SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY School of Information Studies

TEACHING & LEARNING

Assessment Series Part 1: Backwards Design, Rubrics First

Example Rubrics:

DePaul | Teaching Commons

http://resources.depaul.edu/teaching-commons/teaching-guides/feedback-grading/rubrics/Pages/default.aspx

- Types of rubrics: analytic, holistic, developmental
- Creating rubrics
- Evaluating rubrics: questions to ask when evaluating a rubric (existing, creating from scratch or using a rubric developed by another party. Evaluate before and after use.
- More examples these are examples of images from various Universities, Colleges and "The Chronicle of Higher Education"
 - o class participation
 - collaborative learning
 - critical thinking
 - o ePortfolio
 - o experiential learning
 - o online learning
 - o undergraduate research
 - o writing

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY

School of Information Studies

FACULTY CENTER for TEACHING & LEARNING

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY School of Information Studies

TEACHING & LEARNING

Villanova University: ACS Learning Communities Rubric for Evaluating Class Participation

July 31, 2008

| | Strong Work ¹ | Needs Development | Unsatisfactory | |
|--|---|---|---|--|
| Listening | Actively and respectfully listens to peers and instructor | Sometimes displays lack of interest in comments of others | Projects lack of interest or disrespect for others | |
| Preparation Arrives fully prepared with all assignments completed, and notes on reading, observations, questions | | Sometimes arrives unprepared or with only superficial preparation | Exhibits little evidence of having read or thought about assigned material | |
| Quality of contributions | Comments are relevant sand reflect understanding of: assigned text(s); previous remarks of other students; and insights about assigned material | Comments sometimes irrelevant, betray lack of preparation, or indicate lack of attention to previous remarks of other | Comments reflect little understanding of either the assignment or previous remarks in seminar | |
| Impact on seminar | Comments frequently help move seminar conversation forward | Comments sometimes advance the conversation, but sometimes do little to move it forward | Comments do not advance the conversation or are actively harmful to it | |
| Frequency of participation | ACTIVELY DARTICIDATES AT | Sometimes participates bu at other times is "tuned out" | Seldom participates and is generally not engaged | |

¹ Class participation deserving of an A grade will be strong in most categories; Participation that is strong in some categories but needs development in others will receive a B; a grade of C reflects a need for development in most categories; D work is typically unsatisfactory in several categories; and F work, unsatisfactory in nearly all.

Georgetown Commons – Georgetown University

Analytic Rubric example (presentation)

Level of performance

| | Criteria | Poor | Developing | Superior |
|----------|--------------------|--|--|--|
| Criteria | Use of visual aids | No visual aids or confusing, distracting visual aids | Visual aids used, but aids don't add to the verbal presentation | Visual aids are clear and necessary additions to the presentation |
| | Performance | No attempt to engage with audience; no evidence of preparation | Attempts to engage audience, though infrequently or not fully successfully | Performance is dynamic engaging, and clearly rehearsed |
| | Knowledge | Presenter makes significant mistakes about material | Presenter shows mastery of presented material but struggles with related material | Presenter has mastery of presentation content and related material |