

Rubrics

FROM ED 209:

Your paper will be graded based on the following rubric:

- 70% Clear and succinct *description* of the texts. Able to articulate the position of the author and the main point(s). No analysis. No questioning. No reflection based on personal perspective. No linkage to other readings. No synthesis and extension of reflection, critique, and other readings.
- 80% Clear and succinct *description* and *analysis* of the texts. Able to articulate the position of the author and the main point(s) and able to analyze it and/or reflect upon it. Rudimentary questioning and linkage to other readings. No synthesis and extension of reflection, critique, and other readings.
- 90% Clear and succinct *description, analysis, critique, and linkage* of the texts. Able to analyze, reflect, and question the author and the main point(s) based on personal perspective and/or other readings. Rudimentary synthesis and extension of reflection, critique, and other readings.
- 100% Clear and succinct *description, analysis, critique, linkage and extension* of the texts. Able to synthesize readings and personal perspectives in order to effectively argue for one's position. Able to show how the central issue is related to other major issues.

FROM ED 201:

Sparks-Langer and Colton's (1991) framework for measuring reflective thinking

Level 1: *no description* (I gave my class a new seating arrangement today.)

Level 2: *simple lay person description* (People were talking, so I moved their desks.)

Level 3: *labeling of events with pedagogical concepts* (I moved my students' seating to stop the side conversations among students and so they would pay attention.)

Level 4: *explanation using only tradition or personal preference* (I think to stop the side conversations, I will mix up boys' and girls' seating arrangements. I remember not being allowed to sit next to my friends in class.)

Level 5: *explanation of events with pedagogical concepts* (I was wondering whether I should allow the conversations between students to continue rather than making a big deal out of it. However I realized I was having trouble getting the attention of two students before giving directions. Knowing that attention is critical for any learning to occur, I realize I have to get the attention of these two students.)

Level 6: *explanation using pedagogical principles and context* (I noticed that two students were talking without permission while I was giving directions. Rather than punish these students for bad behavior, I wanted them to be reinforced for attending to my directions. So I tried moving their desks, and then I tried increasing my wait time before I gave directions.)

Level 7: *explanation with moral and ethical considerations* (After I reflected on my dilemma with the students having side conversations, I am rethinking my position on separating the boys and the girls. How could separating genders improve the students' self-responsibility for social growth? In fact, I think I may be enabling students to continue their patterns of disrespect and irresponsibility because they are not monitoring their own behavior. If I want to have a democratic classroom in which students will take responsibility for their actions, I must include them in the problem solving process. I am taking the responsibility for the students' action when I police their behaviors by moving their desks and taking charge of the situation. Then they are behaving because I have orchestrated the right conditions. If I want them to self-monitor, students need to recognize their role and responsibility in the class for maintaining a positive learning environment. I am going to bring this up at Friday's class meeting.)

FROM Blythe Clinchy's (1986, 2000) stages of ways of knowing (also, c.f. Baxter-Magolda, 1992, 1999):

- 1) Received knowledge
- 2) Subjective knowledge
- 3) Procedural knowledge
- 4) Constructed knowledge
- 5) Contextual knowledge