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Of particular interest in this article is the discussion of variation in grading of the same work. The article discusses how in one 1912 study, that there was a wide variation on how the same two papers were graded. “Scores on the first paper ranged from 64 to 98, and scores on the second paper ranged from 50 to 97. One paper was given a failing mark by 15 percent of the teachers and a grade of over 90 percent by 12 percent of the teachers” (p. 69). While the variations were based on the variations of the criteria/rubric used, a later experiment in 2011 by Hunter Brimi and “attained almost identical results” (p. 69), even though the teachers in this study “had received nearly 20 hours of training in a writing assessment program” (p. 69). Guskey also reports that this was not just a writing program issue—similar studies have been done using a geometry assignment. His proposed solution is to move from a percentage grade system to an integer grading system (ironically, this is how our original rubric was set up prior to WayPoint). Brimi’s work is referenced, as well, and might be interesting to look at.
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While this is a white-paper aimed at selling Certiport’s services, the chart following chart shows some incredibly useful points regarding expectations of Millennial students. We can make use of these expectations/requirements when approaching feedback to students. One enlightening point made here is that 8 in 10 teens “play networked, online video games.” This is also more recent (given the dates of the research provided at the end) than the VGG article below from 2005) and it provides some clear information about the Millennial generation and how learning has changed as a result of culture changing. It also covers some challenges for teachers, most from the Boomer generation, in adjusting to these shifts.
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This article covers EdX, which was founded by Harvard and MIT to offer free Internet courses (MOOCs) using automated grading software. Supposedly, EdX “will make its automated software available free on the Web to any institution that wants to use it.” The system uses Artificial Intelligence to grade. The value of instant feedback is covered, as well as how the software will allow for larger course sizes. In this software, however, the individual instructor enters the scoring system/rubric criteria. While this type of auto-grading is great at the individual level, it would still lead to “the variation you find from instructor to instructor.” Of course, there is the potential for all within a program to use the same criteria, which theoretically would lead to consistent results.

McCrea, B. (2013, July 3). The surprising truth about writing auto-graders. *THE Journal.* Retrieved from <http://thejournal.com/Articles/2013/07/03/Does-Auto-Grading-Writing-Actually-Work.aspx?Page=1>

Interesting reflection on the use of auto-graders as a cost-effective assessment in West Virginia. Their success with using graders led to WV Writes <http://wvde.state.wv.us/oaa/wvwrites/wvwrites.html> which was developed in conjunction with McGraw-Hill. The key take away points from the article include the finding that auto-grader to human inter-rater reliability was higher than human to human. While no one in the article suggests that auto-graders should replace humans, there is a clear sense that having these tools for students can lead to better revisions if students are allowed to use a system like McGraw-Hill’s Writing Roadmap or Vantage’s MY Access! The article opens up some good questions about how to use this as a tool, not as an end assessment.
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While this article is dated, it does shed some light on the ways in which student interaction with the world around them has changed, which led to necessary changes in our feedback to students. This article makes clear that students spend more time interacting with 3D media than they do with plain text. The article indicates that the VGG is “in charge and ready to lead.” They want to be in the driver’s seat. This is interesting for Baker instructors in terms of thinking of student investment and how the desire to have more than one path to success is important, as well as how effort—something we often tell students we cannot assess—is important.