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Objectives

• Examine faculty development strategies for the effective use of analytic grading rubrics

• Evaluate the effectiveness of a challenge-based e-learning activity on curriculum and teaching-learning practices
Background

• Grading rubrics provide specific evaluative criteria to gauge student performance (Truemper, 2004) and to improve student academic performance (Howell, 2011)

• Administrative and pedagogical advantages to using grading rubrics (Solan & Linardopoulos, 2011)
Benefits of Grading Rubrics

• Increased student understanding of instructor expectations (Oakleaf, 2009)

• Provide objective formative feedback to guide student performance (Oakleaf, 2009)

• More meaningful grading experiences (Brescian, Zelna & Anderson, 2004)
Significance

- Few findings focus on the rigorous use of standardized rubric tools in instructional and program assessments or on the perceptions of faculty who use these standardized evaluation tools (Reddy & Andrade, 2010)
Research Questions

• Faculty perceptions regarding the use of standardized analytic rubrics for student evaluation on required assignments

• Use of standardized analytic rubrics promote teaching and learning practices
Recommendation

Design and implement an effective faculty instructional e-learning activity to promote the effective use of grading rubrics.
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Example 1

The student presents key information in sufficient detail but omits one category: the mechanism of action of the medication. Click on the COLUMN in the rubric to select the correct point range for this student.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key/Relevant Drug Information (25 points)</th>
<th>Outstanding or Highest Level of Performance A (92-100%)</th>
<th>Very Good or High Level of Performance B (84-91%)</th>
<th>Competent or Satisfactory Level of Performance C (76-83%)</th>
<th>Poor, Failing or Unsatisfactory Level of Performance F (0-75%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thoroughly presents key/relevant information accurately and in sufficient detail including every category: Class, Mechanism of Action, Drug Administration &amp; Dosage, Drug Interactions, Lab Effects and Interference. Information presented in a clear, organized, and professional manner.</td>
<td>Presents key/relevant information accurately and in sufficient detail, omitting no more than one category: Class, Mechanism of Action, Drug Administration &amp; Dosage, Drug Interactions, Lab Effects and Interference. Information presented in a clear, organized, and professional manner.</td>
<td>Presents key/relevant information accurately and in sufficient detail, omitting no more than two categories: Class, Mechanism of Action, Drug Administration &amp; Dosage, Drug Interactions, Lab Effects and Interference. Information is not clear, organized, or professional in appearance.</td>
<td>Minimal presentation of key/relevant information or presented information is inaccurate. Omits three or more categories: Class, Mechanism of Action, Drug Administration &amp; Dosage, Drug Interactions, Lab Effects and Interference. Information is not clear, organized, or professional in appearance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-25 points</td>
<td>21-22 points</td>
<td>19-20 points</td>
<td>0-18 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Answer Coach

That's correct! The student did not include all relevant information in the five key categories, but left out only one. Therefore, the student is awarded 21-22 points based on the organization and clarity of the information presented.

Very Good or High Level of Performance
B (84–91%)

Presents key/relevant information accurately and in sufficient detail, omitting **no more than one** category:
- Class
- Mechanism of Action
- Drug Administration & Dosage
- Drug Interactions
- Lab Effects and Interference.

Information presented in a clear, organized, and professional manner.

21-22 points
Answer Coach

Hmm... Let's take a look at this again.

The student presented the key information in sufficient detail but omitted one category: the mechanism of action.

Now let's look at the rubric again. If a student omits no more than one category, they earn points within the 21-22 point range.

Very Good or High Level of Performance
B (84-91%)

Presents key/relevant information accurately and in sufficient detail, omitting no more than one category:
- Class
- Mechanism of Action
- Drug Administration & Dosage
- Drug Interactions
- Lab Effects and Interference.

Information presented in a clear, organized, and professional manner.

21-22 points
Example 2

Overall, the student’s work is not particularly visually appealing and the graphics do little to support the information. While legible, the student used many different font types and sizes which distracted from the visual appeal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment Criteria</th>
<th>Outstanding or Highest Level of Performance</th>
<th>Very Good or High Level of Performance</th>
<th>Competent or Satisfactory Level of Performance</th>
<th>Poor, Failing or Unsatisfactory Level of Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visual Effects/Creativity</td>
<td>A (92–100%)</td>
<td>B (84–91%)</td>
<td>C (76–83%)</td>
<td>F (0–75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brochure is eye catching</td>
<td>Brochure is visually neutral, neither enhancing or detracting from content</td>
<td>Brochure is visually neutral, neither enhancing or detracting from content</td>
<td>Brochure is visually confusing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graphics do not distract from purpose of providing information</td>
<td>Graphics distract from purpose of providing information</td>
<td>Graphics distract from purpose of providing information</td>
<td>Graphics inappropriate and/or distract from purpose of providing information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Font style and size legible and appropriate for target audience</td>
<td>Font style and size legible and appealing</td>
<td>Font style and size legible, yet not appealing</td>
<td>Font style and size not appropriate for target audience and/or interfere with reading and comprehension of material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 points</td>
<td>4.5 points</td>
<td>4 points</td>
<td>0-3 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Answer Coach

Competent or Satisfactory Level of Performance
C (76–83%)

- Brochure is visually neutral, neither enhancing or detracting from content
- Graphics distract from purpose of providing information
- Font style and size legible, yet not appealing

4 points

While the visual elements do not particularly add appeal, it was legible and satisfactorily communicated the content. Therefore, the student earned 4 points.
Answer Coach

Look at the rubric closely again. The differentiating factor here is that while most of the visual elements didn't really highlight and support the material, it was legible. Since it did communicate the content adequately, the student earned 4 points.
Learning Activity Effectiveness

• Curriculum
  - Strategic learning
  - Student achievement

• Teaching-learning practices
  - Deep learning
  - Rich feedback
  - Clearly-stated evaluative criteria
Conclusion & Summary

• Instructional e-learning activities enhance faculty performance outcomes

• Cyclical process to promote continuous improvement and enhancement
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