Interviewee Selection & Question Development Rubric

| Criteria | Failing | Acceptable | Good | Excellent |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| Interviewee 4 pts | Selected person has no credentials in dealing with ethical dilemmas. OR no person identified. 0 pts | Selected person has vague or remote credentials in dealing with ethical dilemmas. 2 pts | Selected person has experience and credentials in dealing with ethical dilemmas in health care. 3 pts | Selected person has abundance of current experience and credentials in dealing with ethical dilemmas in health care. 4 pts |
| Questions 4 pts | Fewer than 10 questions developed. No logical flow to the questions. Questions not drawing out information from person interviewed. 1 pt | Ten questions developed with some logical flow to conversation evident with limited information asked through closed questioning. 2 pts | Ten questions developed with logical flow leading to conversational style drawing out information. 3 pts | More than 10 questions developed to provoke a thoughtful conversation using open-ended questions. 4 pts |
| Ethical/ Legal elements 2 pts | No concepts of ethical or legal considerations evident in questions. 0 pts | One concept of ethical or legal considerations evident in questions. 1 pt | Two concepts of ethical or legal considerations evident in questions. 1.5 pts | Multiple (≥ 3) concepts of ethical or legal considerations evident in questions. 2 pts |