

Reflections & Directions

Teaching and Learning at the University of Guelph • ISSN 1710-5161 • Fall 2004

In this Issue

This edition's contributors are concerned with clarity and fairness.

They have high standards. Their students have every opportunity to succeed, but failure is also a real possibility. Assessment isn't a game for them: it's a way of learning.

What's Inside

TSS Updates	2
Teaching as if the World Matters	3
Creating an Assessment Rubric ..	4
Educational Dev. Resouces.....	6
TA Corner	7
TA Resource Binders	8
Upcoming Conference	8
Changing Assignment Criteria.....	Insert



Assessment as Learning

Five years ago the inaugural edition of *Reflections and Directions* (formerly *Teaching Forum*) was launched; the issue's theme was "Assessment."

This theme haunts everything we do at TSS, so it is only fitting that it won't die, and indeed makes its return half a decade later, with a twist. This time around, the two key messages I'd like to promote are:

- Assessment is an integral part of learning, not a supplement or afterthought (it's only through making mistakes and finding out more about them that learners can improve)
- Assessment can – and should – be triangulated with intended outcomes and learning activities.

In Spring 2004, keynote speaker Peggy Maki put it this way at Guelph's Teaching and Learning Innovations conference: what do students remember two years after we teach them? What do we want them to "understand, demonstrate, and represent by the time they graduate?" I was particularly struck by her challenge to think of assessment as learning: how do we know that our students are developing the "habits of mind" in our particular discipline? How do they know that this is what they are developing?

In addition to an exemplary rubric (a way of organizing and conveying grading criteria and feedback) supplied by marie Rush and a revised rubric by Ricardo Ramirez, this issue includes material that challenges us to broaden our conceptions of assessment. You'll find a three of our background concepts glossed on page 6. David

Waltner-Toews, in "Teaching as if the World Matters," explains five ways that he assesses student learning. In my opinion this is an excellent example of the alignment of objectives, activities, and assessments.

The most highly rated session at TA Conference for the past two years has been "Working with Individual Students." In TA Corner, presenter Andria Jones relates how she came to adapt a clinical technique to this all-important but challenging aspect of her role. Although to her the technique felt awkward at first, Jones assures us that it is worth the effort to make individual consultations meaningful and appropriate instances of student learning.

In the end, what underpins our obsession with assessment? My best guess at Guelph is the pillar of learner-centredness called "self-reliant learning." In order to foster the development of self-reliance amongst our students, we need to be clear with the criteria by which **they** can judge their place in our disciplinary knowledge, practices, and (as Maki would say) habits of mind. If anything we've done this Semester has helped faculty and TAs to do this, we can let this topic rest for another five years...

Trevor Holmes,
Educational Development Associate



Production

Reflections & Directions is a bi-annual publication of Teaching Support Services, University of Guelph.

Editor

- Trevor Holmes, TSS

Contributors

- Andria Jones, Population Medicine
- Ricardo Ramirez, School of Environmental Design & Rural Development
- marie Thérèse Rush, Zoology
- David Waltner-Toews, Population Medicine
- TSS staff

Contact Info

Teaching Support Services
Day Hall
University of Guelph
Guelph, ON
N1G 2W1
Phone: (519) 824-4120,
x52973
Fax: (519) 821-8530
www.tss.uoguelph.ca

Copyright

Any part of the *Reflections and Directions* newsletter may be reproduced in print or web form with proper reference. Notification of reproduction would be appreciated.

Comments and Contributions

Comments or submissions to the newsletter may be forwarded to Trevor Holmes, c/o Teaching Support Services, by email tholmes@uoguelph.ca or phone ext. 52963

TSS People

Changes...

Welcome to **Louise Solda**, who joined TSS this past summer and is doing a fabulous job as the Administrative Secretary to the Director. Louise has 16 years' experience at Guelph and most recently worked in Security Services for six years as Administrative Assistant to the Director.

Thanks and Happy Retirement to **Ken Cooke**, our resident clown and dedicated Electronics Technologist. His humane and generous nature will be missed by all of us!

Thanks...

To the five facilitators who ran the College-specific debriefing at TA Conference for the first time ever: **Julia Christensen Hughes** (CSAHS), **Terry Gillespie** (OAC), **Hooman Hoomayanfar** (CPES), **Andria Jones** (OVC), **Dawn Larson** (CBS), and **Dana Paramskas** (COA).

To CUPE 3913, for co-sponsoring the TA Conference lunch. To presenters and attendees at all TSS sessions. To Departments and Chairs, for inviting us across the threshold so often this year.

Congratulations...

To **Dana Paramskas**, who won a 2004 3M Teaching Fellowship thirty years after winning the first OCUFA award at Guelph!

To **Julia Christensen Hughes**, Director of TSS, on her Presidency of the Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education

The UGFA Award winners for 2004:
Prof. **John Baird**, Clinical Studies, OVC
Prof. **Gerarda Darlington**, Math & Stats, CPES
Prof. **Joe Lam**, Microbiology, CBS
Prof. **Maurice Nelischer**, Env. Design & Rural Dev., OAC
Prof. **Dorothy Odartey-Wellington**, Lang. & Lit., COA
Prof. **Jim Pickworth**, Hosp. & Tourism Mgmt., CSAHS

Other Award winners for 2004:
Prof. **Keith Cassidy**, History - UGFA Award for Excellence in Service to Faculty & Librarians
Prof. **Bob Keates**, Biochemistry - UGFA Special Merit Award
Ms. **Lorna Rourke**, Academic Liaison Librarian, School of English and Theatre Studies - UGFA Academic Librarianship Award.

TSS Profile...Mary Nairn



Mary Nairn

started as a graphic designer in 1983 with TSS predecessor, The Office for Educational Practice, which housed a complete graphics and photography unit. As graphic design

moved off the drafting table into the realm of the computer, and new technologies began to broach the educational field, OEP was quick to take on the new challenges – the first foray being a project developed with TVOntario, in which Mary used the 'brand new' Telidon computer graphics system. Soon, specific instructional technology programs were being written at U of G, and as "OEP" evolved into "TSS," Mary began working more closely with faculty to design and develop interactive lessons and mastery testing modules, and use the first on-campus conferencing system (remember VITAL? CADrill? CoSy?!). In order to help them keep pace with frequent technological changes, Mary coordinated workshops for faculty. Today, she continues to support instructional staff in her new role as Program Coordinator for TSS, organizing customized individual training sessions and small group workshops, course development institutes and conferences.

Committed to meeting campus teaching needs, Mary welcomes your training and development ideas. Call x-53571 or by email mnairn@uoguelph.

Recent TRC Acquisitions*

Fink, *Creating Significant Learning Experiences: An Integrated Approach to Designing College Courses*

Maki, *Assessing for Learning*

Palomba and Banta, *Assessing Student Competence in Accredited Disciplines*

Stevens and Levi, *Introduction to Rubrics*

Zull, *Art of Changing the Brain*

* our library is now part of the Trellis system

Teaching as if the World Matters



David Waltner-Toews,
Population Medicine

Originally, Professor Waltner-Toews sent this along after a Learning Styles series in Fall 2002 and revised it in 2003 for inclusion in a future *Reflections and Directions*. It is included here as an example of teaching that aligns the objectives, activities, and assessments in a course.—Ed.

I teach a 4th year course called Epidemiology of Foodborne Diseases at the University of Guelph. These diseases occur because of interactions between the population dynamics and genetics of people, food animals and bacteria. The patterns we see of, say salmonellosis, or diseases associated with *E. coli* 0157:H7 or toxic residues in food, are thus deeply embedded in how we live, eat and organize our agrifood system – in other words, our culture, our economic system and our agriculture. All are affected by economic globalization and some, such as those associated with contaminated fish and shellfish, have tie-ins to global climate change. Whatever else it may be, the epidemiology of foodborne diseases is a public science, rich with ethical, political and cultural dimensions as well as natural science.

Students in this course have backgrounds in biomedical sciences, food science, and toxicology. Some of them excel at verbal or written argument (though far fewer than I would prefer), some at quantitative analysis, and others at memorization of facts. Their aspirations range from careers in food or pharmaceutical companies to academia, government or activist non-government organizations.

The question I have had to ask myself is: How can one teach a subject matter that is complex to a student body that has multiple goals and a variety of learning styles? I have solved this problem over the past 15 years by ensuring that my assignments, below, are part of my substantive teaching.

Outbreak investigation:

Students are given a set of data from a party, showing who ate what, who got sick, etc, and are expected to answer a set of questions based on their analyses. This is to be done as individuals without consulting others. In this exercise, students learn how to structure, do, analyze and interpret an outbreak investigation.

Public dissemination:

Students are asked to select a target group (e.g. an industry, patients in a doctor's office, check-out clerks in a grocery store), a message they think that group needs to hear, and design an appropriate communication to get the message across (brochure, poster, workshop, video, skit, song, web-page). If the method of communication involves a workshop, talk or seminar, they are given the opportunity to present it to the class. They may do this in groups. Previ-

ous years' assignments have included a three minute video, "The Young and the Retching", targeted at daytime TV viewers, interactive skits for day cares, powerpoint presentations for restaurant workers, a "teaching dinner" at a synagogue, brochures for people who can't read English, and interactive web sites. The purpose of this exercise is to have students learn how to translate complex science into every day practice and language.

Diary & essay:

Students are asked to keep a record of what they eat every day for one week. Then are then asked to write an essay on the foodborne disease implications of that diet, using the ideas and techniques presented in class. The purpose of this assignment is to have students reflect on their own eating habits, the personal risks associated with those habits, and how individual behaviour can create cumulative, systemic effects which are unintended, surprising, and quite different from those at the individual level.

Town Hall meeting:

The class is divided into small interest groups (for instance, farmers, consumers, retailers, government), and students are asked to role play key stakeholders. The regulators put a proposal on the table to deal with a particular foodborne disease issue, and each other group must respond in an informed, assertive and creative manner appropriate to their situation. For instance, the regulators may propose that all imports of unpasteurized cheese be banned to prevent listeriosis in Canada, or that a particular food component (an artificial fat or sweetener) not be licenced, or that irradiation of hamburger be compulsory to prevent enteric diseases. Students do everything possible to represent their group's interests in the debate. They may bring posters and/or brochures to hand out. There are often two such meetings, depending on the class size. Since all food safety issues involve a mix of science, economics, values, and public and special interest, I want students to be able to leave my class able to argue their points of view in a coherent, logical, scientifically valid manner. They also need to be able to work in groups, since most of the work in food and waterborne illness will do will require them to do this (often, as in the case of Walkerton or Salmonella outbreaks, with the public watching).

...continued on page 8

Creating an Assessment Rubric



marie Thérèse Rush,
Multimedia Programmer
and Lab Coordinator,
Zoology

“Not only can well-prepared teachers visualize and explain the meaning of success, they can also impart that meaning to others so as to help them become outstanding performers. In short, they don’t just criticize, they inspire improvement” Stiggins, R. J. (2001). *Student-involved classroom assessment*, (3rd ed.). NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall; 196-197.

In the 4th year Environmental Biology of Fishes course, students must give an oral presentation on fish adaptations. As I reflected on my teaching development, three questions emerged:

- (1) “Is the oral presentation a valid method of assessing our students?”
- (2) “How can I improve on my method of assessing students?” and
- (3) “How can I help our students improve their oral presentation skills?”

The answer to all three questions can be found at <http://www.uoguelph.ca/zoology/rush/MEd/EDU6140/assessment1.html>

The rubric (facing page) is part of the answer to the second question. In the past, I have struggled with designing a valid set of performance criteria which would capture the student’s true level of knowledge, reasoning, performance skills and academic achievement and which would be as unbiased as possible.

Over the years, a point system has evolved to ‘objectively’ evaluate student performance, however, the assessment has been based on the evaluator’s point of reference, therefore for each student, the same three graders evaluate the performance, and the graders’ scores are pooled and averaged in order to obtain the student’s final score. Stiggins (cited above) helped me to see that I have not been giving our students clear achievement targets and have not provided an example of what is expected in order to achieve performance-based academic success.

Achievement targets

The purpose of the oral presentation remains twofold:

1. To provide students an opportunity to perform in front of an audience the skills they develop while researching, analysing, drawing conclusions and preparing for their oral presentations.
2. To assess students’ proficiency in Environmental Biology of Fishes by evaluating their skilful delivery of combining knowledge and reasoning outcomes and drawing new insights to the adaptations enabling fishes to survive in the aquatic environment.

Students require clear targets and a final goal. Providing a description of the components of a good oral presentation enables our students to focus on achieving the desired outcomes. For this reason, a rubric was designed to display components of an exceptional presentation on one end and an amateur presentation at the other end, defining targets for students to achieve.

Performance Criteria

The key to successful performance is articulated in the oral presentation rubric. Levels of success are denoted in the column sections: Exceptional, Admirable, Acceptable, and Amateur. These help students to focus on requirement targets.

The scoring is analytical in nature; the highest to lowest score range given for each section is [4, 3, 2, 1]. Each of the different levels of performance leading from the highest to the lowest is mapped out in the rubric.

Accurate assessment equips students with the knowledge needed to process and improve on areas where they are weak. This performance assessment satisfies five specific quality standards: (1) clear targets; (2) focused purpose; (3) proper method; (4) sound sampling; and (5) accurate and free from bias and distortion (Stiggins 2001).

The oral presentation is a very effective performance assessment tool and most students enjoy the opportunity for self-study and derive a sense of satisfaction with the performance skills they master.

This rubric is marie Thérèse Rush's modification of the multimedia project rubric developed by Caroline McCullen, Instructional Technologist, SAS inSchool, Cary, NC www.SASinSchool.com [Accessed Jan. 2003]

Appendix II: ZOO*4330 Environmental Biology of Fishes Oral Presentations Rubric						
Assignment: The oral presentation will be based upon a detailed description of a morphological, behavioural, physiological, or genetic, etc. specialization in any fish species or group of species and how that specialization is an adaptation to a specific environmental condition. Students are encouraged to go beyond mere descriptions in their presentations to try and address ultimate as well as proximate questions.						
Student name:	Exceptional: 4 points	Admirable: 3 points	Acceptable: 2 Points	Amateur: 1 point	Self Evaluation	Professor + Lab Instructor Evaluation
Introduction	Introduces self. Clearly states the presentation title. Outline of talk is given or clearly states questions and areas to be addressed in the talk.	Self and topic are introduced. Informs audience of the outline of the talk.	Does not introduce self or topic. Does not provide an outline for talk.	No introduction (self or topic) given. No outline given.		
Background knowledge of speaker and Depth of Presentation involving a detailed discussion or a morphological, behavioural, physiological, or genetic specialization in the fish species or group of species chosen.	Speaker conveys strong background knowledge of subject area.	Speaker conveys moderate knowledge of subject area.	Speaker conveys basic knowledge of subject area.	Speaker conveys limited background knowledge of subject area.		
Focus of Presentation on how the specialization is an adaptation to specific environmental conditions.	Speaker conveys strong knowledge and understanding of chosen specialization. Specialization is discussed in depth. Focus of specialization is maintained throughout presentation.	Speaker conveys moderate knowledge and understanding of chosen specialization. Specialization is discussed adequately. The talk focuses on the specialization.	Speaker conveys basic knowledge and understanding of chosen specialization. Specialization is not discussed in depth. Speaker drifts from specialization in talk.	Speaker conveys limited understanding of chosen specialization. Speaker diverges from studies on fish species or specialization.		
Oral Presentation Skills (<i>Minus 1 mark for each infraction [overtime; delivery not practised; font size; crowding; other]</i>)	Communicates ideas with enthusiasm, proper voice projection, appropriate language, and clear delivery.	Communicates ideas with proper voice projection. Adequate preparation and delivery.	Some difficulty communicating ideas, due to voice projection, lack of preparation, or incomplete work	Great difficulty communicating ideas. Poor voice projection. Little preparation or incomplete work.		
Discussion following Presentation - defending or explaining points covered in presentation	Demonstrates the topic has been mastered. Delivers confident, accurate responses to questions which can be answered. Offers an alternate response to questions which cannot be answered.	Able to listen and respond confidently and accurately to questions.	Some difficulty listening and responding to questions.	Great difficulty listening and responding to questions.		
Assessing colleagues' presentations - indicator of ability to comprehend course material by evaluating colleagues contributions (<i>This is evaluated orally during the discussions and/or by written evaluations to be submitted.</i>)	Demonstrates superior ability at comprehending material, able to listen critically and provide constructive comments and/or ask questions of colleagues.	Demonstrates good listening and comprehension skills. Able to address questions and/or provide helpful comments.	Demonstrates adequate listening and comprehension skills. Able to assess fairly.	Demonstrates limited listening and/or comprehension skills. Lacking skills in assessing colleagues.		
Scale: 22-24=Exceptional 18-21=Admirable 12-17=Acceptable 6-11=Amateur				Total Points	0	0

An Educational Developer's Backdrop to Assessment



Trevor Holmes,
Educational Development
Associate,
TSS

Peter and I often raise the following models when faced with the prospect of discussing “Assessment as Learning.” The third is the more controversial; all three should be treated with a scholarly skepticism, and we invite debate.

Bloom's Taxonomy

Many decades ago, Benjamin Bloom and associates decided to classify three domains of learning – cognitive, psychomotor, and affective -- with regard to their various levels of sophistication. This is the provenance of many a curriculum specialist's refrain: knowledge, skills and attitudes. Without ignoring the psychomotor and affective domains (after all, university's claim to special status in society is founded on our ability to foster values and attitudes) – we rely heavily on the cognitive domain descriptions when attempting to align assessment with objectives. We recommend writing learning objectives and designing assessment tools based on these levels. Which mixture of the levels is appropriate for your course, given its place the curricular structure? The levels are particularly amenable to certain verb choices, and we have a handout that shows this (for all three domains, in fact) at <http://www.tss.uoguelph.ca/idres/AssessTheme.html>

Bloom, B.S. et. al., Eds. *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The Classification of educational goals. Handbook I: the Cognitive Domain*. New York; David McKay, 1967 (1956).

Kirkpatrick's Four Levels of Evaluation

If you are assessing how your course went or how a total program is going, Kirkpatrick is key. There are other models, but this is the one Peter and I will be flogging for a while. The levels are: Reaction, Learning, Transfer and Results. All four can be measured, and we'd like to promote the idea that it's really important to focus on learning, since it is something that can help us to contextualize immediate reaction. Learning is evidence of course and teaching effectiveness. It would be lovely to assess transfer (have people applied their learning to another setting?) as evidence that students learnt deeply, too. Imagine if the exam in one course were to become a pre-test in the course that follows from it, or if students had to present a portfolio of their transfer of learning over several courses. Results, or long term impact, can be measured later (often after graduation).

Kirkpatrick, Donald L. *Evaluating Training Programs: The Four Levels*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler, 1994.

See also commentary by A. Rae Clementz (Word download):
http://bryant2.bryant.edu/~assess/Program_Level_Evaluation.doc

The Perry Scale of Intellectual and Ethical Development

William Perry reported that male Harvard undergrads decades ago moved from very dualistic thinking and an absolutism with regard to truth toward a more nuanced and contextual approach some time after their degrees. Although the studies and their offspring since then carry a great deal of persuasive power, and although we introduce the scale in many workshops, we ask that it be taken with a grain of salt. It's useful to understand the positions on the scale: see the website below, but avoid the temptation to conflate Perry positions with particular ages or year levels of student.

Perry, William G., Jr. (1970), *Forms of Intellectual and Ethical Development in the College Years: A Scheme* (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston).

Perry, William G., Jr. (1981), “*Cognitive and Ethical Growth: The Making of Meaning*”, in Arthur W. Chickering and Associates, *The Modern American College* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass): 76-116.

<http://www.cs.buffalo.edu/~rapaport/perry.positions.html>



Andria Jones,
Population Medicine

One on One: Communication between the student and the TA

There exists a growing body of research exploring the relationships between patients and their medical doctors and more recently, veterinarians. Silverman, Kurtz and Draper (1998) developed the Calgary-Cambridge Observation Guide (CCOG), which is a 5-point plan for skills-based communication. In learning about the guide for the Art of Veterinary Medicine course at the OVC, I discovered that the skills are equally applicable to communication in many areas of life, including working with individual students.

The adaptation of the CCOG for teaching is not at all far-fetched, and has proven useful to me in many communications with my students. By regularly reviewing the guide, and by trying to implement the skills into my repertoire, I feel better able to assess my students' needs. Development of rapport, active listening, checking in with the student – these all help me to better learn why the student has chosen to approach me. By clearly outlining the student's needs and expectations of our meeting, we are better able to develop a plan of action together, and therefore use our time efficiently. I've also found that establishing the priorities of meeting helps to focus the student's attention.

Regularly checking in with the student during all stages of the meeting (including initiation of the session, gathering information, building rapport, explanation and planning, and closing the session) has been particularly beneficial. This skill allows me to assess whether or not there exists a mutual understanding, and whether we are effectively achieving our objectives for the meeting. When we conclude the session, the summary of our meeting and the student's next steps help to solidify what we've discussed, and ensure that the student's needs have been met.

Practicing and implementing the skills in the CCOG first seemed awkward to me; I wondered whether such a detailed meeting plan would seem forced or insincere. But, with some practice and the development of my own communications vocabulary, I found that it got much easier. I feel that I can now more effectively address the student's needs and use our (precious) time more efficiently. The results have been well worth the effort.

Reference: Silverman, Kurtz and Draper (1998). *Skills for Communicating with Patients*, Oxford: Radcliffe Medical Press.

5-Step Approach

(1) Initiating the Session:

- Establish initial rapport and build a relationship
- Identify the reason(s) for the consultation

(2) Gathering Information:

- Explore the student's problems in more detail
- Understand the student's perspective
- Provide structure to the session

(3) Build the Relationship (throughout the session)

- Develop rapport
- Involve the student

(4) Explanation and Planning

- Provide the correct amount and type of info
- Aid accurate recall and understanding
- Share decision making

(5) Close the session

- Summarize the session briefly
- Establish a safety net
- Final check of the student's understanding and comfort



Little-known facts:

Guelph was a regional hotbed of teaching development run by faculty for faculty. There are minutes and papers put together by what was called the "Office of Educational Practice" from numerous local "Show and Tell" sessions from the 1980s and 90s in our archive. Not only does browsing through these extant documents cause a thrill of recognition when one sees who actually contributed; there are also numerous useful tips presented in a very clear format.



A Fine Balance: The Student Experience of Learning

June 8-11, 2005

University of Prince Edward Island



Charlottetown, PEI

www.stlhe.ca

continued from page 3...

Final Exam:

This is a short answer exam of about 20 questions worth one mark each. The intent is to do a "mop-up" to ensure that students know key diseases, etiologies, and epidemiologic issues. They are usually done in 20 minutes and I am finished marking by the end of the two-hour period.

Each assignment is worth 20 percent of the final mark. As is evident, a student may excel in a few ways of learning and get a reasonable mark.

With so much attention to form, one might ask what happens to content? I of course give lectures, and have guest lecturers from Health Canada, the Canadian Food Inspection Agency, and other relevant government departments as well as other academic disciplines, such as philosophy. Furthermore, I expect students to read and assess both printed, peer-reviewed literature and web-based material critically.

While content is important, it is not everything. Sadly, I have found that these science students have learned very well how to amass "the facts," and very little about how to ask critical questions about the data and about the world they are about to enter, and almost nothing about how to argue cogently and logically, and how to articulate their questions and answers in public. Without these latter skills I fear they will make not only poor scientists, but poor citizens. I should also add that without teaching using this variety of techniques, I would have a lot less fun!

David Waltner-Toews,
Department of Population Medicine

NEXT Semester's theme:

Scholarship of Teaching

- *what is it?*
- *why do it?*
- *how is it done?*



TSS is once again accepting orders for the popular instructional newsletter *The Teaching Professor*. Ordering multiple subscriptions reduces the price substantially. If you are not familiar with the publication, both the Library (LB 2331.T416) and the Teaching Resource Centre (Day Hall, Rm. 125) hold subscriptions. TSS has a limited number of recent issues available. Samples can also be ordered through the Magna Publications website (<http://www.magnapubs.com/trial.html>).

To order *The Teaching Professor* through TSS, contact Louise Solda, ext. 52973/ email lsolda@uoguelph.ca by January 7th, 2005. Subscriptions run from January to December inclusive.

UPCOMING CONFERENCE

February 21-February 22, 2005
at the University of Guelph

Assessing Teaching in Higher Education: Practice, Problems and Progress

[www.open.uoguelph.ca/
mhrconference/index.cfm](http://www.open.uoguelph.ca/mhrconference/index.cfm)

ANNOUNCING...

The TSS Resource Binders

A major summer project handled brilliantly by Undergraduate Research Assistant Kate Howell, the Resource Binders collect foundational and otherwise important articles, tips, and stories about teaching in higher education. Currently we have 10 topics, and each binder includes one Guelph-specific example (or more). Titles include:

- Assessment of Learning
- Assessment of Teaching
- Classroom Civility
- Course Construction and Re-Design
- International Teaching Assistants
- Lecture Preparation and Delivery
- Scholarship of Teaching
- Students with Disabilities
- Teaching and Guiding Graduate Students
- Teaching More Students

Next steps will be brief summaries of key principles for each topic in handout form, and migrating the tables of contents to the Web along with links to what is available online to Guelph users. Contact tholmes@uoguelph.ca for more information.

Changing Assignment Criteria: Getting Specific with Rubrics



Ricardo Ramirez,
School of Environmental
Design & Rural
Development

In a graduate course that values collaborative learning, Ricardo Ramirez presented a draft grading sheet to his class (below) and received less than enthusiastic response; students wondered what the difference might be between the criteria (especially content and process) and what scale might be used to judge. After attending our “Assessment as Learning II” Ramirez redesigned his grading sheet following Bloom’s Taxonomy (see page 6) and Marie Rush’s model (see page 5). The different approaches, for comparison, are reproduced below and on reverse. No single approach works for everything, but it is a valuable exercise to align one’s learning objectives with the activities in a course and the means of assessment. This example shows what is possible given only a day in which to make changes. What remains to be determined is the range of points per level on the rubric. -- TH

REXT 6070 Proposed grading process for the Group Presentations DRAFT

Random groups are assigned for grading each presentation. Grades are discussed with the presenting group only after all group presentations are over. A final grade is agreed upon with the instructor. (The % contribution of each column to be agreed.)

	Content & process (20)	Design (10)	Presentation (10)	Total (40% of final mark)
Random group				
Random group				
Group presenting				
External				
Instructor				

Content and process of project:

Did the group describe the content and process of their project clearly? Were the services provided explained? Did their reflection on the process provide you with an understanding of what they learned and how? Did you get a sense of what the group accomplished from a capacity development perspective?

Design:

Was the type of presentation appropriate? Did the overall design enhance the content? Did the design make it easier to understand the subject or was it distracting?

Presentation:

Were the speakers knowledgeable? Did you get answers to your questions? Was the presentation practiced/polished? Did the presenters use time appropriately?

Random groups are assigned for grading each presentation. Grades are discussed with the presenting group only after all group presentations are over. A final grade is agreed upon with the instructor. Each presentation will be graded by: two random groups of students, the group presenting, the external(s) and the instructor.

REXT 6070 Proposed grading process for the Group Presentations

Level	Content and process (20)	Design (10)	Presentation (10)	Total (40)
Professional	<p>The content and process of the project were balanced. The audience was able to interpret the significance of the service(s) provided.</p> <p>The organizational context was clearly explained.</p> <p>The group appraised the learning process.</p> <p>The capacity development achievements of the project were critically evaluated.</p>	<p>The structure of the presentation was clear.</p> <p>The methods and media enhanced the understanding of the process Vs the content.</p> <p>The methods never distracted the audience from the substance.</p> <p>The combination of methods and media was creative to the extent that one felt like emulating it.</p>	<p>The presenters conveyed a strong background knowledge of the subject area.</p> <p>The voices were clear and confident.</p> <p>The distribution of time among the team was appropriate and relaxed.</p> <p>The discussion session demonstrated mastery over the content and confidence in defending an argument.</p> <p>The delivery was practiced and polished.</p>	
Admirable	<p>The content and process of the project were balanced.</p> <p>The audience was able to infer the significance of the service(s) provided.</p> <p>The organizational context was explained.</p> <p>The group analyzed the learning process.</p> <p>The capacity development achievements of the project were analyzed.</p>	<p>The structure of the presentation was understandable.</p> <p>The methods and media validated the process Vs the content.</p> <p>The methods at times distracted the audience from the substance.</p> <p>The combination of methods and media was interesting.</p>	<p>The presenters conveyed a background knowledge of the subject area.</p> <p>The voices were clear, with some hesitation.</p> <p>The distribution of time among the team needed some work: one or two sections felt rushed.</p> <p>The discussion session demonstrated a general understanding over the content and some confidence in defending an argument.</p> <p>The delivery was practiced but not polished.</p>	
Acceptable	<p>It took some effort to appreciate the balance of the presentation.</p> <p>The audience was able to understand the significance of the service(s) provided.</p> <p>The organizational context was described.</p> <p>The group summarized the learning process.</p> <p>The capacity development achievements of the project were listed.</p>	<p>It took some effort to make the structure of the presentation understandable.</p> <p>The methods and media differentiated the process Vs the content.</p> <p>The methods at times distracted the audience from the substance.</p> <p>The combination of methods and media was unimaginative, yet familiar.</p>	<p>The presenters conveyed an incomplete knowledge of the subject area.</p> <p>The voices were not very clear, with some hesitation.</p> <p>The distribution of time among the team needed some work: several sections felt rushed.</p> <p>The discussion session demonstrated a superficial understanding over the content and limited confidence in defending an argument.</p> <p>The delivery was not well practiced.</p>	
Amateur	<p>There was no balance in terms of content and process (one dominated over the other).</p> <p>The audience was unable to understand the significance of the service(s) provided.</p> <p>The organizational context was not described.</p> <p>The group identified the learning process.</p> <p>The capacity development achievements of the project were vague.</p>	<p>The structure of the presentation was confused.</p> <p>The methods and media did not define the process Vs the content.</p> <p>The methods distracted the audience from the substance.</p> <p>The combination of methods and media was inappropriate.</p>	<p>The presenters demonstrated a lack of knowledge of the subject area.</p> <p>The voices could not be heard, there was constant hesitation.</p> <p>The distribution of time was awkward, sections were skipped and the team ran out of time.</p> <p>The discussion session demonstrated no understanding over the content and no confidence in defending an argument.</p> <p>The delivery indicated improvisation without preparation.</p>	