

Sarah Van Loo
 CEP813_Rubric 2.0

Skill	Complete Understanding 2 points	Partial Understanding 1 point	No Understanding 0 points	Teacher Comments
1 Direct & Specific Feedback				
2 Transparent Learning Targets				
3 Self-assessment Component				
4 Requires only target knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs) to complete				
5 Requires transfer of knowledge to demonstrate understanding				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				

Skill 1: Feedback to students is direct and specific

According to Black and Wiliam (1998), feedback to students should focus only on the work of that student and should not involve comparisons with the work of other students. These kinds of comparisons can be damaging to students' self-esteem and turn the focus of the class toward competition, rather than collaboration and an emphasis on improving learning.

Black and Wiliam (1998) further point out that feedback to students should be direct and specific, giving advice to students so they know what can be improved. This leads students to believe that they have the ability to improve. When they receive low marks and vague feedback, they are led to believe that they lack ability and that the circumstances of their performance are beyond their control.

Criteria in analytic rubrics, Wiggins and McTighe (2005) point out, should be independent and should "describe degrees of quality, proficiency, or understanding along a continuum" (p. 173).

As a teacher, I notice that students sometimes view themselves as "smart" or "not smart," "talented" or "not talented." By providing them with specific feedback that is directly related to their own performance,

students develop a growth mindset. In other words, they learn that they can improve regardless of where they started.

Evidence for complete understanding

Feedback to students is written, provided in a timely manner, is specific to the student (does not compare students with each other), gives specific advice for improvement, AND rubric criteria describes degrees of proficiency along a continuum.

Evidence for partial understanding

2-3 criteria are met: Feedback may be written, may be provided in a timely manner, may be specific to the student, may give specific advice for improvement, AND rubric criteria describes degrees of proficiency along a continuum.

Evidence for no understanding

Feedback is not given in a timely manner, it compares students to each other, does not give specific advice for improvement.

Skill 2: Learning targets/criteria are transparent

Students should have access to the criteria by which they will be graded. When criteria are transparent, "this satisfies a basic fairness principle," (Shepard, 2000, p. 11), allowing students to achieve excellence by knowing what the standards require. Conversely, according to Black and Wiliam (1998), when students do not have a clear picture of their learning targets, "they appear to become accustomed to receiving classroom teaching as an arbitrary sequence of exercises with no overarching rationale" (p. 143). Having transparent criteria also allows for self-assessment by the student, which is identified as Skill 3 in this rubric.

I have noticed that when students have clear expectations laid out for them, it actually takes the guesswork out of what they need to do and prevents a lot of questions from being asked of me, the teacher. Students do not need to ask or guess what quality work looks like because clear guidelines have already been laid out for them.

Evidence for complete understanding

Learning criteria are in writing, available to students from the beginning and throughout the assessment process. Learning criteria may be in writing, posted around the classroom or in students' work folders, or may be available in the learning management system that is used in the class.

Evidence for partial understanding

Learning criteria are in writing, but were provided to students after the assessment process had already begun. Learning criteria are not available in the learning management system or in another place where students can access them, should they misplace them.

Evidence for no understanding

Learning criteria are not available to students.

Skill 3: Component of self-assessment by student

When students have the opportunity to assess their own work, the criteria of the assignment and the feedback from teachers and peers becomes more important than the grade alone (Shepard, 2000). Students and teachers are able to develop a collaborative relationship in which students take responsibility for their own learning, appreciating "that standards are not capricious or arbitrary" (p. 12). Further, students become very honest about their own work and are prepared to defend their work with evidence (Shepard, 2000).

In my teaching experience, when students assess their own work, they use what they discover to improve their own work. On their own, they iterate on their projects and make improvements.

Evidence for complete understanding

The assessment instrument requires students to assess their own work, using clear criteria, and to defend their assessment with evidence.

Evidence for partial understanding

The assessment instrument requires students to assess their own work, using clear criteria, but does not require students to defend their assessment with evidence.

Evidence for no understanding

The assessment instrument does not require students to assess their own work.

Skill 4: Requires only target Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities (KSAs) to complete

One approach to creating valid and fair assessments is to require only target knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs) to complete the assessment. Assessment designers first identify what evidence is needed to judge whether students have demonstrated specified aspects of learning. After determining what knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs) are required, assessment designers then examine the assessment tasks to determine whether other unwanted, non-target KSAs are required to complete the assessment. If unwanted KSAs are included in the assessment, the assessment will yield results about the target KSAs and non-target KSAs, such as language skills or math skills (Trumbull & Lash, 2013). Therefore, non-target KSAs should be eliminated.

In one of my own classes last week, students were working in small groups to build a testbed to discover how the inputs and outputs of our robotics kits work. The students enjoyed building the testbed but were getting frustrated at the subsequent testing steps during which they were required to read and follow four pages of written instructions broken into four parts. As students worked on this process over a few class periods, I realized they were being inadvertently assessed on their reading skills (a non-target skill). Between class periods I photographed the testbed at each of the four major steps they were to work toward, annotated the photos, and shared them with students, eliminating the need to do the reading. While I recognize the importance of learning to read, I also recognized that reading skills were not what I was trying to assess in this activity. Students who had struggled with reading were then able to complete the rest of the assessment independently.

Evidence for complete understanding

Based on a review of which KSAs are necessary to demonstrate proficiency in a given criteria, the assessment includes minimal (0-1) non-target KSAs (such as reading). If non-target KSAs are included in the rubric, accommodations are made and accompany the assessment, such as additional illustrations, text translations (especially if done on a digital device), or read-alouds.

Evidence for partial understanding

Based on a review of which KSAs are necessary to demonstrate proficiency in a given criteria, the assessment includes 2-3 non-target KSAs (such as reading). If non-target KSAs are included in the rubric, accommodations are made and accompany the assessment, such as additional illustrations, text translations (especially if done on a digital device), or read-alouds.

Evidence for no understanding

Based on a review of which KSAs are necessary to demonstrate proficiency in a given criteria, the assessment includes non-target KSAs without accommodations.

Skill 5: Assessment requires transfer of knowledge to demonstrate understanding

According to Bloom (as cited in Wiggins & McTighe, 2005), "To understand is to be able to wisely and effectively use—transfer— what we know, in context; to apply knowledge and skill effectively, in realistic tasks and settings" (p. 7). A well-crafted assessment that assesses students' ability to transfer what they know should include an authentic performance task (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005).

The assessment tool should clearly describe criteria for degrees of understanding. Understanding should be assessed separately from other traits, like mechanics, organization, and craftsmanship. According to Wiggins and McTighe (2005), those other traits should be assessed in a separate rubric, or all of the traits should be assessed in a grid-style rubric.

As an elementary arts educator, I almost never assessed students using any kind of paper-and-pencil test. Regardless of what artist, technique, or style we were studying together, an art project was the authentic assessment my students completed. While some students might have had a difficult time stating the definition of a horizon line, they were able to create artworks with horizon lines in them. This authentic demonstration was more meaningful than being able to choose from multiple choice options on a written test.

Evidence for complete understanding

The assessment requires students to demonstrate their understanding using an authentic performance task.

Evidence for partial understanding

The assessment requires students to demonstrate their understanding by applying transfer of knowledge to a scenario in a written assessment.

Evidence for no understanding

The assessment does not require students to demonstrate their understanding through an authentic performance task or in a written assessment.

REFERENCES

Black, P. & William, D. (1998). Inside the black box: Raising standards through classroom assessment. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 80(2), 139-144.

Shepard, L. (2000). The role of assessment in a learning culture. *Educational Researcher*, 29(7), 4-14.

Shepard, L. (2005). Linking formative assessment to scaffolding. *Educational Leadership*, 63(3), 66-70.
Retrieved from

<http://p2047-ezproxy.msu.edu.proxy2.cl.msu.edu/login?url=https://search-ebSCOhost-com.proxy2.cl.msu.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ofs&AN=507839305&scope=site>

Trumbull, E. & Lash, A. (2013). *Understanding formative assessment: Insights from learning theory and measurement theory*. San Francisco: WestEd. Retrieved from

www.wested.org/online_pubs/resource1307.pdf

Wiggins, G.P. & McTighe, J. (2005). *Understanding by design*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Retrieved from

<http://p2047-ezproxy.msu.edu.proxy1.cl.msu.edu/login?url=https://search-ebSCOhost-com.proxy1.cl.msu.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=e000xna&AN=133964&scope=site>