

Part One

Summary of Skills Assessment

For Philosophy students:

1. Critical Thinking –*ability to analyze, reflect, provide effective counter-arguments (advocatus diabolic), and synthesize arguments, claims, evidence, et al.*
2. Creative Thinking – *ability to create/construct engaging, original treatments of any issue, argument, position, propositions, et al.*
3. Inquiry – *the ability to work independently, plan independently, deeply care about your topic, follow a wholly original path of study et al.*
4. Understanding content
5. Demonstrating knowledge
6. Original Interpretation
7. Exemplary Writing

For History students:

1. Critical Thinking (*which consists of what is called the Big Six: Establishing historical significance, using primary source evidence, identifying continuity and change, analyze cause and consequence, take historical perspectives, and understand the ethical dimension of historical interpretations*). *The actual measure of any or all of these skills are variable. There is no expectation that a student will become in effect an "historian".*
2. Creative Thinking – *ability to create/construct engaging, original treatments of any issue, argument, position, propositions, et al.*
3. Understanding content and demonstrating knowledge.
4. Historical Empathy: showing some care about why history is important.
5. Independent Inquiry
6. Exemplary Writing

Extended discussion of Assessment

Like Shrek, assessment is like an onion. It is layered and complex. I am going to focus on two layers.

The surface layer is the institutional one (you might refer to this as a “super-structure element”). This is where we determine a label that is supposed to act as a guidepost for your progress in a comparative way; this is despite talk every where in the world of education of “learner-centredness. Whether it is a letter grade, percentage, or valutive expression, the critical point is the worth of the thing. It is superficial, lacking depth, and is only useful if it reflects a mutual negotiated outcome.

The significant layer I am interested in falls under the notion of formative assessment. This is a dynamic assessment process that I believe should be shaped by hermeneutic discourse; simply put, we should negotiate the terms of continuous improvement thus we both share the outcome. I don't believe that there is much worth in a one-off, static inquiry in this world of learning.

Internally, we will use the letter grade label for what it is worth. When report card time comes, we will translate this into whatever institutional label is required

The following is a more detailed set of criteria that are rolled up in the summative key skill listed in the first part of this document:

- ***Richness and depth of understanding***
- ***Critical and creative thinking***
- ***Clarity and good flow in language use and expressions***
- ***Demonstration of insights***
- ***Respectful communication and enthusiastic engagement***
- ***Showing care, empathy, and encouragement***
- ***Integrating the theoretical and the personal.***
- ***Real life examples (anchors).***
- ***Good language skills.***
- ***NOT be a summary of the course materials: MUST BE IN YOUR OWN WORDS/VOICE, not copied (cut-and-paste) or derivative.***
- ***Depth of reflection, interpretation, examination, and/or analysis.***
- ***Demonstrated support for others & respectful communication***

Grading in this course is an exercise of discernment and a heuristic way of sizing up how you are progressing in the coursework. My sincere advice to all of you is to please take your learning personally and seriously, focus on what you learn and how you may apply it to your everyday life issues and situations.

The most important thing is that this is a process. You will have as many opportunities as is possible within the limitations of this super-structure we call a school that I can provide to improve and attain the best possible outcome for you.

Learning Outcome & Content Criterion

Extending/6-6+/A-/A+ Range

- Thorough and meaningful consideration of the relevant and salient issues
- Authentic and seamlessly connection between the personal and the world at large that speaks powerfully to objectives
- Sophisticated and detailed understanding

Applying/5-5+/B-/B+ Range

- Consistent and effortful consideration of relevant issues
- Connection between personal and the larger world is clear and pertinent to objectives
- Solid grasp of course content, without flaws in the understanding or gross simplifications of course concepts and its relevance

Developing/4-4+/C/C+ Range

- Includes some discussion of relevant course concepts
- Makes some connections between personal and the larger world; connections may be thin, or addressed on a superficial level
- Basic grasp of course content, with some flaws in understanding or gross simplifications

Beginning/Incomplete//C- Range

- Includes none to very little discussion of relevant course concepts
 - Makes none to very little connections between personal and the larger world; connections may be weak, or addressed on a less than superficial level
- Showing none to very little grasp of course content, with many flaws in understanding and/or gross simplifications

Learning Outcome Insight/Analysis Criterion

Extending/6-6+/A-/A+ Range

- Penetrating insight and depth of reflection
 - Demonstrates appreciation of layers of complexity, critical reflection, ambiguities and dilemmas
 - Conclusions are confident and informed, yet tentative and open to alternative viewpoints
 - Evidence of steady personal growth and self-understanding through consistent and earnest effort.

Applying/5-5+/B-/B+ Range

- Thoughtful comments and reflections based on earnest engagement
- Demonstrates some evidence of critical ambiguities, layers of complexity
- Conclusions are straightforward and supported by evidence
- Evidence of some personal growth and self-understanding throughout the project

Developing/4-4+/C/C+ Range

- Perfunctory grasp of issues and its relevance to personal project
- May contain gaps in logic, faulty reasoning, or tenuous relevance to ethical content
- Superficial statements/conclusions may lack substantive support
- Inconsistent/insufficient evidence of honest engagement in the project

Beginning/Incomplete//C- Range

- No grasp of issues and its relevance to personal project
- Contain many gaps in logic, faulty reasoning, or tenuous relevance to ethical content
- Unoriginal statements/conclusions lack of substantive support from the literature
- No to very little evidence of engagement in the project

Learning Outcome Expression Criterion

Extending/6-6+/A-/A+ Range

- Clear, coherent, and impactful writing/communication that may include strength of persuasion, fluidity of composition, sophistication of diction, imaginative and descriptive prose.
- Engaging to read; style enhances the substance

Applying/5-5+B-/B+ Range

- Clear and straightforward articulation of content.
- Thorough treatment of project topics, backed by substantive evidence
- Errors do not impede meaning
- Easy, smooth reading; style matches substances

Developing/4-4+C/C+ Range

- May present gaps in discussion; ideas may lack clarity and thorough articulation.
- May present problems related to coherence and clarity
- Mechanical errors may impede meaning
- May be difficulty to read due to mechanical or stylistic problems

Beginning/Incomplete//C- Range

- Lack of discussion; ideas are not clear.
- None to very little coherence and clarity
- Too many mechanical errors that impede meaning
- difficulty to read due to mechanical or stylistic problems/ show no effort of editing

Through negotiation, together we will translate this into the following:

Incomplete (I)	Beginning (BEG)	Developing (DEV)	Applying (APP)	Extending (EXT)
<p>Insufficient evidence has been gathered to assess student ability in this area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assignments have not been handed in or are only partially completed. 	<p>This student demonstrates a beginning level of understanding.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The quality of work within the body of evidence may be vague and/or undeveloped. • The student consistently demonstrates this level of achievement. 	<p>The student demonstrates a developing level of understanding.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The quality of work within the body of evidence may be adequate and/or concrete. • The student consistently demonstrates this level of achievement. 	<p>The student demonstrates a well-developed level of understanding.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The quality of work within the body of evidence may be clear and/or well reasoned. • The student consistently demonstrates this level of achievement. 	<p>The student demonstrates a mastery level of understanding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The quality of the work within the body of evidence may be perceptive and/or insightful. • The student consistently demonstrates this level of achievement.