

## Rubrics

### Detailed Rubric: Class Participation

	Frequency	Relevance	Preparedness/Interaction	Use of German
A	Frequency of comments is optimal. Steps in when there are silences to move discussion along but keeps quiet when this allows others to contribute.	Contributions enhance lesson or discussion: they may ask a key question, elaborate, bring in relevant personal knowledge, move the discussion along, identify issues or take the discussion to another level. Students use the vocabulary of the topic to be precise and clear. Able to synthesize or indicate gaps or extensions to topic.	Always demonstrates commitment through thorough preparation; always arrives on time. Consistently interacts in a respectful way. Excellent listening skills and awareness.	Stays in German the entire class period, initiates conversations in German, and responds in German to the teacher and to classmates.
B	Contributes regularly to discussions, and allows others their turns to share their comments as well.	Contributions are related to the topic and in general make connections between the topic and students' comments. Clarification questions are asked. Language is clear, if somewhat general, and specific details are provided.	Rarely unprepared; rarely arrives late. Consistently interacts in a respectful way. Student does not cause disruptions during class and is an attentive, good listener in class.	Always uses German to respond to the teacher and to communicate with classmates during structured activities. Makes all routine requests in German.
C	Comments occasionally. Sometimes talks over others.	Comments may only repeat what has been already said, or may be tangential or may sidetrack discussion from time to time. Language is fairly general; only personal experience has some specific details.	Often unprepared; occasionally arrives late. Interacts in a respectful way most of the time. Student does cause some disruptions during class. Somewhat attentive, good listener in class.	Only uses German in structured class, group and pair activities. Initiates most other conversations or makes requests in English.

D	Remains mostly silent or disrupts the class.	Comments are not related to topic at hand, or go back to previous part of discussion or question. Language is so general or confused that it's difficult to understand where comment fits.	Rarely prepared; often arrives late. Shows general disrespect to teacher and peers during instruction and interactions. Student is not attentive, or a good listener in class, and shows disruptive behavior	Almost exclusively uses English when talking with classmates. Uses as little German as possible during class, pair and group activities.
---	----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Modified based on:

<http://www.sites4teachers.com/links/redirect.php?url=http://www.rubrics4teachers.com/sample/ParticipationRubric.pdf> and <http://www.edci.purdue.edu/vanfossen/604/604partrubric.html>

## Simple Rubric: Lab Report

LABORATORY 3 REPORT GRADING RUBRIC	POINTS
<b>LENGTH &amp; COMPLETENESS (20%)</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does it reaches the minimum length (2-3 pages of text, 1-2 pages of graphics) without obvious filler (or font/margins shenanigans)?</li> <li>• Does it address all required questions/components as specified in the handout?               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Where is your study region?</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Did you describe the physical geography of your region?</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>○ <i>Where, precisely are your stations?</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Is there a map showing the locations of your weather stations?</i></li> <li>▪ <i>How far apart your stations?</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Are there any significant landforms between the two stations?</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>○ <i>What is the annual precip cycle for each of your stations?</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Did you include a graph of the annual cycle of precipitation for each station?</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Did you include the total annual precipitation for each station?</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<b>/20</b>
<b>CLARITY &amp; PROFESSIONALISM (20%)</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is it formatted properly (spacing, margins, titles, etc.)?</li> <li>• Are graphics are complete and effective?</li> <li>• Does it lack spelling, grammar, and style errors?</li> <li>• Is writing clear and concise?</li> <li>• Is organization clear, straightforward and effective?</li> </ul>	<b>/20</b>
<b>VALIDITY OF ANALYSIS (30%)</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear and accurate description of the annual precipitation cycle for each site</li> <li>• Clear and accurate statement of the relative precipitation levels for the two sites</li> <li>• Clear and accurate description of the patterns in total annual precipitation for each site</li> <li>• Clear and accurate statement of the comparison between annual and interannual precipitation patterns at the two sites</li> </ul>	<b>/30</b>
<b>UNDERSTANDING (30%)</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear explanation of the factors responsible for the observed cycles at each location</li> <li>• Accurate assessment of the most important factor(s) creating the difference in precipitation levels for the two sites</li> <li>• Clear explanation (demonstrating understanding) of how that factor leads to the observed differences</li> </ul>	<b>/30</b>
<b>TOTAL maximum score</b>	<b>/100 points</b>
<b>TOTAL Lab Points (10 points possible)</b>	

## **Holistic Rubric: Oral Presentation**

**5 – Excellent** The student clearly describes the question studied and provides strong reasons for its importance. Specific information is given to support the conclusions that are drawn and described. The delivery is engaging and sentence structure is consistently correct. Eye contact is made and sustained throughout the presentation. There is strong evidence of preparation, organization, and enthusiasm for the topic. The visual aid is used to make the presentation more effective. Questions from the audience are clearly answered with specific and appropriate information.

**4 – Very Good** The student describes the question studied and provides reasons for its importance. An adequate amount of information is given to support the conclusions that are drawn and described. The delivery and sentence structure are generally correct. There is evidence of preparation, organization and enthusiasm for the topic. The visual aid is mentioned and used. Questions from the audience are answered clearly.

**3 – Good** The student describes the question studies and conclusions are stated, but supporting information is not as strong as a 4 or 5. The delivery and sentence structure are generally correct. There is some indication of preparation and organization. The visual aid is mentioned. Questions from the audience are answered.

**2 – Limited** The student states the question studied but fails to describe it fully. No conclusions are given to answer the question. The delivery and sentence structure are understandable, but with some errors. Evidence of preparation and organization is lacking. The visual aid may or may not be mentioned. Questions from the audience are answered with only the most basic response.

**1 – Poor** The student makes a presentation without stating the question or its importance. The topic is unclear and no adequate conclusions are stated. The delivery is difficult to follow. There is no indication of preparation or organization. Questions from the audience receive only the most basic or no response.

**0** No oral presentation is attempted.

Reference:

Wiggins, G. (1998). *Educative assessment: Designing assessments to inform and improve student performance*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

## Simple Checklist

- 12 font, double-spaced
- Stapled
- Spelling check
- Citations and Bibliography in APA style
- Includes at least 3 outside sources
- Includes at least two readings from the syllabus
- Organization: paper has an introduction with thesis, it provides support and additional information in an reasonable sequence in the body of the paper, conclusion provides a summary of findings.
- I consulted with the writing center

### APPENDIX 3

#### Checklist for the Evaluation of Teaching Portfolios

- ✓ Does the portfolio include current information?
- ✓ Does the portfolio balance information from self, from others, and from products of student learning?
- ✓ Is there coherence among the various components of the portfolio, revealing demonstrated effectiveness in practice tied to an articulate philosophy?
- ✓ Does the portfolio demonstrate teaching consistent with departmental and institutional strategic priorities and missions?
- ✓ What constitutes valid documentation and evidence?
- ✓ Are multiple, selective sources of information included, offering a diverse and objective assessment of teaching?
- ✓ Does the portfolio adequately supplement narrative description, analysis, and goals with empirical evidence in the appendix?
- ✓ How clearly and specifically does the portfolio reveal the relevance of professional development, research, and scholarship to the teaching enterprise?
- ✓ Does the portfolio include a core of agreed-upon seminal statements with accompanying evidence? Are the core elements of the portfolio derived from disciplinary, departmental, and institutional standards?
- ✓ Do products or outcomes of student learning reveal successful teaching?
- ✓ Does the portfolio provide evidence of efforts to improve teaching? Is there evidence of improvement in methods, materials, evaluations, goals?
- ✓ Is the portfolio the *only* source of information on teaching effectiveness? Or is it complemented by additional materials and corroborative information about a professor's complex and varied roles?
- ✓ How does the portfolio profile individual style, achievements, discipline? Is a strong case made in both narrative and documentation in the appendix for the complexity and individuality of a professor's particular teaching effort in a particular discipline with a particular group of students?
- ✓ Does the portfolio meet established length requirements?
- ✓ Do evaluators understand and value how and why portfolios are used and know the strengths and limitations of portfolios?

## Case Study

Situation: One of your students comes to see you during office hours to contest a grade. She received a “C” on her paper. She truly believes that she should have received a “B.” She presents a good argument, and you admit that maybe you have been a bit harsh grading her paper. (Privately, you realize that you were quite exhausted by the time you got to her paper, and you barely have any memory of reading it.)

You tell her that you will review her paper and will change her grade accordingly. A couple of days later, when you go back to teach your class, a line of students approaches you before class starts. They mention a variety of different reasons that they would like you to re-grade their papers, too....

\*\*\*

- 1) What factors do you consider as you weigh students’ requests?
- 2) What do you do to avoid being swamped by re-grade requests?