MSC Project-Level Scorer Survey  
Summary of Results

Number of Respondents: 66  
Response Rate: 52%

66 out of 127 project-level scorers completed the MSC scorer survey. Of the respondents, 73% were full-time faculty, 8% were part-time faculty, 15% were professional staff members, and 5% indicated other. 38% of the respondents were written communication scorers, 29% were quantitative literacy scorers, and 33% were critical thinking scorers. Survey respondents represented a variety of disciplinary areas, including humanities (26%), arts (5%), social sciences (27%), mathematics and computer science (11%), physical and natural sciences (12%) and professional and applied programs, such as business, education, and physical therapy (20%).

60% of respondents strongly agreed that rubrics are an effective tool for assessment of student learning, while 37% somewhat agreed.

Evaluation of the Kansas City Scoring & Calibration Training

Survey respondents reported that they felt that, prior to entering the breakout rooms, they had adequate information on the development and use of value rubrics (95%) purpose of the scoring training (94%), the process for calibration (82%), and the characteristics of effective scorers (79%).

100% of respondents indicated that the scoring and calibration session prepared them for scoring student work. 78% reported that adequate time was allocated to the two-day scoring and calibration training event in Kansas City. 76% of respondents indicated that participating in the scoring and calibration training significantly increased their understanding of the VALUE rubrics and their application of the assessment of student work; 20% indicated the training somewhat increased their understanding, and 5% reported that the training did not increase their understanding.

Scoring

94% of respondents scored the required number of artifacts (75-100), and 6% scored fewer than the required about. 80% of respondents scored between 3-6 artifacts per hour. 11% scored more than 7 artifacts per hour, and 9% scored 2 or fewer artifacts per hour. Overall, survey respondents found it very easy to access and score student work via the data management system. 96% indicated it was very easy or easy to access student work via the data management system, 98% indicated that it was very easy or easy to score student work electronically via the data management system and 100% indicated that it was very easy or easy to enter scores into the data management system.

Survey participants were asked to identify factors that significantly influenced their ability to objectively score student work products at any point during the scoring process. Scorers indicated the following
factors significantly influenced their ability to objectively score student work products: the disciplinary content of the artifact encumbered application of the rubric (46%), the student who produced the artifact was identified (12%) and the institution where the artifact came was identified (11%). 20% indicated “other” factors, including artifacts without answer keys, multiple choice tests, lengthy assignments, art work, different understandings of what critical thinking is, and grading comments by the instructor.

Overall, survey respondents felt prepared to score artifacts in their assigned area. 100% of the written communication scorers felt very well prepared or prepared to score student work. 95% of quantitative literacy scorers felt very well prepared or prepared to score student work. 100% of critical thinking scorers felt very well prepared or prepared to score student work.

Three themes emerged from survey respondent open-ended feedback on the calibration training. First, several respondents suggested that the amount of large group time be reduced, some even suggested eliminating the second day. Second, respondents suggested increasing the time allotted to small group conversations. Third, respondents indicated that it would be useful to provide examples of scored student work with rationales for scores.

Rubric Feedback

92% of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that the cover page of the rubric was easy to understand. 88% strongly agreed or agreed that the cover page of the rubric helped them understand how the learning outcome can be applied across multiple disciplines. 86% strongly agreed or agreed that the 4-0 scale provided a sufficient range for evaluating the performance level of the student work. 80% strongly agreed or agreed that benchmark, milestone and capstone descriptors for performance levels were relevant for making scoring decisions. 83% strongly agreed or agreed that benchmark, milestone and capstone descriptors for the performance levels were understandable for making scoring decisions. 75% strongly agreed or agreed that the multiple dimensions (or criteria) of the rubric encompass the core meaning of the intended learning outcome. 89% strongly agreed or agreed that the rubric as a whole was a useful tool for evaluating student work.

Respondents were asked to rate the degree to which the submitted student work they were assigned to evaluate could be appropriately assessed using the corresponding VALUE rubric on a scale of 8-1 (8=highly appropriate; 1=not at all appropriate). The average rating was 6.23 out of 8.

Respondents provided recommendations for modifying the VALUE rubric they used for scoring. Three themes emerged from the feedback: a. double-barreled descriptors; b. clarification on “assumptions” on QL and CT rubrics, c. clarification on the use of sources in the WC rubric.

Professional Development Activities

Respondents were asked to rank what professional development activities would be useful to prepare individuals to serve as project-level scorers.

1. VALUE rubric information sessions or materials (49% indicated most important)
2. Multiple calibration sessions (37% indicated most important)
3. Opportunities to score student work electronically prior to training (12% indicated most important)
4. Lessons learned presentations or documents from campus leaders and faculty who have gone through the scoring process (8% indicated most important).