

Report of Value Rubric Review Group  
Written Communication  
November 4, 2014

Members: Kurt Haas, Vincent Patarino, Gillian McKnight-Tutein, Steve Werman, Gig Leadbetter, Laureen Cantwell, Alison Harris, Susan Longest, Dan Ashton, Darren Gemoets, Terry Chase, Keith Fritz, Robin Calland, Bill Wright, Monte Atkinson, Joe Richards, Kate Dreiling, Blake Bickham, Megan Glynn, John Sluder, Bette Schans

The review group for the written communication value rubric met from 2 to 6 p.m. on November 4, 2014. The first hour of the session was spent scoring and calibrating one artifact. Over the next two hours, the group read and scored five artifacts each (2 reviewers read the same 5 artifacts) for a total of 50 artifacts. During the remaining time, the group discussed the process and the usefulness of the rubric for assessing written communication in Essential Learning.

The following are comments and suggestions as a result of the discussion:

- It was determined prior to the session that the assignment would be included with the artifacts. This was based on the suggestion by the members of the assessment committee subgroup which held a mini pilot the previous month. The review group concurred that it was vital to have the assignment in order to know what the particular artifact was addressing and to score the paper.
- The review group decided that there should be changes in the wording of some of the criteria categories to make the scoring more understandable. Some examples are: in Criteria 5, what is the difference between some errors and few errors? Also, it appears that the language in the benchmark and lower milestone categories is stronger than the language at the capstone level.
- Some members questioned the lack of the word grammar in the criteria. It is implied in the term “mechanics” in Criteria 5. Others thought that grammar should have its own criteria because it is easy for grammar to be washed out or get lost in the context of the categories of syntax and mechanics. The answer comes down to meaning and maybe this does need to be clarified.
- Should there be a category for proof-reading?
- Terry Rhodes stated that in scoring the rubric, readers should start by looking at the highest category and then move down if the paper does not meet the category (4 -3 -2 -1). Some members stated it was easier to start lower and go to the higher levels.
- There was a discussion regarding content specific areas. Some faculty use MLA style while others assign APA or another writing style. The rubric is very general so faculty from all disciplines should be able to score the artifact regardless of the style used. Also, even if faculty are reading an artifact from another discipline, they do not have to understand the content as long as the elements of the rubric are present in the paper.
- The requirement for sources in a paper is not clear. The category of ‘Not Applicable’ needs to be added if the assignment does not require sources so the score will not be skewed.
- Overall the group decided that the rubric could be used if the language of some wording in the categories was changed.

The results are as follows:

Context and Purpose:	2.23
Content Development:	2.01
Genre and Disciplinary Conventions:	1.99
Sources and Evidence:	1.79
Control of Syntax and Mechanics:	2.08
Average of artifacts:	2.02