



Minutes
Meeting With Institutional Research
September 7, 2011

The Department met with Jessica Ickes & Daniel Flowers for a 2 hour workshop on inter-rater reliability. Jessica shared two AWP papers and we read and rated the papers using the AWP rubric we had developed a year ago. Jessica then asked us how we had rated the paper on both the critical reflection on the standards aspect and on the writing aspect. This immediately showed that we need to disconnect the two aspects. Daniel suggested that we put one aspect on one side of the paper and the writing on the other. The following list represents our discussions:

- Which writing errors are serious enough to pull down a score.
- We need to clean up the rubric. Jessica suggested that we might want to look at the rubric and description sheet used by the Writing Program. We will do that.
- We should really use the rubric closely when we are grading. We will use the Teacher Candidate Standards rubric when assessing the Standards aspect.
- We discovered that on a number of things we agreed on the score, but for entirely different reasons! Conclusion: we need to have conversations, preferably just before we grade both the written and oral performances.
- We are planning to give the rubric to candidates prior to their submissions and then to provide our feedback on the rubric when returning the papers for resubmission.
- We agreed that the primary reason a candidate received a 1 rating (rather than the 2 they should get) is lack of evidence. Evidence of intentionality needs to be apparent in both the written and oral performances.
- Do we want to continue using a 'never to always' approach or a 'getting better' approach?
- We need to go over the rubric before we use it in the spring, asking the question: is the rubric measuring what we want it to?