

Grading to Standards

Betsy Bunting

Ron Wence

Rancocas Valley Regional High School

January 7, 2015

GOAL

Use better feedback to improve student learning

Questions

- Are you happy with your current grading practices?
 - What is the purpose of grades?
 - Are your grades a good indicator of student knowledge?
-

Purposes of Grading (Guskey)

- ❑ Communicate the achievement status of students to their parents, CST, counselors, and others
- ❑ Provide information to students for self-evaluation
- ❑ Select, identify, or group students for educational programs
- ❑ Document students' performance to evaluate the effectiveness of instructional programs
- ❑ Provide incentives for students to learn

Reflection Time...

- List the initiatives you have implemented over the last few years.
- Star items that have had a significant impact on student learning.
- Circle anything that has provide a 20% increase in achievement.

Are these on your list?

- New book
 - Revised curriculum
 - Changed assessments
 - Lesson planning - GANAG
 - Sent people to workshops
 - Changed instructional delivery
 - Differentiated instruction
 - Added technology
-

The Big Four (Pollock)

- A well articulated curriculum
- Planning for delivery
- Varied assessment (summative vs. formative)
- Criterion based feedback

Beginning the grading to standards process

- ❑ Brought in consultants
- ❑ In 2009-2010 five teachers graded to standards, now 20/20+
- ❑ Created local standards
- ❑ Created assessments following UbD to measure depth of knowledge
- ❑ Created a plan to close the gap between expected levels of learning and demonstrated knowledge

Changes We've Seen

- ❑ Classroom behavior
- ❑ Personal responsibility
- ❑ Student success
- ❑ Higher quality responses
- ❑ Raised curricular expectations
- ❑ Students learned more...

Geometry Grades

Year	MP Avg.	Exam Avg.	Difference
Traditional Year 1	83	68	-15
Traditional Year 2	84	69	-15
Standards Year 1	83	86	+3
Standards Year 2	84	87	+3

Final Exam Results

Grade	Traditional Grading	Grading to Standards
93-100	37%	44%
85-92	15%	23%
77-84	15%	19%
70-76	7%	7%
60-69	10%	3%
below 60	17%	4%

Students Achieving "C" or Higher

Grade	Traditional Grading	Grading to Standards
77-100	66%	86%
below 77	34%	14%

Student Feedback

End of Course Student Survey

- **What have your experiences in previous math classes been like?**

Choices	% of Total
Math is great for me!	12.2%
I usually do well in math.	24.3%
I do okay.	33.3%
I have to work hard to do well.	15.1%
I have trouble doing well.	15.1%

- How has this class compared to other math classes you have taken?

Choices	% of Total	% of Lower Skilled
Much better!	54.6%	60%
Somewhat better	33.3%	40%
About the same	9.1%	0%
A little worse	3%	0%
Just awful	0%	0%

- Do you feel this **method of assessment helped you to learn the skills better** than you would have under a more conventional grading method?

Choices	% of Total	% of Lower Skilled
Much better	69.7%	70%
Somewhat helpful	30.3%	30%
No difference	0%	0%
I learned less	0%	0%

What does it look like?

□ The local standards

□ The assessments

□ The gradebook

Creating Assessments

- ❑ Select a topic
- ❑ What were your goals for that topic?
- ❑ Think of a way to assess those goals that will accurately depict the student's level of knowledge
- ❑ Sample assessments
Standard check, test, reassessment

Types of Items

- Level 1: Simpler details and processes that have been explicitly taught.
- Level 2: Slightly more complex ideas and processes that have been explicitly taught.
- Level 3: This is the key level – state expectations...
- Level 4: More challenging and above state expectations
- Level 5: Inferences and applications that may go beyond what was taught.

What does it look like?

The local standards

The assessments

The gradebook

The Gradebook

- Advanced – 100%
- Proficient – 93%
- Basic – 85%
- Not Proficient – 0%

- Reassessed to Basic – 77%

- Local standards – 90% of grade
- All other work – 10% of grade

Labeling Performance

□ Levels of understanding/quality

- Beginning, progressing, adequate, exemplary
- Unsatisfactory, needs improvement, satisfactory, outstanding
- Novice, apprentice, proficient, distinguished

□ Level of mastery/proficiency

- Below basic, basic, proficient, advanced
- Incomplete, limited, partial, thorough
- Pre-emergent, emerging, acquiring, extending

□ Frequency of display

- Rarely, occasionally, frequently, consistently
- Never, seldom, usually, always

□ Degree of effectiveness

- Ineffective, partially effective, effective, highly effective

□ Evidence of accomplishment

- Little or no evidence, partial evidence, sufficient evidence, extensive evidence

Then what...

- What happens when a student does not demonstrate a satisfactory level of understanding?

The Goal...

Do I now have an idea of how I can use better feedback to improve student learning?

Resources and Contacts

- ❑ Improving Student Learning, One Teacher at a Time; Jane Pollock
- ❑ Improving Student Learning, One Principal at a Time; Jane Pollock
- ❑ Feedback, the Hinge that Joins Teaching & Learning; Jane Pollock
- ❑ Understanding by Design; Grant Wiggins and Jay McTighe
- ❑ Thomas Guskey: University of Kentucky

- ❑ Betsy Bunting: bbunting@rvrhs.com
- ❑ Ron Wence: rwence@rvrhs.com