

Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation

A peer-reviewed electronic journal.

Copyright is retained by the first or sole author, who grants right of first publication to the *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*. Permission is granted to distribute this article for nonprofit, educational purposes if it is copied in its entirety and the journal is credited. Articles in PARE are indexed in the Directory of Open Access Journals (www.doaj.org).

Volume 10 Number 3, April 2005

ISSN 1531-7714

Student perspectives on rubric-referenced assessment

Heidi Andrade, and Ying Du
University at Albany

This study suggests that students use rubrics to support their own learning and academic performance. In focus groups, fourteen undergraduate students discussed the ways in which they used rubrics to plan an approach to an assignment, check their work, and guide or reflect on feedback from others. The students said that using rubrics helped them focus their efforts, produce work of higher quality, earn a better grade, and feel less anxious about an assignment. Their comments also revealed that most of the students tend not to read a rubric in its entirety, and that some may perceive of a rubric as a tool for satisfying a particular teacher's demands rather than as a representation of the criteria and standards of a discipline.

... the student's point of view matters because of its effect on learning. From the student's point of view, classroom assessment information is not merely information "about" himself or herself. Rather, it forms a major part of his or her learning life, becoming part of the lessons he or she is expected to learn, the relationship he or she has with the teacher and the subject matter, and relationships with peers. (Brookhart, 2003, p. 6)

Rubrics have become popular with teachers as a means of communicating expectations for an assignment, providing focused feedback on works in progress, and grading final products (Andrade, 2000; Goodrich, 1997; Moskal, 2003; Popham, 1997). Although an informal survey of rubrics available on the Web reveals that educators tend to define the word "rubric" in different ways, a commonly accepted definition is a document that articulates the expectations for an assignment by listing the criteria, or what counts, and describing levels of quality from excellent to poor (Andrade, 2000). See Appendix A for an example of an analytical rubric that fits this definition.

Rubrics are often used to grade student work but they can serve another, arguably more important, role as well: Rubrics can teach as well as evaluate. When used as part of a formative, student-centered approach to assessment, rubrics have the potential to help students develop a "vision of success" as well as "make dependable judgments about the quality of their own work" (Stiggins, 2001, p. 11). In his book, *Student-involved classroom assessment*, Stiggins (2001) argues that students are "the key assessment users" (p. 17), and, as such, should be able to use assessments in many of the same ways that teachers use them—to clarify the standards for quality performance, and to guide ongoing feedback about progress toward those standards. Other assessment theorists, including Black and Wiliam (1998), Shepard (2000), Brookhart (2003), and Wiggins (1998), put forward a similar conception of assessment as a moment of learning.

There is limited empirical evidence that students can and do use rubrics to their advantage. In a study of the impact of rubrics on eighth grade students' writing and knowledge of the qualities of effective

writing, Andrade (2001) concluded that simply handing out and explaining a rubric was associated with higher scores on one out of three essays written by the students. Questionnaires administered at the end of the study revealed that students who had received rubrics tended to identify more of the criteria by which writing is evaluated, suggesting that they were developing an understanding of the qualities of effective writing as defined by the rubrics they received.

A recent study by Hafner and Hafner (2003) provides additional evidence that undergraduate students can be effective users of rubrics. Their analysis of rubric-referenced peer evaluations of oral presentations in a college biology class showed that student ratings correlated highly with instructor ratings and were not influenced by course standing or gender. Hafner and Hafner conclude that their rubric is a valid and reliable tool for peer rating, and that rubrics present an effective strategy for teaching and learning in the context of a college science classroom.

Research by Schafer, Swanson, Bené and Newberry (2001) lends indirect support to the view of students as users of assessments. Their study of the effects of teacher knowledge of rubrics on student achievement suggests that teaching teachers about the rubric used to evaluate student work on constructed response test items was associated with higher scores on high school algebra and biology tests. Schafer et al. speculate that the higher test scores are the result of teachers having incorporated “operational definitions of achievement” (p. 152) into their instruction in ways that were understood and used by students.

Noting the need for more research on how assessments may be used as a “mechanism for instruction” (p. 152), Schafer et al. call for investigations into student behaviors that lead to improvements in achievement. Indeed, although the three studies discussed here present evidence for a link between rubrics and student learning, little is known about the mechanisms behind the achievement advantage provided by a rubric. Although Stiggins’ image of students actively engaged in their own assessment has face validity and enormous appeal, whether or not assessments actually serve the purposes of learning as well as

evaluation depends on how students perceive of and use them. Because “student perceptions are inextricably tied to the classroom assessment experience and ultimately the meaning and use of the information it affords” (Brookhart, 2003, p. 6), the study reported here was designed to provide some evidence of how students perceive of and use assessment in general and rubrics in particular.

The research reported in this article is from a subset of data collected for a study of undergraduates’ responses to criterion-referenced self-assessment. The purpose of the main study was to begin to paint a picture of student self-assessment that could contribute to the development of a theory of self-assessment. For a report on the full study, see Andrade and Du (manuscript in preparation). We report the rubric-related findings here because we believe they warrant attention from researchers and teachers interested in better understanding how rubrics can support the learning process. Our expectation is that this study will inform future research on student engagement in assessment, particularly whether and how assessments can promote achievement and provoke learning behaviors typically associated with academic success, such as goal-setting, self-monitoring, and revision (Zimmerman & Schunk, 2001).

METHOD

Participants. Fourteen undergraduate teacher education students (six female and eight male Caucasian, middle class Midwesterners) participated in topical interviews in focus groups. Three of the groups included four students. Because two women could not attend their scheduled focus group interview, one of the female groups had two students. Each student had completed Dr. Andrade’s 200-level educational psychology course with a field placement prior to the interviews. The course and field experience involved regular use of rubrics, including co-creating rubrics in class, formal rubric-referenced self-assessment, and teacher feedback. See Appendix A for a rubric that was co-created with one class.

Procedures. Focus groups were used because they may permit participants to make more critical comments than they would in one-on-one interviews (Kitzinger, 1995), because the format of

a focus group tends to create a permissive, non-threatening environment in which participants can share ideas and perceptions (Krueger & Casey, 2000), and because “young people are often stimulated to talk more expansively when others of their age join them” (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998, p. 100). The groups were segregated by gender because earlier research suggests that males and females may respond differently to rubric-referenced self-assessment (Andrade & Boulay, 2003; Goodrich, 1996). The interview protocol for the main study, from which the data for the study reported here was drawn, can be found in Appendix B.

DATA ANALYSIS

Analyzing focus group data is similar to the processes used to analyze other qualitative self-report data, with an added emphasis on the impact of group dynamics and the interactions between participants (Kitzinger, 1995). An adapted version of the Consensual Qualitative Research methodology (CQR) (Hill, Thompson, & Williams, 1997a) was used to analyze the interview data. CQR involves a team of researchers in data analysis. Individual team members look over the data in order to develop a starting point and then come together to discuss it. The final result of the analysis is based on a consensus of team members' interpretations. Consensus is defined as “general agreement, which is arrived at after open discussion and new synthesis based on an airing of all viewpoints,” as opposed to “forcing agreement” by imposing a statistical averaging of viewpoints or the majority viewpoint (Hill, Thompson, & Williams, 1997b, p. 607). The open airing of viewpoints allows team members to hear what they have missed and avoid carrying personal issues into the data and, more importantly, to come up with a new conceptualization of the data that might not have emerged without discussion. Although CQR has been used most often in studies of therapeutic processes, it is a “general method that can be used with a wide variety of topics and questions” (p. 607).

The analysis in this study involved 5 main steps: 1) developing and coding domains or topic areas, 2) constructing core ideas across cases from the coded

data, 3) examining the data for confirmatory and disconfirmatory evidence, 4) charting the results, and 5) writing a narrative summary. Codes were defined in terms of the content of participants' comments, rather than by length of utterance. Information about interview number (1-4) and placement within the interview were included with each code in order to allow for an examination of representativeness of students' views (Reed & Payton, 1997). Students' names have been changed in this report for the purposes of confidentiality.

FINDINGS

Students' comments regarding rubric use were consistently positive. They liked the fact that rubrics let them know “what's expected,” and contrasted it with the “guessing game” they felt they had to play when teachers did not provide a rubric or some sort of guidelines for an assignment. In fact, the most commonly cited purpose of rubrics was to communicate the teacher's expectations and thereby provide “direction.” Students also noted that rubrics help identify strengths and weaknesses in their work when used to give feedback, and that knowing “what counts” made grades seem fair. Both the male and female students talked at length about how they used rubrics and about the results of rubric use. We found no evidence of gender differences in the data.

Student use of rubrics

Students spoke about using rubrics to determine a teacher's expectations, plan production, check their works in progress, and guide and reflect on feedback from others.

Determining expectations for an assignment.

Some of the most animated discussions arose when the students talked about being unable to decipher their teachers' expectations. Their frustration was clear during such conversations:

Nathan: It seems like with a lot of my classes, I'm not so much worried about, well like, how well I think the work is. I'm just worried about doing work that the professor's going to like. So I think, like, the checklist and the rubric is like, helping me understand what they want or how they think so I can like you know, give them what they want. Because we're like in groups for

some of these classes and we're like doing these projects together. And we're not thinking, like, is this good enough? We're like literally saying out loud, okay what is he gonna want for this. And I don't think that's good enough. He's gonna want that right there. You know?

Jason: A good example of that is, I'm in a class right now with a professor and it's really a hands-on class. But she hasn't told us exactly what she's expecting. And everybody has been just panicking, because here it is, we're past midterms already. We don't have a single grade yet. We don't have a clue what she's expecting us to do.

Bill: Oh-ho.

Jason: And we're just, oh my. We're just pretty tense. And it's pretty much going to come down to... a final presentation. And that's our grade—how that goes. And we're all just, everybody is freaking. We all think we're doing good work. But she hasn't told us if SHE thinks we're doing good work. So we don't really have a clue.

Bill: That's tough. I, the guy I was telling you about that I was re-writing the paper for last quarter, uh, we didn't have anything all quarter. He never gave out a syllabus. And he said, if you want the syllabus, you have to get online and print it out. [laughter] And we never knew how much the final papers were. And then it turned out that the final paper was worth 3/4 of the grade, the other 1/4 being attendance. [laughter] So basically, I came back after spring break, thinking, oh, I got an A in there. I got back and I had an incomplete on my grade. I was, I went crazy. [laughter] And I'm still going crazy. Because I don't think he's changed it..., which means that it could turn into an F and screw me.

Each focus group in some way contrasted the frustration of not knowing their teachers' expectations with the relief or insight provided by a rubric. Some students, like Nathan above, talked about using rubrics to simply give the teachers what they wanted: "[A rubric helps] me understand what they want or how they think so I can... give them what they want"; "[The rubric brings] you in the

right direction, what you know the teacher feels you should be focusing your thought on." Other students noted that rubrics orient them toward their teacher's expectations while allowing them to "make the decisions ourselves about how we wanted to go about it": "It'll gear me toward where I'm supposed to be and what I'm supposed to be understanding from it without telling me what I'm supposed to be understanding, [rather than] telling you, 'This is what you're supposed to be understanding,' [it is telling you,] 'This is where you're going to find that understanding.'"

Planning production. With few exceptions, students reported using rubrics to plan an approach to an assignment: "We read through and, you know, we use that as a guideline to help us plan out the paper, the project we're going to be working on." Some of their comments suggest that they use a rubric like a recipe or a map: "I can look through that before I start the assignment and use that as a plan of attack and have that mapped out"; "I read it over once or twice and then I just keep thinking to myself, you know, I'll put that towards the end of the paper, this in the beginning...."

Some students admitted that, although they used a rubric to plan an assignment, they rarely read every level or gradation of quality: "I would read [levels] A and B, because I wouldn't want to go less than that"; "I would just glance at [levels C and D] just out of amusement to see what I could get by with"; "I just read A." One student said she didn't read the rubric very closely until she got feedback from the instructor on a draft of her assignment: "It becomes overwhelming... [so] I looked at it more after you had evaluated it, and then I was like oh, I've got to improve this category and so I'd look at the [levels] in that category."

Checking their work and revising. The interview questions for the study focused on the formal rubric-referenced self-assessment required by the course that students had taken (see Appendix B). Not surprisingly perhaps, students reported doing a lot of informal self-assessment as well, using the rubric "before, during and after to make sure I had everything covered." More surprising were the comments on the ways in which students were able to use a rubric to get a critical perspective on their own work; "... with the help of the guidelines, I

think that made it pretty easy to look at what I did personally and was able to you know kind of almost try to objectively look at it like it was someone else's paper and what would I say about this if someone asked me to give them feedback on it." Most surprising, perhaps, were the students' claims that they would act on their informal self-assessments by revising: "If I self-assess like that, and I find that if I say, hmm, I didn't do that so well, I'll try and correct it. It's like getting another shot, sort of."

Guiding and reflecting on feedback. One student who tended to struggle with writing told of taking a copy of her rubric to a tutor and saying, "... here's what I need in this paper." One young man used rubric scores to analyze patterns of strength and weakness in his writing: "After a number of papers you got like a pattern you could tell like maybe you kept doing well in this part and you kept not doing so well in a certain part, then where you really need to work a little longer on certain areas." Other students spoke about how they would review the scores they received from the teacher and reflect on what the scores meant about the quality of their work: "I'd get papers back, I'd look, go look through what was marked and like, oh yeah, I did forget this, or OK, I guess I did this better than I thought I did." One group of female students spoke at length about the value of getting rubric-referenced feedback on drafts of their work:

Amy: I love my feedback, actually.... I'm like an encourager of it now because I get so many papers back like in my English classes now just nothing, they don't tell you anything, it's just like a B or a C or anything, it's getting back, I mean you never learn. It's just like getting a multiple-choice test back and not going over it after you're finished with it. If you get an A you're happy that you got an A and if you got a B you're so mad that you don't care to go look at that, look back at it and see what you did, so I just think you just need to make it a point for everyone to go over it whether you got the A or the B and just find out. I mean because everybody knows, I mean everybody, even the people that got As could have missed one or two and they're still going to know why they missed that and otherwise they would never have gone, at least I would have never, never

would have gone back. Like on the papers, oh my God, like that was just, it was incredible, it was awesome just to have that and be like oh well you're right I didn't put that in there, you know, and then when you're doing other papers later on you just peek back at it and you're like I really need to, you know, I mean it was great.

Julie: I know with other classes when I had papers and you just get an A on the top and there's no marks at all, like that's, that is even frustrating because you're just like well what did I do right, like it just helps to have some kind of encouragement, I mean not just with just a D paper like you did this wrong. It helps to have the "you did this right" thing so you know what to do for the next time.

Sarah: I want to say that feedback, especially when you have the rubric and you're re-circling you know, where you have messed up and stuff, it, that helped me more than actually writing on a paper I think just because you know what areas you have to work on and then you can go back and correct that area and you, because I know you can't catch everything, but on the rubric it shows what areas you're lacking in and that's what helped me most I think.

Karen: And even like, especially like on the vignette when we did the first one we went through it you know we went back and just circling that one you know however many specific areas, just, I mean that's what you did, you just, when you got back with your group you went over you looked at the rubric what you didn't have in it and then you put it in there, you just, you know.

Amy: Feedback is like, I think, it's like the best thing.

Perceived results of rubric use

The participants in this study believed there were positive outcomes associated with rubric use, including better and fairer grades, improvements in the quality of their work, and less anxiety about assignments.

Better, fairer grades. Students claimed the rubrics "made you do better." One young man put it quite baldly: "It was our own stupid fault if we didn't get

a good grade because you told us what you wanted to see.” Students also agreed that rubrics represent a “fair” way to grade: “I think rubrics basically justify your grade because even if they do have like a grade and what you did wrong, this tells you exactly what you need or what you were lacking in”; “I thought it was fair....” Several students claimed that the rubrics for papers for their educational psychology class helped them get better grades on papers in other classes as well: “If I didn’t have any of these assessments I don’t think I’d have done nearly as well in the class and I probably wouldn’t do as well in some of my other classes that I’ve taken after this”; “I don’t want to use the term ‘generic’ but it will help you in almost any class, what the A work is, what the B work is....”

Improvements in quality of work. One student felt that having a rubric offered him “an opportunity to make sure that I have more quality work to turn in.” Students tended to attribute the improvement in their work to knowing what counts as high quality on an assignment: “I think my [writing] has gotten a lot better. I think it’s just knowing what you expected.” Knowing what was expected enabled students to focus their efforts:

It helped me focus a lot more because in a lot of papers, I know in certain classes I’ve taken in the past... it’s almost like you babble somewhat in the paper trying to make it longer, and you think you’re making your point stronger but in turn you’re weakening it a lot more. Where [a rubric] tells you what you need to put in, you can just cover that, as long as you cover it fully without killing it, without totally overdoing it. My papers, they might not be as long as they once were but they’re shorter and they’re a lot stronger because I get the main information in.

Several students concurred with the point made above, contrasting the focus that results from using a rubric with the habit of “BS-ing” their way through a paper when they don’t know how or where to focus it.

Less anxiety. Perhaps because they dislike writing “BS” as much as we, their teachers, dislike reading it, some students spoke about the affective benefits of rubric use. One young woman said, “[Having a rubric] just eased my mind so much.” A young man said, “Confidence-wise, it just made it easier to turn

your paper in. I can think of many times when I was in a class, and you’d just finished writing a real long paper or something and you don’t want to turn it in because like maybe there’s something I forgot.”

DISCUSSION

The students interviewed for this study uniformly endorsed the use of rubrics and claimed to apply them in purposeful ways intended to improve both their work and their grades. These findings provide support for Stiggins’ (2001) vision of students as “key users” of assessment—at least of rubrics. We were especially struck by students’ claims to have used rubrics to informally self-assess and revise their works in progress, and to reflect on or guide feedback from others. These findings reflect key aspects of academic self-regulation, including goal-setting, planning, self-judgment, and self-reaction (Zimmerman, 2000).

Our findings also validate the cyclical process of formative assessment described by Black and Wiliam (1998), which requires that students are able to 1) recognize the goal, 2) consider evidence about the position of their work in relation to that goal, and 3) have an understanding of a way to close the gap between the two. The students interviewed for this study report using rubrics to enable each of the three steps. A few students even reported transferring their developing conception of “good writing” from one course to another, lending credence to Brookhart’s (2003) claim that formative assessment can help students understand the standards of quality work.

Although students’ comments confirmed many of the arguments made for formative, student-centered classroom assessment, some students revealed possible misconceptions that could limit the effectiveness of a rubric as a support for learning. These misconceptions include the notion that it is not necessary to read an entire rubric, and the belief that a rubric represents a recipe or map to help them give a particular teacher what he or she wants.

Why read the whole rubric if I just want an A [or a B or a...]? The students’ perceptions of rubrics as “guides” or providers of “direction” may focus them on their goal—an A or B on an assignment—but a rubric can do more than

illuminate a target. The gradations of quality for C, D and F quality work can help them avoid common pitfalls in student work. Our data does not clearly indicate whether or not the students understood this but we suspect that they did not.

A rubric is a tool for "giving them what they want." The students who talked about a rubric as a map for giving a particular teacher what he or she wanted appeared to have little sense of a connection between their teachers' expectations and a broader definition of quality. We understand that there are good reasons for this: Some teachers' expectations are truly idiosyncratic, and students tend to develop strategies for temporarily accommodating them (White, 1994; see also Mabry, 1999, regarding the distorting effects of rubrics used to score high-stakes evaluations of writing). In fact, some of the students interviewed for this study complained about having to honor what they believed were unusual or unfathomable teacher expectations. Several of the students, however, made no distinctions between acceptable and unacceptable teacher expectations but described rubrics simply as tools for "giving them what they want." We were troubled by these students' uncritical acceptance of criteria and standards. Worried by the possibility that they were not developing a concept of "good writing" or "effective speaking" or "quality anything," we propose further research into the relationship between assessments and students' emerging conceptions of quality in a discipline or domain.

CONCLUSIONS

This study is based on self-report data from a small sample of students. The limitations of an exploratory study such as this necessarily prevent us from making concrete recommendations to teachers interested in using rubrics as part of a student-centered approach to assessment, particularly those teachers with populations of students very different from our sample. We can, however, note the key finding of this study: Students told of using rubrics in purposeful ways, some of which suggest that rubrics have the potential to promote self-regulatory behaviors such as goal-setting, self-assessment, and revision. Given these findings, further research on students'

conceptions of and misconceptions about assessment and approaches to rubric use is warranted. Research on students' actual use of rubrics, as opposed to reported use, is also likely to inform our understanding of whether and how assessments can serve the purposes of learning.

AUTHOR NOTE

We are grateful to Emily Sniezyk, Katerina Passa, and Ning Wen for their assistance with data analysis, and to Dr. Lawrence Rudner and the reviewers for *PARE* for their thoughtful feedback on drafts of this manuscript.

REFERENCES

- Andrade, H. (2000). Using rubrics to promote thinking and learning. *Educational Leadership*, 57(5), 13-18.
- Andrade, H. G. (2001, April 18). The effects of instructional rubrics on learning to write. *Current Issues in Education* [On-line], 4(4). Available: <http://cie.ed.asu.edu/volume4/number4>.
- Andrade, H., & Boulay, B. (2003). The role of rubric-referenced self-assessment in learning to write. *Journal of Educational Research*, 97(1), 21-34.
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Inside the black box: Raising standards through classroom assessment. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 80(2), 139-148.
- Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S. (1998). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Brookhart, S. (2003). Developing measurement theory for classroom assessment purposes and uses. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 22(4), 5-12.
- Goodrich, H. (1996). Student self-assessment: At the intersection of metacognition and authentic assessment. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University.
- Goodrich, H. (1997). Understanding rubrics. *Educational Leadership*, 54(4), 14-17.
- Hafner, J., & Hafner, P. (2003). Quantitative analysis of the rubric as an assessment tool: An empirical study of student peer-group rating. *International Journal of Science Education*, 25(12),

1509-1528.

Hill, C., Thompson, B., & Williams, E. (1997a). A guide to conducting consensual qualitative research. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 25(4), 517-572.

Hill, C., Thompson, B., & Williams, E. (1997b). A rejoinder to Stiles's, Hoshmand's, and Tinsley's comments about "A guide to conducting consensual qualitative research". *The Counseling Psychologist*, 25(4), 606-614.

Kitzinger, J. (1995). Introducing focus groups. *British Medical Journal*, 311(7000), 299-303.

Krueger, R., & Casey, M. (2000). *Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mabry, L. (1999). Writing to the rubric. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 80(9), 673-680.

Moskal, B. M. (2003). Recommendations for developing classroom performance assessments and scoring rubrics. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 8(14). Available: <http://pareonline.net/getvn.asp?V=8&n=14>

Popham, J. W. (1997). What's wrong-and what's right-with rubrics. *Educational Leadership*, 55(2), 72-75.

Reed, J., & Payton, V.R. (1997). Focus groups: Issues of analysis and interpretation. *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 26, 765-771.

Rubin, H. & Rubin, I. (1995). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

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

Schafer, W., Swanson, G., Bené, N., & Newberry, G. (2001). Effects of teacher knowledge of rubrics on student achievement in four content areas. *Applied Measurement in Education*, 14(2), 151-170.

Stiggins, R. J. (2001). *Student-involved classroom assessment* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice-Hall.

White, E. (1994). *Teaching and assessing writing: Recent advances in understanding, evaluating and improving student performance*, 2nd edition. Portland, ME: Calendar Islands Publishers.

Wiggins, G. (1998). *Educative assessment: Designing assessments to inform and improve student performance*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Zimmerman, B. (2000). Attaining self-regulation: A social cognitive perspective. In M. Boekaerts, P. Pintrich & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation* (pp. 13-41). New York: Academic Press.

Zimmerman, B., & Schunk, D. (2001). *Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: Theoretical perspectives* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

APPENDIX A

Rubric Co-Created with Students in an Undergraduate Educational Psychology Course

The rubric below was used to provide feedback on and grade student projects in an undergraduate educational psychology course. The project involved students in designing instruction that reflected current theories of teaching and learning, and creating a 15-minute skit that demonstrated their ability to apply the concepts to classroom practice.

LEARNING VIGNETTES PERFORMANCE RUBRIC

	A	B	C	D/F
Instructional objectives (what your students will learn, 1 pt.)	Communicates objectives to audience verbally and in writing, & shows how they connect to the assessment of the project. Objectives reflect the generativity of the topic & include ≥ 1 high-level thinking goal(s) (critique, metacognition, analyze, interpret, solve complex problems, apply, etc.). A handout w/background info is provided.	Communicates objectives verbally & in writing but doesn't connect them to assessment. Objectives only tend to reflect the generativity of the topic and include 1 high-level thinking goal for students.	Communicates learning objectives to audience by simply saying them or writing a list. Objectives do not reflect the generativity of the topic &/or do not include high-level thinking objectives.	Does not communicate learning objectives effectively, &/or objectives do not reflect the generativity of topic, &/or does not include high-level thinking objectives.
Instructional theories and techniques (how you teach, 7 pts.)	Uses a wide variety of techniques that promote learning objectives, e.g. modeling, metacognition/thinking skills, attn to misconceptions & motivation, student interaction, wait time, MI, constructivism, ongoing feedback, transfer, reflection on prior knowledge, positive reinforcement, teacher expectations, etc.	Uses a variety of techniques. Most are appropriate for the learning objectives of the lesson. Some may not be well- matched w/objectives but none are blatantly inappropriate.	Uses a few teaching techniques. The appropriateness of one ore more may be unclear, seem "crammed in" or random.	Uses only one or two approaches to instruction. The approaches used may be limited to "traditional" techniques such as memorization or lecture.

	A	B	C	D/F
Active engagement (what students are doing, 4 pts.)	All or most of the instruction involves active engagement on the part of students. The teacher(s) acts as a monitor and resource.	Most of the instruction involves active engagement. Lecture & seat work, if used, require thoughtful participation by students.	Lots of teacher talk. Some active engagement is used, but the bulk of the instruction does not rely on it.	Instruction rarely actively engages students in learning. It relies on lecture, worksheets, etc. The teacher acts as director.
Adaptations for Students with Special Needs (3 pts.)	Student's behavior reflects the case profile. Seamless attention to atypical student. The instruction focuses on the student's needs, uses a variety of appropriate strategies for meeting those needs, & creates a supportive environment that fosters self-worth. Is consistent with laws, policies & procedures.	Student's behavior tends to reflect the case profile. LV focuses on individual needs, uses some appropriate strategies but overlooks others. Some elements of a supportive learning environment are evident but others are missing.	Student's behavior does not reflect case profile. The teacher may create a dependency on the part of the student. There is recognition of student's needs but the interventions either don't fill it or single the student out by focusing too much on her/him.	Deals only w/typical development, or uses only inappropriate strategies, e.g. punishment is the only strategy used with an AD/HD student.
Developmental appropriateness (3 pts.)	At least one attempt is made to explicitly promote development by addressing common milestones in cognitive, linguistic, personal, social, &/or moral development. All activities and concepts are age appropriate.	All activities and concepts are age appropriate.	Most activities and concepts are age appropriate, but there is one example of a content or a teaching technique that is either too simple or too sophisticated.	Several activities or concepts are not age appropriate.
Presentation (2 pts.)	Organized and interesting. Actors know their lines & are professionally dressed. Costumes, scenery, humor and narration are used effectively. Performance is 15 minutes long.	Professional. May over-rely on telling instead of <i>showing</i> how techniques are used. Actors talked too fast &/or too quietly.	Some parts were out of character, unpolished, and/or unprofessional. The LV was choppy &/or blah. Went over 15 minutes time limit.	Inappropriate dress &/or language. No clear attempt to engage audience. Actors read from notes.

APPENDIX B

Interview Protocol

1. What are the most useful sources of feedback about your performance for you? Can you give an example?
Why those?
 - a. What were the most useful sources of feedback in my class?
 - b. What about self-assessment? Did you do it? Was it useful? Why or why not?
2. Did you do any kind of self-assessment before coming to my class?
 - a. If so, please tell me about it. Give me an example.
 - b. If not, why not?
3. I'm doing this study to start finding out how students respond to self-assessment. Let's start with a reminder of the kind of self-assessment you did in my class....
4. Tell me about your experiences with formal self-assessment in my class. What did you think and feel when you were asked to self-assess?
 - a. Did you do it?
 - b. Why did you do it or not do it?
 - c. If you did it, how did you do it? Give me an example.
 - d. What was it like to assess your own work?
 - e. What, if anything, did you get out of doing it?
 - f. How was it like or unlike the self-assessment you talked about earlier when I asked about feedback?
5. Do you do any self-assessment now?
 - a. Do you remember to do it if you aren't required to?
 - b. If you do remember, do you care to do it?
 - c. If you remember and care to do it, do you feel like you know how to do it?
6. Self-assessment seems to help some students but not others. Can you explain why?
 - a. How or why did it not help you if it didn't? Please give an example.
 - b. Does it seem possible that male and female students respond differently to self-assessment? If so, can you try to explain it?
 - c. Is it possible to structure self-assessment so all students benefit? If so, how? If not, why not? Give me an example.
7. What is self-assessment for? What does it involve?

Reference

Andrade, Heidi & Ying Du (2005). Student perspectives on rubric-referenced assessment. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 10(3). Available: <http://PAREonline.net/getvn.asp?v=10&n=3>