clarity and fairness.

Title: From learning outcome to rubric

Exercise: drafting, critiquing and finalising a rubric, then producing a learner-friendly version of it.

Duration: 40–45 minutes

Form of work: individual work (or in pairs with a colleague teaching the same subject)

Tools: ChatGPT, Claude or Gemini; your learning outcomes and task description; optionally rubrics in Moodle or Google Classroom

Instructions:

1. Choose a practical task you will assess soon. Write down the 2–3 learning outcomes it serves and the context (learners’ year, conditions, exam requirements).
2. Adapt the example prompt from the core text to your task and ask for a four-level rubric draft. Remember: no learner data is needed.
3. Ask neutral, critical questions (alignment, vague words, fairness, weighting). Where the AI is wrong or too general, correct the draft yourself.
4. Try the rubric on two sample products (anonymised earlier work or descriptions invented by the AI). Finally, ask the AI for a learner-friendly “I can...” version and check it.

Lessons learnt:

- Criteria derived from learning outcomes make assessment more transparent and more consistent.
- AI drafts descriptors quickly, but their professional correctness and level must be checked by the teacher.
- Trying a rubric on sample work reveals vague or overlapping descriptors before learners are assessed.

Exercise 2 – classroom work with students

Objective: to make assessment criteria transparent to learners and to develop their self-assessment by building a rubric together.

Title: What makes good work? – Criteria we understand

Exercise: learners compare good and weaker examples of work, formulate criteria, turn them into a simple rubric with AI support, and use it for self-assessment.

Duration: 45 minutes

Form of work: group work (3–4 learners), then whole-class discussion

Tools: two or three sample products or photos (e.g. welds, cakes, installation boards); school-approved AI tool or teacher-led use on the projector; paper or a shared document

Instructions:

1. Groups examine a good and a weaker example of a typical product of their trade and list what makes the difference.
2. The class collects the features and groups them into 3–4 criteria. The teacher enters them into the AI tool and asks for a three-level rubric in learner-friendly language.
3. Groups compare the AI draft with their own list and with the teacher's requirements: What is missing? What is unclear? The class agrees on the final wording, which the teacher approves.
4. Learners use the rubric to assess their own latest piece of work and choose one criterion they want to improve next time.

Lessons learnt:

- Learners who help to formulate the criteria understand the expectations better.
- Comparing examples trains professional judgement about quality.
- The agreed rubric becomes a tool for self-assessment, not only for the teacher's assessment.

Notes for teachers:

- Designing a rubric requires no personal data; if photos of learners' work are used, make sure that no faces, names or other personal details are visible.
- The final criteria remain the teacher's responsibility: check them against the learning outcomes and exam requirements before using them for assessment.

Copyright © 2026 VITA Consortium

This work may be reused and adapted under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License (CC BY-SA 4.0).



Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the National Agency.