



TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS FRAMEWORK

EVIDENCE-BASED TEACHING PRACTICES

FEEDBACK & ASSESSMENT

Feedback and Assessment are used to continuously monitor performance and communicate progress and levels of mastery to students. Instructors who incorporate frequent and ongoing assessments are able to use these data to adjust teaching strategies and provide feedback to students about their learning- motivating students to be more self-directed. This collection of **evidence-based teaching practices** helps instructors develop their skills in **Feedback and Assessment**. Consider starting with key inclusive practices (👥) or key Universal Design (UDL) practices (🧠) in this domain. See [TILT's Recommended Process for Annual Review of Teaching](#) to learn more about how to utilize this resource.



First Four Weeks

- Use low-stakes assessments during the [First Four Weeks](#) of class
- Administer a [mini-exam](#) at the same difficulty level as larger exams
- Structure time for students to engage in [self/peer assessment](#)
- Provide structure and guidelines for student [group work and group assignments](#); guide and reteach [skills](#) for productive, [inclusive group work](#) 👥



Summative Assessment

- [Align assessments](#) with objectives; share this alignment with students; provide transparent [assignment directions](#): start with this [template](#) 👥
- Create [rubrics](#) for assignments, papers, and presentations; share rubrics with students when introducing the assignment 👥
- Vary assessments: quizzes, exams, [assignments](#), papers, projects, simulations, and presentations 👥🧠
- Create real-world, [authentic assessment opportunities](#)
- Scaffold large [assignments](#); allow for rough drafts, revisions, and [peer feedback](#) 🧠
- Provide checklists and graphic organizers for large assignments 🧠
- Give students opportunities to engage in [self/peer](#) assessment of their assignment drafts using the rubric
- Consider [group quizzes or tests](#) in addition to individual testing
- Engage students in [project “exemplar” analysis](#) before an assignment is due
- Consider student-centered, [alternative grading practices](#) for all or parts of your course

Formative Assessment

- Use [Classroom Assessment Techniques](#) to check for understanding and promote mental retrieval and [deep learning](#) in [residential, hybrid, and online courses](#) 👥
- Be willing to [diverge from your teaching plan](#) if checks for understanding reveal student confusion or knowledge gaps
- Use rubrics as a [teaching and learning tool](#)
- Use “on the fly” in-class [checks for understanding](#): fist to five, think-pair-share, think-*ink*-pair-share, thumb-o-meter, [iClickers](#), [Kahoot](#), etc.



Feedback

- Give [timely](#) and [specific feedback](#); ask questions or use [sentences like](#), “The best part of this is ___because” or “I don’t have a clear picture of ___”
- Provide guidelines, practice, and support for students to [engage in problem solving](#) or [give feedback](#) to each other
- Make sure students know that formative assessment is a [form of supportive feedback](#)—not all formative assessment needs to be graded
- Encourage students to develop test-preparation and test-taking skills by conducting a [post-test analysis](#)
- Provide guidelines and prompts [for individual and collective reflection](#). 🧠





TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS FRAMEWORK

SELF-ASSESSMENT RUBRIC

Use this rubric to reflect on your current instructional practices, set a teaching goal, and monitor growth. TILT recommends revisiting this throughout the year to continue to reflect and adjust as you work towards your goal. TILT does not recommend using this as an observation tool or for direct evaluation. See [TILT's Recommended Process for Annual Review of Teaching](#) to learn more about how to utilize this resource.

FEEDBACK & ASSESSMENT

Focus Area & Evidence	Advanced	Proficient	Developing	Emerging
Summative Assessment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Variety and frequency Alignment with course objectives Scaffolding Assignment examples Assessment criteria 	Assessments are varied, frequent, and aligned with course objectives. At least one real-world authentic assessment is given. All students find assignment directions clear. Large assignments are broken into several parts with instructor or peer feedback. Students engage in analyzing/discussing examples of assignments. Rubrics are co-created with students.	Assessments are mostly varied, frequent, and aligned with course objectives. Most students find assignment directions clear. Large assignments are broken into several parts with instructor or peer feedback. Students engage in analyzing/discussing examples of some assignments. Rubrics are shared with students when an assignment is introduced.	Assessments could be more varied, more frequent, and better aligned with course objectives. Some students may be confused by assignment directions. Large assignments may require a rough draft, but little feedback is given. Students may be provided assignment examples. Assessment criteria is in list form or rubrics shared with students when grade is given.	Assessment variety, frequency, and alignment with course objectives is inconsistent. Many students are confused by assignment directions. Large assignments are turned in for a final grade with little or no opportunity for feedback or improvement. Assessment criteria are simply listed or not shared with students.
Formative Assessment and Feedback <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Class activities Low-stakes assignments/quizzes Formative assessments 	The instructor regularly uses formative assessment strategies and low-stakes activities, assignments, and/or quizzes to gauge student understanding, modify future lessons, make in-the-moment instructional adjustments, and give feedback to students.	The instructor uses several formative assessment strategies and low-stakes activities, assignments, and/or quizzes to gauge student understanding, modify future lessons, make in-the-moment instructional adjustments, and give feedback to students.	The instructor uses one or two formative assessment strategies and low-stakes assignments to give students feedback.	The instructor does not yet use formative assessment strategies or low-stakes assignments to give students feedback.
First Four Weeks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Early low-stakes assignments and feedback 	The instructor provides an ample number of low-stakes assessments and feedback to students during the first four weeks of class.	The instructor provides some low-stakes assessments and feedback to students during the first four weeks of class.	The instructor provides little feedback to students during the first four weeks of class.	The instructor does not provide feedback to students during the first four weeks of class.
Feedback <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Timely, supportive, constructive, and specific feedback Peer feedback 	Instructor feedback is prompt, supportive, constructive, and specific. Students are taught how to give quality feedback to each other, and peer feedback is a regular component of the course. Students use feedback to improve work before it is assessed.	Instructor feedback is timely, constructive, and specific. Peer feedback is occasionally incorporated into an assignment or activity. Students are encouraged to use feedback to improve work before it is assessed.	Instructor feedback is timely but may have limited detail. Students are encouraged to use instructor feedback to improve future work. Students may engage in peer feedback for one assignment.	Instructor feedback is limited and is not returned to students in time to use it to inform subsequent work. Students do not engage in peer feedback.





TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS FRAMEWORK

REFERENCES

FEEDBACK & ASSESSMENT

- Angelo, T., & Cross, K. (1993). *Classroom assessment techniques: a handbook for college teachers* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Barr, J. J. (2016). Developing a positive classroom climate. The IDEA Center, IDEA Paper #61(October 2016). https://www.ideaedu.org/Portals/0/Uploads/Documents/IDEA%20Papers/IDEA%20Papers/PaperIDEA_61.pdf
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2009). Developing the theory of formative assessment. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 21(1), 5-31. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11092-008-9068-5>
- Caldwell, J. E. (2007). Clickers in the Large Classroom: Current Research and Best-Practice Tips. *CBE—Life Sciences Education*, 6(1), 9–20. <https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.06-12-0205>
- Darby, F. (2019). *Small Teaching Online*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gibbs, G., & Simpson, C. (2005). Conditions Under Which Assessment Support Students' Learning [Review of *Conditions Under Which Assessment Support Students' Learning*]. *Learning and Teaching in Higher Education*, 1, 10–11. <https://eprints.glos.ac.uk/3609/1/LATHE%201.%20Cond>
- Ladyshevsky, R. K. (2013). Instructor presence in online courses and student satisfaction. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.240429/ijstl.2013.070113>
- Lehman, R. M., & Conceicao, S. C. (2010). *Creating a Sense of Presence in Online Teaching: How to “Be There” for Distance Learners*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Lipnevich, A. A and Smith, J. K. (2008). Response to Assessment Feedback: The Effects of Grades, Praise, and Source of Information. ETS Research Report ETS RR-08-30. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service. <https://www.ets.org/Media/Research/pdf/RR-08-30.pdf>
- McDaniel, M. A., Anderson, J. L., Derbish, M. H., & Morrisette, N. (2007). Testing the testing effect in the classroom. *European Journal of Cognitive Psychology*, 19(4-5), 494- 513.
- Meer, N. M., Chapman, A. (2014). Assessment for confidence: Exploring the impact that low stakes assessment design has on student retention. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 12, 186-192. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2014.01.003>
- Myers, C.B. & Myers, S.M. (2007). Innovation in High Education 31: 227. <https://doi-org.ezproxy2.library.colostate.edu/10.1007/s10755-006-9020-x>
- Pennebaker JW, Gosling SD, Ferrell JD (2013). Daily Online Testing in Large Classes: Boosting College Performance while Reducing Achievement Gaps. *PLoS ONE* 8(11): e79774. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0079774>
- Policy Review: Creating Student-Centered Course Policies – Equity Accelerator*. (n.d.). Retrieved July 18, 2023, from <https://collegetransitioncollaborative.org/policy-review/>
- Rhodes, M., Cleary, A., & DeLosh, E. (2020). *A guide to effective studying and learning: practical strategies from the science of learning*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Roediger, H. L. (2013). Applying cognitive psychology to education: Translational educational science. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 14, 1-3.
- Sadler, D. R. (2008). Transforming Holistic Assessment and Grading into a Vehicle for Complex Learning. *Assessment, Learning and Judgement in Higher Education*, 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-8905-3_4
- Stevens, D. D. & Levi, A. J. (2012) *Introduction to rubrics: An assessment tool to save grading time, convey effective feedback and promote student learning* (2nd ed.). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.
- Syllabus Design*. (n.d.). Vanderbilt University. <https://cft.vanderbilt.edu/guides-sub-pages/syllabus-design/>
- Tanner, K. D. (2013). Structure Matters: Twenty-One Teaching Strategies to Promote Student Engagement and Cultivate Classroom Equity. *CBE—Life Sciences Education*, 12(3), 322–331. <https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.13-06-0115>
- Two-Stage Exams*. (2014). https://cwsei.ubc.ca/sites/default/files/cwsei/resources/instructor/Two-stage_Exams.pdf
- Walck-Shannon, E. M., Cahill, M. J., McDaniel, M. A., & Frey, R. F. (2019). Participation in Voluntary Re-quizzing Is Predictive of Increased Performance on Cumulative Assessments in Introductory Biology. *CBE—Life Sciences Education*, 18(2), ar15. <https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.18-08-0163>
- Walvoord, B. E., & Anderson, V. J. (2010). *Effective grading: A tool for learning and assessment in college* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

