Writing Rubrics Project  
Phase I: Collecting Rubrics

Report and Recommendations

The CIEP Writing Rubric Research project has been in the works for quite a while now. This term, an additional task of networking/collecting info was added to expand on data available elsewhere for a more in-depth analysis. For the sake of revision/evaluation, it was agreed that the CIEP Writing 6 Final Essay rubric will serve as a starting point of the project (a.k.a Sample).

The response can be categorized into three types of feedbacks:

I. In-house teaching faculty feedback
II. Email correspondence with teachers/administrators elsewhere (IEP - type organizations in the U.S. and abroad)
III. Samples of Writing Rubrics sent in response to the inquiry

Report

I. In-house teaching faculty feedback
   A fill-in questionnaire and a ‘sample’ rubric were sent out to all the instructors for comments and suggestions of which five have been completed and returned.

* The hard copies of feedback are anonymous and will be numbered from 1 to 5 for reference purposes.

In the Introduction Section (summary of 'complaints'):

The wording of the items is inconsistent and to the point of becoming too dubious (for ways to improve, see suggestions from the questionnaires); consequently, the numerical score is perceived as not reliable (0 – 5 and 0 – 10 for the same section)

In the Body Section:

There is the same discrepancy in scoring with the descriptors being perceived as “too general” (e.g. “how many transitions should be there?” and what transition is considered string enough), redundant at times; one-sided (e.g. fitting an argumentative essay but not any other kind); or unclear (“how sequencing is different than organization,” “what is logical”). Additional concern
expressed in #5 Q. is about 'formative' relevance of the rubric (i.e. "exposition of relevant evidence" would be difficult to decipher).

In the Conclusion Section:
Some performance descriptors are considered as "too easy" for Level 6 (#3 Q.), as aiming to the minimal requirements which are "not enough" (#2Q.), or as being not specific (e.g. no mention that no new ideas should be introduced at this point, #1Q.)

In the Grammar/Structure Mechanics Section
Though no significant changes were discussed by the majority of respondents, one feedback was more explicit regarding this matter (#2Q.):

"New grammar: The line between new grammar for the level and overall grammar needs to be clearer. Sometimes they can blend together.

[...] "show potential to be outstanding with future revision;" by the 3rd draft, they've had plenty of time for feedback and revisions, and shouldn't be rewarded for not listening to the teacher/peer editor's editing remarks. A score of 7-8 reflects minor use of new grammar and/or some minor errors in new grammar but mostly uses previously-learned grammar. Just throwing in the easier grammar elements that they've learned shouldn't be given a higher score. A score of 9 should have something about "more extensive/difficult" new grammar. 9 could also be for a high and accurate use of new grammar.

Overall grammar: not just complexity or variety of structure, but ACCURACY of grammar usage as well; I suggest looking at the TOEFL writing rubric for this part."

II. Email correspondence with teachers/administrators elsewhere (IEP - type organizations in the U.S. and abroad)