

Growing Students Voice in Evaluation: Seat at the Design Table

Purpose of the Tool:

This tool offers a process in order to grow student voice and social construction in the examination and development a scoring checklist or rubric. The clearer students are in understanding key criteria and related descriptors, the more equipped they are to use the scoring tool to guide their thinking and development for the task at hand.



IF YOU WANT THEM TO UNDERSTAND A SCORING TOOL Clarifying the Language of a Rubric... *(sliding to the right from teacher generated)*

1. Students work in groups. Read/view example and individually identify strong examples and weak examples of work using a teacher-generated rubric.
2. Examine work together identify which ones are strong and which ones are weak using the language of the rubric.
 - a. Have the students mark up the scoring tool/rubric, circling the words that are most significant to their evaluation of the work and underlining the words that are unclear to them
 - b. Have the students justify the scoring choices they made using the descriptors of the criteria
3. Work together as a class to understand that evaluation is a collaborative act of agreement about the indicators
4. Have the students clarify language based on student mark ups. The goal is to have them grow their understanding of the key criteria to help guide their thinking and development of a given task and to realize that evaluation is a judgment so a shared understanding, with examples, is necessary to have a higher degree of agreement among the evaluators.

IF YOU WANT THEM TO DEVELOP A SCORING TOOL... *(sliding to the right from co-created)*

1. Students work in groups. Read/view example and individually identify what makes a strong example and what makes a weak example based on established criteria. For example, in mathematics a teacher could provide them with titles such as strategy, computation, justification. An English teacher could provide criteria such as focus, evidence, mechanics. Should be based on what the genre expects and aligned to state/national standards.
2. Students describe their reasoning or judgment for their score to one another and identify descriptors from small groups. Students examine work together to come to consensus on which ones are strong and which ones are weaker.
3. Work together as a class to describe the meaning of each criterion based on their analysis of student work. The work needs to remain visible throughout this process. Ideally, they should focus on the genre or form rather than being project specific. For example, it should be based

on describing the criteria for an infographic rather than for criteria that are specific for the content of the infographic. The power of a rubric for the genre or form is that it can be transferred to other content areas.

IF YOU WANT THEM TO DEVELOP A PERSONALIZED SCORING TOOL... (*sliding to student generated*)

1. Student chooses an existing scoring tool based on what they are hoping to accomplish with the task.
2. Student modifies the tool as appropriate given the dimensions of the project/challenge.
3. Students conferences with teacher to examine relevance and credibility of the scoring tool to guide and evaluate the work. Student may need to modify the scoring tool and/or process based on feedback.

TO AMPLIFY THE EXPERIENCE

- Have them use key criteria that are quality indicators outside of school walls (e.g., industry standards, competitions)
- Have them articulate how the work could be made better to move toward quality (e.g., [Austin's butterfly](#) as an example)