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We desire accurate communication and understanding.
If you have wonderings, questions, arguments, etc. please speak up.

## Typical Grading Practices (from our experience)

- Use a 100-point (percentage) scale
- Have grade ranges similar to A:90-100, B:80-89, C:70-79, D:60-69, F:0-59
- Have several parts, e.g., homework, projects, quizzes, exams, attendance \& participation, extra credit, group work, etc.
- Use homework grading as a major source of student feedback
- Assign zeroes to missing work/assessments


## What is Equitable Grading?

- A book by Joe Feldman
- Grading practices that:
- Are mathematically accurate, validly reflecting students' academic performance
- Are bias-resistant, preventing subjectivity from infecting grades
- Motivate students to strive for academic success, persevere, accept struggles and setbacks, and to gain critical lifelong skills


## Typical Grading Practices

- Are not mathematically accurate
- Are not bias-resistant
- Do not motivate students


## Accuracy: The 100-Point Scale Accuracy: Zero for Missing Work

- 90/80/70/60 grade ranges $\rightarrow 10$ values for $A, B, C, D$ and 60 for $F$
- A zero in one component lowers 2 B's to an F
- Does missing work indicate a total lack of capability? How do you know?


## Accuracy: Grading Categories and Weightings

Should grades here be the same or different?

| Category | Category Weight | Student 1 |  | Student 2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Score | Weight | Score | Weight |
| Homework | 30\% | 80\% | . 24 | 60\% | . 18 |
| Tests \& Projects | 40\% | 60\% | . 24 | 95\% | . 38 |
| In-class Activity | 20\% | 90\% | . 18 | 70\% | . 14 |
| Participation | 10\% | 100\% | . 10 | 60\% | . 06 |
| Weighted Score |  | 76\% |  | 76\% |  |


| Category | Student Score | Class X |  | Class Y |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Weighting | Result | Weighting | Result |
| Homework | 80\% | 30\% | . 24 | 5\% | . 04 |
| Tests \& Projects | 60\% | 40\% | . 24 | 85\% | . 51 |
| In-class Activity | 90\% | 20\% | . 18 | 5\% | . 045 |
| Participation | 100\% | 10\% | . 10 | 5\% | . 05 |
| Weighted Score |  | 74\% |  | 65\% |  |

## Accuracy: Early Failures, Eventual Learning

- I had a student who failed for six weeks. I told him he was supposed to learn from his mistakes. His work improved, his grades got higher, and he was doing A-work at the end of the semester.
- What should his grade be?
- Why?


## Accuracy: Non-Academic Performance

- Attendance \& participation likely contribute to learning but don't measure it
- Penalizing late work does not reflect academic capability
- Penalizing cheating does not reflect academic capability
- A group score does not reflect individual academic capability
- Extra credit (typically enrichment or advanced content) does not measure performance on course content-if it does it should be required, not extra


## Additional Discussion re Accuracy?

## BIAs-Resistant: But IM NOT BIASED

- We refer to unintentional bias-Bias-resistant practices value knowledge, not environment or behavior
- Students come to our classes with different background knowledge
- Students have outside-of-class circumstances that may restrict class-related activity
- Students vary in how quickly they learn the content of our courses


## BIAS-Resistance: SOME ISSUES

- Extra credit (typically enrichment or advanced content, not in course goals) gets used by those in a better position to profit (have resources, supports, stronger backgrounds, etc.)
- Late penalties are unrelated to actual capability and unduly burden students with few resources, weak prior knowledge, overwhelming life issues, stress, etc.
- Participation credit rewards compliant students and can be antithetical to some who may view it as "acting white" or putting oneself above the teacher
- Including homework/learning activity when grading favors those who already know the material or learn quicker or are "better" students


## Additional DISCUSSION RE BIAS RESISTANCE?

## Motivational: Research \& Experience Suggestions

- Contingent extrinsic rewards—do this to get that—undermine intrinsic motivation (p.154)
- Extrinsic motivation lowers performance on creative or complex-thinking tasks and increases unethical behavior (p.155)
- Using (low) grades as punishment causes student withdrawal or low self-esteem (p.157)
- Point-based grades (and extra credit) focus student attention on points, not content


## Additional Discussion re Bias Motivation?

## Suggested Action: Revise Instruction

- Identify desired outcomes (including any soft skills)
- Create assessments covering all outcomes, perhaps a mix of individual \& comprehensive assessments
- Create learning activities designed to develop each capability
- Content presentation
- Student Practice
- Feedback to students


## Suggested Action: Create Grading System

- That uses zeroes only for actual performance (not missing stuff)
- Includes performance only on assessments, not homework
- Uses equal grade bands, e.g., a minimum grade of 50 or 4/3/2/1/0 or good/okay/marginal/poor, mastered/not-mastered or rubricbased results or . . .
- Allows counting more recent/later assessments or reassessments


## IMPLICATIONS

- Substantial work in initial planning of outcomes, learning activities, and (perhaps multiple versions of) assessments-soft-skills may be outcomes, they need their own assessments
- Assessments for individuals in group work will need to be developed. Soft-skill assessments have need to be developed.
- Reimagining the provision of feedback to students, perhaps redefining "teaching" activity
- Less time spent grading
- No more arguing about points and students focus on learning content
- (ultimately) Happier students


## DISCUSSION

- Our thinking about grading has changed dramatically. For us it is unprofessional not to use these practices. Fortunately, we also think our instruction becomes better as a result.
- Wonderings, arguments, questions, . . .
- PPT at http://www.cs.uni.edu/~adberns/presentations/lsamp2020.pdf

