Rubric Norming Process

1. Think aloud through scoring several examples.
2. Ask raters to independently score a set of examples.
3. Review the results as a group.
4. Discuss and then reconcile inconsistent scores. This process is repeated on a new set of examples.
5. A consensus (or can “disagree and commit”), negotiate when student artifacts are concrete, focused, and shorter range of services libraries produce.

Lessons Learned

- “I know an information literate student when I see one” does not equal “I can articulate what information literacy skills look like in artifacts of student work.”
- If we want to make high-stakes decisions about student lives, we must investigate, not assume, interrater reliability.
- The process of writing and rating with rubrics results in improvements in teaching, assessment, collaboration, etc.
- Norming is essential for establishing shared understanding of the rubric and achieving greater inter-rater reliability.
- Almost everyone likes norming, and many people are surprised by how much they like it.
- Analytical rubrics appear to be more effective when assessing student artifacts than holistic rubrics.
- Specific, precise, detailed performance descriptions are crucial to achieve interrater reliability.
- Raters appear to be more confident about their ratings when student artifacts are concrete, focused, and shorter in length.
- The best raters “believe in” outcomes, value constructed consensus (or can “disagree and commit”), negotiate meaning across disciplines, develop shared vocabulary, etc.

“RAILS has enabled us to put systems and procedures in place that we will draw on for all subsequent assessment efforts!”

“Happy RAILS To You! Using Rubrics for Authentic, Reliable, and Convincing Learning Assessments Almost 100 rubrics online at www.railsontrack.info!”

10 Institutions, 110 Raters, and 1000 Students in 2 years...What We Learned...and What You Need to Know!