Session objectives

- Introduce the *Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education* and Bloom's taxonomy
- Look at the “rubric” as a tool to aid and improve criteria based grading.
- Review the standards of the *Quality Matters* rubric for evaluating online courses.
- Explore resources for developing your own rubric.

Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education

1. Encourages faculty to student contact
2. Encourages cooperation among students
3. Encourages active learning
4. Gives prompt feedback
5. Emphasizes time on task
6. Respects diverse talents and ways of learning

1. Encourages faculty to student contact
   - Syllabus
   - Welcome letter
   - Course information for getting started
   - Announcements
   - Staff information
   - Email protocol & communication policy
   - Grade Book - feedback

2. Encourages cooperation among students
   - Cyber Café
   - FAQs
   - Groups / teams
   - Peer review
   - Class participation
   - Student chat room
   - Discussion boards
   - Student introduction assignment
   - Communication tools

3. Encourages active learning
   - Classroom Assessment Techniques
   - Active/cooperative learning/problem based learning, case studies
   - Peer review
   - Techniques for getting students to read
   - Discussion boards
   - Groups / teams
4  Gives prompt feedback

- Rubrics
- Grade book comments
- Individual/group emails
- Classroom Assessment techniques
- Multiple measures, multiple times
- Self reflection/assessment
- Peer grading

5  Emphasizes time on task

- Course schedule online
- Explicit statement on expected time commitment necessary for success in the class
- Estimated times for completion on major assignments
- Course design - interim submissions on large projects
- WIIFM – authentic learning

6  Communicates high expectations

- Syllabus – language is encouraging
- Learning outcomes are explicit
- Rubrics
- Announcements
- Bloom’s Taxonomy / Critical Thinking
Respects diverse talents and ways of learning

- Multiple measures, multiple times
- Multiple modalities
- Team formation
- Diversity / access
- Choices in assignments

USING RUBRICS

Two definitions…

A tool that presents elements important to a given assignment and describes degrees of attainment of these elements.

A scoring tool that lists the criteria by which a paper, project, or presentation will be graded.

How do you grade?

On a curve

Against a standard

Looks like a “B” to me!

Explicit traits identified

Explicit traits identified
Building the rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>11-$15</th>
<th>6-$10</th>
<th>0-$5</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mowing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crooked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trimming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edges neat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WIFM instructor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Saves time
- Consistency
- Fewer student questions as to “why”
- Facilitates focus on higher order skills
- Communicates with others (Writing Center, others teaching same course)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WIFM student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Timely feedback
- Easier to read instructor comments
- Explanation of the ideal
- Assigning points - students know what’s important
- Translation of “faculty speak”
**WIIFM**

**Faculty teaching the same course**

- Learn expectations of the course and assignments
- Consistency across sections

**WIIFM**

**Program assessment**

- Alignment with program learning outcomes
- Multi rater reliability

**Considerations**

- How detailed do you need to be?
- How much differentiation can realistically be made?
- Is there “language” specific to your discipline?
- What is the tone? Is it learner-centered? Punitive?
**Additive – subtractive**
Doing something better or less well between the scales

**Different qualities**
Each level represents a different skill such as in Bloom’s taxonomy.

**Criterion weight**
- Are all criteria equally important?
- If not, what percentage of importance would you give to each criterion?
- How specific can I be and still be realistic?
Example

Guide to Rating Critical Thinking
Washington State University

1) Identifies and communicates the problem/question at issue (excluding the source's position).

Score: 1 2 3 4 5 6
Substantively Developed

2) Identifies and presents the student's own perspective and position as it is important to the analysis of the issue.

Score: 1 2 3 4 5 6
Substantively Developed

3) Identifies and communicates OTHER issue perspectives and position that are important to the analysis of the issue.

Score: 1 2 3 4 5 6
Substantively Developed

Example

The Critical Thinking Rubric

1) Identifies and communicates the problem/question at issue (excluding the source's position).

Evaluating
Does not identify and communicate the problem, or confused or describes a different and inappropriate problem.

Score: 1 2 3 4 5 6
Identifies only the basics of the issue, but recognizes sources of the issue.

2) Identifies and presents the student's own perspective, position, and position as it is important to the analysis of the issue.

Reflective
Does not identify and communicate the problem, or confused or describes a different and inappropriate problem.

Score: 1 2 3 4 5 6
Identifies the main problems and subproblems, and relates, or explains aspects of the problem, and identifies issues, such as defining the relationships to each other.

3) Identifies and communicates OTHER issue perspectives and positions that are important to the analysis of the issue.

Score: 1 2 3 4 5 6
Substantively Developed

Example
Example

Role Play: Observation Checklist

Student: __________________ Class: __________________
Observer: __________________ Date: __________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Check</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved communication skills observed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates effective listening skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active participation in group discussions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Beyond grading

- Grading
- Self assessment
- Peer review

40 STANDARDS

17 – essential (3pts)
11 – very important (2pts)
12 – important (1pt)

Requires 72 of 85 points to meet Quality Matters expectations

- Course Overview and Introduction
- Learning Objectives
- Assessment and Measurement
- Resources and Materials
- Learner Engagement
- Course Technology
- Learner Support
- Accessibility
Web resources

**Rubistar**

http://rubistar.4teachers.org/index.php

Plus: Presents an editable list of traits/criteria and descriptions. No account required to draft and print a rubric.

Minus: K-12 is more heavily represented than Higher Education.

**iRubric**

http://www.rcampus.com/rubricshell.cfm?mode=gallery&sms=public

Plus: Gallery of rubrics presented by others. Significant representation from Higher Education. Filtered search.

Minus: Rubrics are created by the general public. No suggestions for verbiage beyond finding examples in rubrics created by others. Requires an account (free) before you can draft/edit a rubric.
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