

Cook, Kazan, & Behm: 2016 IACRL Presentation

What is Dynamic Criteria Mapping (DCM)?

DCM is a qualitative assessment practice that encourages a community to articulate what they value when they evaluate student work individually in their respective courses and/or collectively during assessment exercises. DCM privileges practitioner knowledge rather than the expertise of a testing corporation.

What Happens During a Dynamic Criteria Mapping Exercise?

Through small and large group *articulation sessions*, participants discuss what they value pedagogically, what criteria they use to evaluate student work, and what learning outcomes inform their courses and programs. Once criteria are evident, participants work to organize criteria into constellations, visually representing the relationships among the various criteria and constellations by producing a map. The map is subsequently distributed among constituents to inform teaching and learning.

What are the Benefits of DCM?

- i. A visual representation of what a community values
- ii. Increased student learning and better instruction if a program closes the assessment loop, allowing the criteria outlined in the map to inform the pedagogical practices
- iii. Professional development for those who participate in DCM
- iv. Builds a culture of assessment by emphasizing organic, contextually sensitive assessment practices that privilege practitioner expertise and student learning

What We Did: In piloting DCM to better understand how Elmhurst College conceptualizes information literacy,

1. Participants reviewed sample essays and completed a worksheet where they described their responses.
2. Relying on their notes, participants discussed their responses in groups of three, particularly noting evaluative comments, identifying criteria, and referencing specific characteristics and passages within the sample texts. Small groups tried to establish a consensus regarding what characteristics they privileged as a demonstration of information literacy. Participants attempted to clarify their understanding of information literacy.
3. Using the notes from the small groups, participants reported on their discussions, noting various criteria and whether consensus was established. As a large group, we discussed each sample, comparing and contrasting the positive and negative characteristics of each, and tried to establish consensus regarding what particular characteristics demonstrated information literacy and to what degree of sophistication.
4. As a larger group, we reviewed notes, clustered synonymous comments and similar criteria into constellations, and attempted to construct a visual representation of clustered criteria to visually render the dynamics among criteria.

References

- Adler-Kassner, L. & P. O'Neill. (2010). *Reframing writing assessment to improve teaching and learning*. Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.
- Broad, B. (2009). Organic matters: In praise of locally grown writing assessment. In B. Broad, L. Adler-Kassner, B. Alford, J. Detweiler, H. Estrem, S. Harrington, M. McBride, E. Stalions, & S. Weeden (Eds.), *Organic writing assessment: Dynamic criteria mapping in action*. (pp. 1-13). Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.
- Broad, B. (2003). *What we really value: Beyond rubrics in teaching and assessing writing*. Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.
- Huot, B. (2002). *(Re)articulating writing assessment for teaching and learning*. Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.
- Moss, P. (1994). Can there be validity without reliability? *Educational Researcher*, 23(2), 5-12
- Yancey, K. B. (1999). Looking back as we look forward: Historicizing writing assessment. *College Composition and Communication*, 50(3), 483-503.

Information Literacy Dynamic Criteria Mapping—Summer 2015

Reviewer: _____

of Student Artifact: _____

Directions: Please write your name and the number of the student sample in the space provided above. As you are reviewing each student essay, please respond to the following guiding questions. Responding to these questions will help us understand and make explicit the criteria, conventions, and characteristics that we value and look for in student work. Please complete this worksheet for each student artifact that we review.

1). Does this text demonstrate information literacy? (Y/N)

2). Why? What rationale can you provide for deciding as you did?

3). What aspects or characteristics of the sample text do you value or privilege or emphasize?

4). Why do you value those aspects/characteristics? What do they reflect, represent, and/or demonstrate?