My name is Yao Hill. I am a Faculty Specialist at the Assessment Office. Our office oversees program and institutional level assessment. Our mission is to use program assessment to improve student learning. We offer assessment workshops on various topics.

Assessment Office’s Mission

Improve student learning through academic program assessment

Website: manoa.hawaii.edu/assessment

We have two faculty specialists in the office: Monica Stitt-Bergh and myself. We conduct workshops, provide individual consultations, and facilitate assessment work sessions. Check out our website for resources and past workshop materials.

You may use these materials only for nonprofit educational purposes. Please give credit/cite appropriately.
This workshop is developed based on our analysis of 238 academic program Annual Assessment Reports. We found that quite a few programs developed program outcomes, mapped how their courses provide learning opportunities for outcome achievement through their curriculum maps, and identified learning evidence to assess program outcomes (e.g., student writings in senior-level writing intensive classes). But their results were based on individual faculty’s judgment of the quality of the student work. Judgments were not based on commonly agreed upon criteria. This makes interpretation of the results and use of the assessment results difficult.
In this workshop, I will provide techniques that facilitate collaborative development of evaluation criteria.

Workshop Outcomes

• Articulate the benefits of and need for faculty collaboration.
• Able to facilitate collaborative development of evaluation criteria:
  – three-person interview
  – collaborative rubric adaptation

These are the workshop outcomes.
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First of all, let’s step back and think about the question: why do we want faculty to collaborate in criteria development?

Possible answers:
- Create common expectations among the faculty of the quality of student work
- Promote faculty sense of autonomy
- Promote collegiality and collaboration among faculty
- So that the burden of assessment doesn’t just fall on one person
- Increase faculty buy-in because they are using the product that they produced
- …
The depth and meaning of assessment is only as good as the scope and quality of faculty involvement (Kinzie, 2010)

Research from a national survey shows that...

Faculty self-determined engagement is the key to a culture of assessment (Stanton & Goff, 2010)
We know faculty involvement and engagement is important. What make faculty want to engage? According to the self-determination theory, the assessment activity has to promote sense of autonomy. That is, it should not be a top-down decision or prescription of the course of action. Second, faculty needs necessary assessment knowledge and skills. Last but not least, it has to allow faculty to see the connection between assessment and what they do, as well as the connections between themselves and peers and the program. In other words, the assessment activity has to be personally meaningful and socially satisfying. The techniques that I am going to introduce today will help to promote faculty self-determined engagement.
As a famous program evaluator and scholar Jean King says, “To be human is to engage in interpersonal dynamics” and “Dynamics are forces that produce activity and change.” Her work inspired some of the approaches that Monica and I use. We promote collaboration and building a culture of assessment through collaboration.

Promote Collaboration

- Neutral facilitator
- Process that allows equal contribution
- Common end goal: product oriented
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Understand the role of facilitator

- Neutral but provides guidance
- Sets the ground rules
- Prepares the materials for the participants
- Get someone else to take notes if possible
- Summarizes input and disseminate

Let’s get started

Let’s say that your program assesses writing ability by asking faculty to report student achievement in senior-level writing classes. Each faculty decides whether each student meets or does not meet the program outcome on their own. How do you know whether each faculty member is using the same criteria judging the quality of the writing? Could anyone be too strict? Could anyone be too lenient?
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Major Challenges

• No history of collaboration
• Relying on implicit criteria
• Not familiar with evaluation tools such as checklist or rubrics

There are common challenges that some programs face: Faculty tend to work in solos. There has been no opportunity for faculty to discuss student learning in the past in an open and non-threatening environment. When evaluating student work, faculty may tell you: “I know it’s good when I see it.” They were not introduced to tools such as checklists or rubrics. Or for some reason, they are against it.

Structured Observation List (Suskie, 2009)

A Structured Observation Guide for a One-Act Play

Notes

Pace and rhythm
Characterizations
Stage presence
•
•
•
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THREE-PERSON INTERVIEW

Your turn

Three-Person Interview

• Form a group of 3. Each plays a role:
  – Interviewer
  – Interviewee
  – Note-taker
• Rotate the role → 3 interviews
• At the end, summarize the common criteria
• 1 interview = 3 minutes
• Summary = 5 minutes
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Interview 1

3 min

Interview 2

3 min
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Advantages of Structured Observation List

• Respect faculty expertise and autonomy
• Help faculty articulate learning goals
• More systematic evaluation of student work
• The notes help the development of a more descriptive rubric

Why reinventing the wheel?
Rubric Adaptation

1. Many existing rubrics are out there
   - V.A.L.U.E. rubrics in particular
   - Resources on handout

2. Collaborative adaptation promotes faculty buy-in

First, there are enormous numbers of rubrics out there. We can use them rather than creating one from scratch. AAC&U’s valid assessment of learning in the undergraduate education rubric set, known as VALUE rubrics, is a particular useful source. I also provided a handout on rubric sources. It is the blue handout on the second page of your handout set.

However, any existing rubric used somewhere else needs to be vested and adapted by faculty/staff in one’s own program. Only through collaborative adaptation can faculty establish common interpretation of performance expectations and make the rubric align with the program—its students, its requirements, and mostly importantly, its outcomes. The collaborative adaptation process will also help faculty buy-in of the assessment process.
Strategies

1. Prepare an agenda and a script

- **Agenda**
  1. Discuss the rubric
  2. Score Sample A
  3. Score Sample B
  4. Summary + next steps


2. Have a desired outcome and process

- e.g., to revise the rubric to align with PLO through discussion and evaluation of student papers
Strategies

3. Make contributions visible

- Flipchart
- Projector

Strategies

4. Decide how to decide

- Consensus
- Majority
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So in this workshop, we are going to simulate a rubric adaptation process. The facilitator has a script to follow, which is also in your handout. I will also show the rolling script in big fonts to familiarize you with the process.
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Setting

• Department meeting in Ethnic Studies
• Facilitator from the Assessment Office
• All faculty are present

Step 1 Introduction (5 min)

a. Welcome the participants

Facilitator’s script:

Thank you for coming today. In our last meeting, we decided to measure one program learning outcome 4 in the BA program next semester. That is: effective written communication. This semester, the Curriculum Committee is developing a scoring rubric related to this outcome. We found a rubric that we think can be used as a starting point. It is the written communication rubric from the Language Program at UW.
Step 1 Introduction (5 min)

b. Specify the goal/outcome of the session

Facilitator’s script:

Our goal for today is to have an open discussion on how to revise the rubric to align with our program outcome.

Step 1 Introduction (5 min)

c. Provide agenda

Facilitator’s script:

Today’s agenda: (pointing to the agenda)

1. Discuss the rubric
2. Score Sample A
3. Score Sample B
4. Summary + next steps
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Step 1 Introduction (5 min)

d. Set the ground rules

Facilitator’s script:

To have a productive discussion, we have the several ground rules: (pointing to the ground rules)

1. Actively contribute
2. Give a chance for others to speak
3. Disagree with respect

Step 1 Introduction (5 min)

e. Instruct faculty to review the rubric

Facilitator’s script:

First let’s spend several minutes to read the rubric. On your blue handout, you can see the target program learning outcome listed on the top and the draft rubric below that. When reading the rubric, think about whether the rubric is aligned with the outcome and major instructional activities in our curriculum. Write on the handout anything to be added, modified, or deleted. Let’s use five minutes to do this on our own.
Step 2. Rubric Revising Suggestions (15 min)

a. Faculty silently review the rubric and write suggested additions, modifications, and/or deletions.

3 min

b. Start the discussion with a general question.

Note-taking starts.

Facilitator’s script:

How well does the rubric relate to the outcome(s) being measured?
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Step 2. Rubric Revising Suggestions (15 min)

c. Follow-up questions:

*Facilitator’s script:*

- Is anything missing?
- Is anything extraneous?
- Is anything unclear?

The features listed should be important and support what we emphasize in the classroom. Trivial features and unrelated features should be left out.

---

Step 2. Rubric Revising Suggestions (15 min)

d. After 10 minutes, inform the participants:

*Facilitator’s script:*

These are good suggestions. Please keep them in mind as we apply the rubric to the student [papers]. After we've reviewed 2 papers, we'll come back to these lists and decide how to modify the rubric.
Step 3. Score Sample A (15 min)

score → share → discuss → rescore

a. Instruct faculty to score with ethical considerations.

Facilitator’s script:

Now, let’s use the rubric to score student work sample A. I want to emphasize that the purpose of this activity is to assess the program, not individual students or faculty. If you happen to recognize the students or their instructors from the writing samples, please do not disclose their identities in respect of his/her confidentiality and privacy.

Step 3. Score Sample A (15 min)

score → share → discuss → rescore

a. Facilitator’s script continued:

Let’s use 5 minutes to score Student A’s work, which is on a white double-sided sheet. Write down your score on the pink scoring sheet. Provide reasons for your score in the note area.
Step 3. Score Sample A (15 min)

score → share → discuss → rescore

b. Faculty silently score Sample A and write notes.

5 min

Step 3. Score Sample A (15 min)

score → share → discuss → rescore

c. Record the number of participants for each score. Example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Score = 3</th>
<th>Score = 2</th>
<th>Score = 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Step 3. Score Sample A (15 min)

score → share → discuss → rescore

c. Facilitator’s script:

Can you give me a show of hands if you scored ‘3’ for Sample A? Who scored ‘2’? Who gave it a ‘1’? [Count the show of hands and record on paper or screen]. We can see that majority of us gave the paper a 3, and a few gave it a 2. Can I have a volunteer to explain why you gave the paper a 2 or 3? In your explanation, use language and concepts from the rubric as much as possible.

Step 3. Score Sample A (15 min)

score → share → discuss → rescore
d. After reaching saturation → rescore

Facilitator’s script:

Now that we’ve discussed the [paper] and you’ve had a chance to hear how others applied the rubric, I’d like you to rescore the [paper] in light of what you’ve heard. . . . Does anyone want to change their initial score?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Score = 3</th>
<th>Score = 2</th>
<th>Score = 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Step 4. Score Sample B (15 min)

score → share → discuss → rescore

a. Instruct faculty to score.

Facilitator’s script:

Now, let’s use the rubric to score student work sample B. It is on the yellow double-sided sheet. Again, write down your score on the green scoring sheet. Provide reasons for your score in the note area.

b. Faculty silently score Sample B and write notes.

5 min
Step 4. Score Sample B (15 min)

score → share → discuss → rescore

c. Record the number of participants for each score.

Facilitator’s script:

Can you give me a show of hands if you scored '3' for Sample B? Who scored '2'? Who gave it a '1'? [Count the show of hands and record on paper or screen]. We can see that majority of us gave the paper a 2, and a few gave it a 3. Can I have a volunteer to explain why you gave the paper a 2 or 3? In your explanation, use language and concepts from the rubric as much as possible.

Step B. Score Sample B (15 min)

score → share → discuss → rescore

d. After reaching saturation → rescore

Facilitator’s script:

Now that we’ve discussed the [paper] and you’ve had a chance to hear how others applied the rubric, I’d like you to re-score the [paper] in light of what you’ve heard. . . . Does anyone want to change their initial score?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Score = 3</th>
<th>Score = 2</th>
<th>Score = 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Step 5. Summarization + Next Steps
(10 min)
Facilitation Tip: Get agreement on how decisions will be made, e.g., consensus, majority rule.

Facilitator’s script:

Now that we’ve had a chance to discuss the rubric and score and discuss pieces of student work, we’re going to take the last part of our time together to see what modifications that we are going to make, and finally, talk about next steps.

Facilitator’s script continued:

I suggest we use a consensus method when we decide if the rubric needs changes. This means we will listen to each other’s proposals to change the rubric, then discuss, and then see if we are willing to live with the proposal or not. It doesn’t mean we’re seeking 100% agreement. Instead, it means that it is a change that everyone is willing to support. It may be, but is not necessarily the rubric most preferred by each person. Can we use consensus decision making or would you prefer a different method like 85% majority vote needed?
Step 5. Summarization + Next Steps
(10 min)

Facilitator’s script continued:

Now, let’s take a look at our initial list of suggested changes. Which ones do we want to keep?

Step 5. Summarization + Next Steps
(10 min)

Summarize the session’s accomplishments and set next steps:

Facilitator’s script:

We accomplished a lot today. We agreed that ... I am going to make these changes and send it out for everyone’s review and final comments in next two days. Here are the next steps: We will collect research papers in the capstone courses by the end of this semester. In the beginning of the next semester, we will schedule another work session to do standard setting and rater training. After that...
Summary

• Benefit & need for collaborative evaluation criteria development
• Structured observation list through three-person interview
• Rubric adaptation

Questions?

Yao Zhang Hill
yao.hill@hawaii.edu
University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa
Manoa.hawaii.edu/assessment
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Workshop Handouts

Three-Person Interview Response Sheet

**Target Program SLO:** Students will be able to communicate effectively in writing.

**Activity Goal:** To create common criteria for effective written communication skills.

**Guidelines:** Form a group of three. One person serves as the interviewer, one as the interviewee, and the third person as the note-taker. The interviewer will ask the interview question below. The note-taker will write down the key ideas from the interviewee. After three minutes, switch roles, and repeat until each person has the opportunity to play all three roles. After each person has been interviewed, use 5 minutes to identify the common criteria as a group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Question:</th>
<th>What aspects of student writing do you pay attention to when evaluating its quality?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interview 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tips:</strong> Think about your expectations of good writing for senior level students, and/or good writing from seniors that you encountered in your experience. What makes you give it an “A” versus “B” or “C”?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interview 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interview 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Group Ideas:**

Similarities?! Common themes?! Predictions?! Conclusions?

---
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Rubric Sources

1. AAC&U VALUE Rubrics: [http://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics](http://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics) (Need to enter email to download)
   a. Intellectual and Practical Skills (Inquiry and analysis, Critical thinking, Creative thinking, Written communication, Oral communication, Reading, Quantitative literacy, Information literacy, Teamwork, Problem solving)
   b. Personal and Social Responsibility (Civic knowledge and engagement—local and global, Intercultural knowledge and competence, Ethical reasoning, Foundations and skills for lifelong learning)
   c. Integrative and Applied Learning
3. University of Hawaii at Manoa
4. Opened Practices: [http://openedpractices.org/resources](http://openedpractices.org/resources) (Need to register and log in to add own content and get detailed instructions.)
5. Rcampus iRubric: [http://www.rcampus.com/indexrubric.cfm](http://www.rcampus.com/indexrubric.cfm) (Need to register and log in to search rubrics and build one’s own rubric)
   Describe the benefits, list related articles and books, list sample rubrics and development resources
7. Rubric samples for higher education by Dr. Dorothy I. Mitstifer from Kappa Omicron Nu Honor Society: [http://rubrics.kappaomicronnu.org/index.html](http://rubrics.kappaomicronnu.org/index.html)
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Sample Rubric to Adapt

**Learning Outcome:** Students can communicate effectively in writing

**Written Communication Outcome Draft Rubric**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOCUS</strong></td>
<td>Sharp, distinct controlling point made about a single topic with evident awareness of task.</td>
<td>Apparent point made about a single topic with sufficient awareness of task.</td>
<td>No apparent point but evidence of a specific topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTENT</strong></td>
<td>Substantial, specific, and/or illustrative content demonstrating strong development and sophisticated ideas.</td>
<td>Sufficiently developed content with adequate elaboration or explanation.</td>
<td>Limited content with inadequate elaboration or explanation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ORGANIZATION</strong></td>
<td>Sophisticated arrangement of content with evident and/or subtle transitions.</td>
<td>Functional arrangement of content that sustains a logical order with some evidence of transitions.</td>
<td>Confused or inconsistent arrangement of content with or without attempts at transition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STYLE</strong></td>
<td>Precise, illustrative use of a variety of words and sentence structures to create consistent writer's voice and tone appropriate to audience.</td>
<td>Generic use of a variety of words and sentence structures that may or may not create writer's voice and tone appropriate to audience.</td>
<td>Limited word choice and control of sentence structures that inhibit voice and tone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONVENTIONS</strong></td>
<td>Evident control of grammar, mechanics, spelling, usage and sentence formation.</td>
<td>Sufficient control of grammar, mechanics, spelling, usage and sentence formation.</td>
<td>Limited control of grammar, mechanics, spelling, usage and sentence formation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Rubric Adaptation Activity: Score Sheet

Reader Initials: ________

Writing Outcome Score Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SCORE (1-3)</th>
<th>Notes/Explanations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Facilitation Activity: Rubric Adaptation

Activity outcome: Pilot test a rubric in order to verify usefulness and/or revise the rubric.

Process: Open, full-group discussion

Materials needed:

- Copies of the targeted program student learning outcome(s)
- Copies of the (draft) rubric for the SLO(s)
- 2-3 samples of student work (different levels of quality, if possible). Copies or available on Laulima or other secure site.
- Copies of a score sheet with blank space for notes

Time in minutes

Prior to the session, faculty members read the targeted SLO(s), the rubric, and the samples of student work.

5 Step 1. Welcome participants and describe the activity.

“Thank you for coming today. As you know from our presentation at the department meeting, the BA program has selected three student outcomes to investigate next semester: writing, critical thinking, and ethical reasoning. This semester, the Curriculum Committee is developing a scoring rubric related to those three outcomes. We found a rubric that we think can be used as a starting point. The rubric comes from [the language program at UW]. Our goal for today is to have you give feedback on the rubric so that we can revise and be ready for next semester.

Today’s agenda: we’ll first discuss the rubric. Then we’ll apply the rubric to two student papers and after each paper, we’ll discuss the rubric and our scores for that paper. Based on our scoring experience and discussion, we will decide how to modify the rubric.

First let’s spend several minutes to read the rubric. On your handout, you can see the program learning outcome is listed on the top and the draft rubric below that. When reading the rubric, think about whether the rubric is aligned with the outcome and writing-related major instructional activities in our curriculum. Write on the handout anything to be added, modified, or deleted. Let’s use five minutes to do this on our own.”

5 Step 2. Faculty silently review the rubric and write suggested additions, modifications, and deletions.
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Step 3a. The facilitator starts the discussion with a general question and a recorder writes/types responses.

“How well does the rubric relate to the outcome(s) being measured?” [If “not at all,” expect to use the session overhauling the rubric. If “yes,” expect minor changes to the rubric.]

Step 3b. Follow-up questions:

“Is anything unclear?” “Is anything missing?” “Is anything extraneous?” (The features listed should be important and support what we emphasize in the classroom. Trivial features and unrelated features should be left out.)

The recorder creates lists: possible additions, modifications, and deletions.

Continued

Step 3c. After 10 minutes, inform the participants,

“These are good suggestions. Please keep them in mind as we apply the rubric to the student [papers]. After we’ve reviewed several [papers], we’ll come back to these lists and decide how to modify the rubric.”

Step 4. Faculty review and score student work samples. Describe ethical use of student work.

“Now, let’s use the rubric to score student work sample A. I want to emphasize that the purpose of this activity is to assess the program, not individual students or faculty. If you happen to recognize the students or their instructors from the writing samples, please do not disclose their identities in respect of his/her confidentiality and privacy.”
10  Step 5. Record the number of participants for each score for all to see. Example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Score=3</th>
<th>Score=2</th>
<th>Score=1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The facilitator leads a discussion, asking faculty to explain their scores by using language and concepts from rubric. The facilitator carefully listens, paying attention to how the participants are interpreting the rubric and to whether they are basing their scores on things other than what’s in the rubric—these may need to be added or a stipulation to not take something into consideration may need to be added as an explanatory note to the rubric.

“Can you give me a show of hands if you scored ‘3’ for Sample A? Who scored ‘2’? Who gave it a ‘1’? [Count the show of hands and record on paper or screen]. We can see that majority of us gave the paper a 3, and a few gave it a 2. Can I have a volunteer to explain why you gave the paper a 2 or 3? In your explanation, use language and concepts from the rubric as much as possible.”

After reaching saturation—when no new explanations/justifications are given—the facilitator asks the participants to re-score and then records the results. Example:

“Now that we’ve discussed the [paper] and you’ve had a chance to hear how others applied the rubric, I’d like you to re-score the [paper] in light of what you’ve heard. . . . Does anyone want to change their initial score?”

The revised scores are recorded:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Score=3</th>
<th>Score=2</th>
<th>Score=1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15  Step 6. Repeat process for student work sample B

This process of score + share + discuss + re-score continues until there is about 20 minutes left in the session.

20  Step 7. The final 20 minutes are spent doing the following:

a) reviewing the initial list of additions, modifications, and deletions and making appropriate changes to the rubric. E.g., “When you read the initial list we generated, do you think we should take action and revise the rubric?”
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Facilitation Tip: Get agreement on how decisions will be made regarding changes to the rubric, e.g., consensus, majority rule, simple majority. (I recommend consensus.) Example:

“Now that we’ve had a chance to discuss the rubric and score and discuss pieces of student work, we’re going to take the last part of our time together to see if the rubric needs modifications, if we think it can be effectively and accurately used, and finally, talk about next steps.”

“I suggest we use a consensus method when we decide if the rubric needs changes which means we will listen to each other’s proposals to change the rubric, then discuss, and then see if we are willing to live with the proposal or not. It doesn’t mean we’re seeking the majority or 100% agreement. Instead, it means we use everyone’s expertise to develop a rubric that everyone is willing to support. It may be, but is not necessarily the rubric most preferred each person. Can we use consensus decision making or would you prefer a different method like 85% majority vote needed?”

b) answering the question, “Will faculty members be able to reach an acceptable level of agreement, that is, will two faculty members give the same sample the same score or be only one level apart?

Note: Acceptable level of simple agreement with a 3-point scale= in 95-100% of the cases, the scorers give the same score or are one level apart.

c) summarizing the session’s accomplishments and setting next steps.

(Additional) guiding questions for the facilitator

1) How well does the rubric relate to the outcome(s) being measured?
2) Is anything missing? Is anything extraneous?
3) Do we need that number of quality levels? More needed? Fewer needed? Rubrics typically have 3-6 levels of quality.
4) Does the top end reflect excellence and the bottom end reflect entry-level competence? Good practice: the lowest category describes entry-level competence instead of only listing what is missing, e.g., try to avoid statements such as “thesis is missing,” “no evidence.” Work that falls below the lowest level of quality is scored “0.”
5) Do any of the descriptions or dimensions overlap? Each “box” on the rubric should be mutually exclusive.
6) What terms will the students need help with, if any? Should those terms be simplified?
7) Feasible, manageable, practical for program assessment? For use in a course?
8) Is it possible to use this rubric and have two faculty members independently agree or be one level different from each other after training and/or examples of how to apply the rubric?
9) Can the rubric be applied across different kinds of assignments?
10) Will the results be meaningful and help guide program improvement?
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