Standards Based Grading

Research

- Hattie, John. (2009). *Visible Learning:A Synthesis of Over 800 Meta-analyses Relating to Achievement.* New York, NY: Routledge.
    - self-reporting grades (1.44)
    - formative evaluation (.90)
    - teacher clarity (.75)
    - feedback (.73)
    - mastery learning (.58)
- ERIC--Phi Delta Kappan articles on standards based grading: "Standards-Based Grading and Reporting Will Improve Education" (Munoz & Guskey, 2015); "Eight Steps to Meaningful Grading" (Deddeh, Main, & Fulkerson, 2010)
- JSTOR--"Grading & Differentiation: Paradox or Good Practice" (Tomlinson, 2005)
- Guskey, Thomas. (2015). *On Your Mark: Challenging and Conventions of Grading and Reporting.* Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.
- Heflebower, Tammy, Hoegh, Jan K., & Warrick, Phil. (2014). *A School Leader's Guide to Standards-Based Grading.* Bloomington, IN: Marzano Research Laboratory.

Video References

- [Standards-Based Grading Overview](#)
- [Rick Wormeli: Standards-Based Grading](#) (This is about zeros used in grading on a 100 point system and makes the claim against using the mean. Rick Wormeli also has done several other videos on micro topics within SBG.)
- [Toxic Grading Practices--Doug Reeves](#) (Case against using averages)
- [Best Practices in Grading](#) (Student montage)
- [Let's teach for mastery--not test scores--Sal Khan](#)

Philosophy

- Connection to PLC process which includes SLOs and effective learning standards
- Student engagement and reflection with clarity on learning goals and their own progress toward goals
- Differentiation mindset in instruction, assessment, & grading

Traditional Grading vs. Standards Based Grading

	Traditional Grading	Standards Based Grading
Scale	- Percentage, weighted by category - Varied by school and/or teacher - Weighted heavily toward completion of classwork ")'s" weigh heavily and are almost non-recoverable.	4.0 In addition to 3.0 proficiency, the student goes beyond in thought and application. 3.0 Proficiency Level Met Independently 2.0 Simpler goals toward proficiency (DOK 1 & 2) 1.0 With help, partial success at score 2.0 & 3.0 0.0 Even with help, no success
Grade Conversion	90-100% = A 80-89% = B 70-79% = C 60-69% = D 59 & Below = F	3.00-4.00 = A 2.50-2.99 = B 2.00-2.49 = C 1.00-1.99 = D Below 1.0 = F
What Makes Up The Grade	- Assessment performance - Homework performance or completion - Extra Credit - Turned in on-time - Attendance & Punctuality - Behavior - Participation	- Prioritized standards & to what level proficiency was met - Academic & Behavior/Professionalism reported separately - ALL standards-based grades are derived from the results of assessments of student learning
Final Grade Based On	Averaged scores within categories and then weighted categories	Whether students meet the expected standard of learning. Product, Process, & Progress scored (all or part of the three)
Pros	- Tradition - Our grading system is set to this algorithm	- Clearly defined standards and performance level for each - More continuity across grade and subject - Provides information to students for self-evaluation - Can answer, "Did students learn?" - Parents can understand how well students have learned
Cons	- The grade is ill defined with too many variables - Not clear if students have learned - Validity and reliability of grades are not substantiated - Doesn't always reflect learning	- Colleges/Universities are not all prepared for the new reporting - Change - PR