Rubric for the Evaluation of the **ComBuS Toolkit**

Instructions:

Please grade the items below on a scale from 1-5 when answering the question *"To what degree does the Toolkit demonstrate the following?",* by marking with an "X" the option you have chosen *(only one option for each item):*

Criteria	Strongly Agree	Agree	Average	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
	1	2	3	4	5	
CONTENT						
1. The purpose / scope of the toolkit is clearly presented.						
2. The toolkit meets its intended objectives as defined by the project.						
3. The overall content of the toolkit is well-organised.						
4. There is a clear relationship between all the parts of the toolkit.						
5. The toolkit provides enough guidance in how to integrate the tools and resources that it provides, in my teaching and/or in decisions for detecting and combating bullying in school.						

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Average	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
6. There is a good balance between theory and practice presented in the toolkit.						
7. The examples provided in the toolkit are helpful.						

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Average	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
	1	2	3	4	5	
TECHNICAL QUALITY						
8. The toolkit's tone and writing style are appropriate for its intended audience.						
9. Paragraphs are coherently sequenced with clear relationships between them.						
10. No grammar, spelling, and punctuation errors exist.						
11. The images and diagrams in the toolkit are clear, well explained and of a good quality.						

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Average	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
	1	2	3	4	5	
CLARITY[1]						
12. The toolkit makes sense to a high degree.						
13. The toolkit is, to a high extent, systematically worked through, coherent and clearly described.						

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Average	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
	1	2	3	4	5	
CREDIBILITY						
14. The toolkit matches the needs of the target groups to a high extent.						
15. The toolkit is convincing to a high extent.						
16. The toolkit's methodological approaches are plausible and justified.						

[1] More and more professionals are tempted nowadays instead of the traditional positivist (scientific) criteria of *reliability, validity and generalisability* to use the new, alternative criteria for assessing quality, the so-called **4 C**s: **C**larity, **C**redibility, **C**ontribution and **C**ommunicative resonance, as emphasised also by Linda Finlay (2006, *Qualitative research towards public health*. In K311 Block 2 Researching Health. Milton Keynes, Buckinghamshire: The Open University).

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Average	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
17. The users of the toolkit accept/share, to a high degree, the same vision[2] like its developers regarding the contents and tools provided by the toolkit.						

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Average	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
	1	2	3	4	5	
CONTRIBUTION						
18. The toolkit brings added value to the existing knowledge and practices regarding combating bullying in schools.						
19. The toolkit enriches our understanding of supporting anti-bullying approaches, strategies and methods.						
20. The toolkit empowers and/or enhances the personal development of teachers, pupils, school leaders, parents and education decision makers.						
21. The toolkit offers guidance for future action or for increasing the chances of better and more efficient coping with the bullying						
22. The toolkit offers an interesting basis for further development and improvement.						

---

[2] The basis for this assessment should be the personal experience of the respondent/interviewee combined with the socio-professional context in which the users will apply them.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Average	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
	1	2	3	4	5	
COMUNICATIVE RESONANCE						
23. The toolkit is, to a high extent, sufficiently vivid or powerful to draw users in.						
24. The toolkit resonates with users' own experience/understandings[3].						
25. The toolkit's methodologies have been tested and argued in dialogue with others (stakeholders, users, researchers, academic community, etc.)[4].						

---

[3] Idem 2.

[4] Idem 2.

Please write below your personal opinion.

1. Name 3 strengths of the toolkit:

_____

_____

_____

2. Make 3 suggestions on how to improve the toolkit:

_____

_____

_____

3. Name the 3 most interesting things you learned from the toolkit:

_____

_____

_____

4. Any additional comments?

_____

_____

_____