**GCAP 633 Class Discussions and Problem-Based Learning Assessment**

**Student Self-Assessment and Instructor Final Grade**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Student:** | **Instructor:** |
| **Date of submission:**  | **Course:** |

**Note:**

* **You can use the tools available in Moodle** to analyze the quantity and quality of your engagement in the class discussions. Go to your Profile, then click on Forum Posts for a list of all posts you have made the course. This will also save you time in isolating your posts for submission on the quality assessment portion below. Notice that the word count is provided at the bottom of every post.
* **All posts counted in this assessment must be substantive** (i.e., not cheerleader posts, such as, “I really like what you said, André”), and they cannot derive from auxiliary forums (e.g., Coffee Room, Q & A for Assignments). However, they can be a response to another student’s post if your contribution is substantive and reflects the evaluation criteria.
* **You must provide a detailed analysis of the quality** **of your participation** to support your self-assessment. You are required to identify and analyze 6 posts from at least 3 different weeks to support your self-assessment in each of three categories: (a) active engagement in constructivist learning, (b) critical engagement with course content, and (c) application to problem-based learning. See p. 7–11 below
* **Your instructor will verify your post submissions** through spot-checks on both quantity and quality of posts in Moodle using Outline Report (which counts your posts in each weekly class discussion) and the Complete Report (which provides full access to all of your posts). Although your instructor has access to these reports, unfortunately, students do not, because they are not available through the student view of your Profile. The latter report shows the days on which you made each post, the word count of each posts, and the content of each post; please be honest in your self-assessment.
* **Your instructor will assess the representativeness of your sample posts**. Although you are encouraged to show your best work, if the posts selected are significantly different in quality from the majority of your posts throughout the semester, the instructor’s final grade will reflect this discrepancy.

**Quantity Assessment: Extent and Timing of Participation (6%)**

The assessment criteria for the Extent and Timing of Participation are listed below. The expectations listed under the **Meets Standard** range are in orange, because these are the competencies targeted through the assignment. **Please assess yourself on each row of the rubric below by highlighting the cell that you believe best represents your work.** **You do not need to provide a letter grade; this will be assigned by your instructors based on their review of the video and reflection sheet.** Review the example in the first row, then delete it and replace it your self-assessment. Your instructor will provide their assessment and complete the grade in the final column.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Assessment Criteria | Below StandardF to C+ | Support RequiredB- | Approaches StandardB | Meets StandardB+ to A- | Exceeds StandardA to A+ | Instructor Grading |
|  | 0 to 6.9 | 7.0 to 7.4 | 7.5 to 7.9 | 8.0 to 8.9 | 9.0 to 10.0 |  |
| **Timing of posts** | Respond to only 50% of the required questions or prompts or post late 50% of the time (i.e., post on Monday or Tuesday). | Respond to only 70% of the required questions or prompts or post late 30% of the time (i.e., post on Monday or Tuesday) | Respond to all required questions or prompts, with posts towards the end of the week 30% of the time (i.e., post on Sunday or Monday), and no posts on Tuesday. | Respond to all required questions or prompts, with posts paced throughout week, at least one post before Saturday noon MST, and no posts on Tuesday. | Respond to all required questions or prompts, with posts paced strategically based on the flow of the conversation, at least one post before Saturday noon MST, and no posts on Tuesday. |  |
| **Quantity of posts** | 1–2 nonsubstantive posts per question/ prompt and with little or no active engagement with peers | 1–2 nonsubstantive posts per question/ prompt or with little or no active engagement with peers | 2–3 substantive posts per question/prompt, with some active engagement with peers | 3–4 substantive posts per question or prompt, with at least 2 that demonstration active engagement with the perspectives of peers | 3–4 substantive posts per question or prompt, with at least 2 that advance critical reflection and co-construction of meaning with peers |  |
| **Length of posts** | More than 1/2 of posts under 200 words or over 300 words (excluding references or links) | More than 1/4 posts under 200 words or over 300 words (excluding references or links) | Most posts 200–300 words (excluding references or links) | All posts 200–300 words (excluding references or links) | All posts 200–300 words (excluding references or links) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Instructor assessment of Extent and Timing of Participation: \_\_\_/30 = \_\_\_/6**

**Instructor comments:**

**Data to Support Self-Assessment (Quantity)**

Please complete the table below to justify your ratings on Extent and Timing of Participation. Include only substantive posts and **bold any posts that were under or over 200–300 words**, unless an exception was granted for that particular class discussion. Complete for only weeks in which there were required class discussions or problem-based learning (PBL) activities. Indicate the number of required class discussions for each week (you can leave this blank for the PBL in Weeks 11 and 12). You are expected to make 3 to 4 substantive posts per question or prompt. Remember the majority of your posts should fall in the green area.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Number of posts** |
| **Week** | **# of required questions** | **Wednesday to Thursday** | **Friday to noon Saturday** | **Noon Saturday to Sunday** | **Monday** | **Tuesday** | **Weekly total** |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Quality Assessment: Transdisciplinary Program Outcomes (14%)**

The assessment criteria for the Transdisciplinary Program Outcomes are specific to this course. The expectations listed under the **Meets Standard** range are in orange, because these are the competencies targeted through the assignment. **Please assess yourself on each row of the rubric below by highlighting the cell that you believe best represents your work.** **You do not need to provide a letter grade; this will be assigned by your instructors based on their review of the video and reflection sheet.** Review the example in the first row, then delete it and replace it your self-assessment. Your instructor will provide their assessment and complete the grade in the final column. **You must also justify this self-assessment through your analysis of specific posts (see pp. 7–11).**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Assessment Criteria | Below StandardF to C+ | Support RequiredB- | Approaches StandardB | Meets StandardB+ to A- | Exceeds StandardA to A+ | Instructor Grade |
|  | 0 to 6.9 | 7.0 to 7.4 | 7.5 to 7.9 | 8.0 to 8.9 | 9.0 to 10.0 |  |
| **A. Active Engagement in Constructive Learning** |
| **Effective communication** | Fail to communicate ideas. | Communicate ideas in a way that is unclear, incoherent, or long-winded. | Communicate ideas with inconsistent clarity and conciseness. | Communicate ideas clearly, succinctly, and effectively to interdisciplinary, specialist, and nonspecialist audiences. | Present ideas professionally, tailored appropriately to the target audience. | / 10 |
| **Positive relationships** | Exhibit poor interpersonal relationships and problem-solving skills. | Make minimal efforts to foster relationships and solution-focused interactions. | Attempt, somewhat successfully, to develop effective relationships and to interact in a positive solution-focused manner. | Develop and maintain effective relationships, and interact in a positive solution-focused manner. | Assume a leadership role in advancing effective relationships and positive, solution-focused interactions. |  |
| **Collaboration** | Devalue, or refuse to engage in, collaboration with clients, peers, colleagues, and systems. | Attempt, with little success, to collaborate respectfully and effectively with clients, peers, colleagues, and systems. | Attempt, with some success, to collaborate respectfully and effectively with clients, peers, colleagues, and systems. | Collaborate respectfully and effectively with clients, peers, colleagues, and systems. | Assume a leadership role in fostering respectful and effective collaboration with clients, peers, colleagues, and systems. | / 10 |
| **Constructivist learning** | Ignore the ideas of peers. | Engage only in cheerleading responses to peers, without integrating their ideas. | Acknowledge the ideas of peers, without actively fostering, or engaging in, co-construction of meaning. | Foster actively creative, purposeful, contextualized, and collaborative constructive learning processes. | Assume a leadership role in engaging peers in creative, purposeful, contextualized, and collaborative constructive learning processes. | / 10 |

Continued on next page.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessment Criteria** | **Unsatisfactory****F to C+** | **Borderline****B-** | **Good****B to B+** | **Excellent****A- to A** | **Outstanding****A+** | **Instructor Grade** |
|  | **0 to 6.9** | **7.0 to 7.4** | **7.5 – 8.4** | **8.5 to 9.4** | **9.5 – 10** |  |
| **B. Critical Engagement with Course Content** |
| **Cognitive complexity** | Express either/or, linear, rigid, or uncritical thinking from a narrow, singular frame of reference. | Demonstrate some movement beyond uncritical thinking and cognitive rigidity. | Demonstrate basic critical thinking skills, and step outside of a singular frame of reference by acknowledging alternative perspectives. | Be tolerant of ambiguity, and foster cognitive complexity to enable you to see beyond your own values, worldview, and sociocultural contexts. | Commit actively to valuing diversity of perspectives, and demonstrate comfort with ambiguity and unanswered questions. | / 10 |
| **Generalization of knowledge** | Ignore relevant knowledge that could be applied to new questions, problems, or contexts. | Attempt, with little success, to apply knowledge to new questions, problems, or contexts. | Apply knowledge to new questions, problems, or contexts. | Analyze critically, apply, and generalize knowledge to new questions, problems, or contexts. | Analyze critically, synthesize, and evaluate the generalization of knowledge to new questions, problems, or contexts. | / 10 |
| **Cultural diversity** | Express views that may result in dignitary harm to persons or peoples from other cultures. | Undervalue the importance of respect for, and responsivity to, cultural diversity. | Acknowledge, but apply inconsistently, respect for, and responsivity to, cultural diversity. | Value, respect, and be responsive to cultural diversity. | Commit to, and advocate for, cultural inclusivity and responsivity. | / 10 |
| **B. Critical Engagement with Course Content** |
| **Cultural responsivity** | Assume that knowledge is culture blind and ignore the limitations of its application across contexts. | Underestimate the culture-bound nature of knowledge and the limitations of its application across contexts. | Acknowledge the culture-bound nature of knowledge and the limitations of its application across contexts. | Assess critically the relevance and cultural responsivity of the application of knowledge within individual, family, community, social, and global contexts. | Evaluate, critique, and adapt knowledge to ensure its relevance and cultural responsivity to individual, family, community, social, and global contexts. | / 10 |
| **Responsive mesolevel change** | Resist engaging in culturally responsive and socially just change processes at the mesolevel. | Attempt, with little success, to engage in culturally responsive and socially just change processes at the mesolevel. | Engage, to some degree, in culturally responsive and socially just change processes at the mesolevel in collaboration with, or on behalf of, clients. | Engage in culturally responsive and socially just change processes at the mesolevel (i.e., schools, organizations, and communities) in collaboration with, or on behalf of, clients. | Articulate an evidenced-based position in support of, and implement effectively and collaboratively, culturally responsive and socially just change at the mesolevel. | / 10 |
| **Responsive macrolevel change** | Resist engaging in culturally responsive and socially just change processes at the macrolevel. | Attempt, with little success, to engage in culturally responsive and socially just change processes at the macrolevel. | Engage, to some degree, in culturally responsive and socially just change processes at the macrolevel on behalf of clients. | Engage in culturally responsive and socially just change processes at the macrolevel (i.e., broad social, economic, and political systems) on behalf of clients. | Articulate an evidenced-based position in support of, and implement effectively, culturally responsive and socially just change processes at the macrolevel. |  |

**Instructor assessment of Program (Transdisciplinary) Outcomes: \_\_\_/100 = \_\_\_/14**

**Instructor comments:**

**Total Class Discussion Grade (Quantity + Quality): \_\_\_\_\_/20 = \_\_\_\_\_%**

**PLEASE BE SURE TO COMPLETE THE NEXT PAGE TO SUPPORT YOUR SELF-ASSESSMENT.**

**Data to Support Self-Assessment (Quality)**

Select 6 posts from at least 3 different weeks (including 2 from weeks 11 or 12) to use in your self-assessment. Apply only the evaluation criteria that fit with category you are addressing: (a) active engagement in constructivist learning, (b) critical engagement with course content, and (c) application to problem-based learning. You do not need to meet all of the evaluation criteria in each post or in each week. However, you must demonstrate each evaluation criteria in the table on pages 4–5 in your overall combination of posts. **You must provide a rationale for how you met the criteria; simply copying your posts here is insufficient, and if you do that, your assignment will be considered incomplete.** You can provide this rationale in any format you choose; however, you must not exceed 100 words (or the equivalent) per sample post (i.e., 600 words maximum). See the Appendix for some examples of how you might present your rationales.

**A. Active Engagement in Constructive Learning**

**Week #:**

**Discussion question/prompt:**

**2 sample posts, word count for each post, and rationale(s) for meeting the assessment criteria:**

**B. Critical Engagement with Course Content**

**Week #:**

**Discussion question/prompt:**

**2 sample posts, word count for each post, and rationale(s) for meeting the assessment criteria:**

**C. Application to Problem-Based Learning**

**Week #:**

**Discussion question/prompt:**

**2 sample posts, word count for each post, and rationale(s) for meeting the assessment criteria:**

**Appendix**

**Options for Self-Analysis of the Quality of Class Discussion Posts**

You are welcome to be creative in how you provide your rationale for the quality of your posts; the samples below are intended to be only examples of different approaches. These are authentic posts made by students in GCAP 633 in previous years. Please note that the specific evaluation criteria may not match the current course, because these have evolved over time. In particular, you are not longer graded on APA format in discussion posts or problem-based learning activities.

**Sample 1: Using the comments function in Word**

**Note:** In your own submissions, you can insert the comments directly into your class discussion submission document. I created a pdf to insert here, because I didn’t want to disrupt this entire document by using the review feature in this example. When using Word, to add a comment, click on the “Review” tab, and then the “New comment” tab.

**Sample post 1:** **Word count 299 + Rationale**

****

**Sample 2: Using a written rationale**

**Note:** This student has used only 100 words even though they refer to two posts. They could have used 200 words here (2 posts x 100 words each), but they were able to concisely note how they have met the criteria.

**Rationale:**

My posts reflect **constructivist learning;** as I engaged with discussion prompts, I invited group engagement and meaning-making by summarizing the group discussion and by presenting a new direction for thought. In both posts, I embedded my personal perspective within socially constructed worldviews (**self-awareness**) involving Indigenous needs and the role and competency of the counsellor. Both posts reflected critical, both/and thinking (**cognitive complexity**), because I raised questions for group discussion about the micro, meso, macrolevel approaches to support Indigenous mental health, the level of competency that can be expected of non-Indigenous counsellors, and the notion of *do no harm* within the context of Indigenous counselling.

**Sample post 1: Word count = 304**

After this week’s readings, I had the sense that regardless of how much self-reflection I do or formal education I receive, I will never reach competency as a counsellor to counsel Indigenous clients. I fear that I would do harm (versus good) as a result of my lack of deep knowledge and appreciation of Indigenous cultures and the influences of historical trauma, despite a desire for it not to be so. I had an opportunity last week to meet an Indigenous social worker, who impressed upon me the need for young clients to embrace the meaning of historical trauma as a part of healing their present. This was certainly a resounding message in this week’s readings. My comments here, then, hinge on the debate as to whether a non-Indigenous counsellor can truly do good and do no harm, and whether they can effectively partner with Indigenous clients to deliver culturally sensitive trauma care. Having said that, I believe that meso and macrolevel changes are most needed. We need to support training of more Indigenous counsellors so they form a larger contingent of culturally sensitive Indigenous counselors. I see that the individual non-Indigenous practitioner role (microlevel) is to respect an Indigenous client by beginning exploration that results in a culturally sensitive referral. In other words, I believe that non-Indigenous and Indigenous counsellors need to partner in the care of Indigenous clients, and it is for this reason that I suggest we need to start with broad systems level changes that grow and support these partnerships.

I am expecting lots of pushback on these ideas, but am trusting in the thoughtfulness and respect of my peers as I float these evolving ideas out to you. There are no easy solutions and all ideas are needed on the table to begin to even approach a reasonable solution.

**Sample post 2: Word count = 302**

It is helpful for me to pull together the musings of our group. Glancing through our responses thus far, and at the risk of being too simplistic, it seems the approaches revolve around two ideas: 1) at the microlevel, there is a need for counsellors who are competent in culturally-sensitive Indigenous counselling; 2) at the meso and macrolevels, we need more Indigenous counsellors. Some have argued it is easier to make changes at the microlevel because the macrolevel requires substantial resourcing. However, training competent counsellors also takes substantial resources. And, perhaps there are drawbacks to a grapeshot approach (i.e., not all of us may encounter Indigenous clients regularly, depending on where we practice, and the competency among counsellors to support Indigenous clients may vary and do harm versus good). This takes us back to the idea of meso and macrolevel changes (i.e., investing resources in an infrastructure of Indigenous “mental health”; I use that term carefully in light of our readings related to strength and resilience and away from pathology), which may include as one strategy, a concerted effort to train and locate Indigenous counsellors in areas of high need with a goal of available, equitable access. Are there ways of thinking outside the box on this? I’m almost at 300 words, so this is a seed idea. The Mental Health Commission has an e-mental health arm and a declared interest in increasing access and availability through e-strategies (including telecounselling). These strategies are cheaper and farther reaching. Could this be appropriate for Indigenous clients if there were no counsellors in their region, especially as a beginning strategy while the volume of in-person resources builds? Could this be a way of extending scarce resources? Or, is this completely inappropriate for Indigenous clients given their depth of distress and the cultural value on relationship?

**Sample 3: Using a written rationale**

**Note:** This student has used about 150 words to refer to two posts. Again, they were able to concisely note how they have met the criteria. An additional 50 words could have been used.

**Rationale:**

These two posts are an example of me respectfully commenting on the perspectives of my peers with the intention of fostering ongoing **constructivist learning processes**. In the second post, I pushed myself to demonstrate leadership in actively and respectfully responding to concerns raised by peers about my position, and then offering additional ideas for consideration. In both posts, I approached the situation professionally, and I integrated resources to substantiate my perspectives and provide an alternative viewpoint when appropriate, thus demonstrating the **generalization of knowledge**. In the second post, in particular, I demonstrated thoughtful consideration of the counter-arguments posed by my peers and assumed a both/and, critical thinking approach that demonstrated **cognitive complexity**. My response was inclusive of their ideas, yet offered other lenses for consideration in looking at this challenging question of inclusion. I also demonstrated **intellectual honesty & scholarly integrity** by citing and referencing sources outside of the course materials.

**Sample post 1: Word count = 289**

Thank you for sharing a perspective that you have encountered in your interactions with others. This is a question that I have also encountered in my conversations. It was interesting to see in the research the level of support and the challenges to your yes . . . but statement.

Some people may have the view that there are no benefits to having children with developmental disabilities within what is perceived by society as *regular classrooms*. Carrington et al. (2016) discussed curriculum modifications, challenges with resources, equipment, and increased responsibilities for teachers working with children with developmental disabilities in an integrated classroom. This sounds like a macro level issue where there is not sufficient government support provided to teachers financially, in addition to providing teacher’s aids within the classroom. Some people may say why bother? I propose that the benefits outweigh the disadvantages. The integration process is relatively new and with proper advocacy and funding in the future, there is an opportunity to make this transition more beneficial for everyone involved.

According to Carrington et al. (2016) some of the benefits of the integrated classrooms were the interpersonal relationships developed with the children’s peers, and teachers, including decreased feelings of *othering* than were usually experienced by the children with developmental disabilities. By creating environments where the self-esteem of children with developmental disabilities is nurtured from a young age, are we not setting them up for success, socially and academically? Kwon, Hong, and Jeon (2017) discussed how children benefit from increased interactions with other children with developmental disabilities by increasing their level of understanding and compassion towards these individuals. In order to have a compassionate society in the future, it is necessary to foster those attitudes in our children today.

Carrington, S., Berthelsen, D., Nickerson, J., Nicholson, J. M., Walker, S., & Meldrum K. (2016). Teacher’s experiences of inclusion of children with developmental disabilities across the early years of school. *Journal of Psychologists and Counsellors in Schools, 26*(2), 139-154. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jgc.2016.19>

Kwon, K., Hong, S., & Jeon, H. (2017). Classroom readiness for successful inclusion: Teacher factors and preschool children’s experience with and attitudes toward peers with disabilities. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education, 31*(3), 360-378. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02568543.2017.1309480>

**Sample post 2: Word count = 293**

L, you mentioned a valid concern about if/when may it be appropriate for children with developmental disabilities (DD) to be in a separate classroom focused on their needs. I believe the benefits of inclusion are substantial. I also agree with the sentiments of some of my peers that some children with DD may express excessive behavioural issues and pose potential safety concerns for the individual, the students in the class, and the teacher. At that point, no one is learning. I believe most children with DD will work extremely well in an inclusive classroom where there are trained support systems to accommodate the needs of *all*of the students, and the teachers; whereas, some students may require a different environment that provides more focused attention to their needs.

Frankel, Hutchinson, Burbidge, and Minnes (2014) mentioned that students perceived children with DD negatively, including expressions of fear, **when** the teacher was not able to manage the behaviour or the situation. These were situations with excessive behavioural issues. Is it possible that in extreme behavioural situations inclusion may produce the opposite result of what is trying to be accomplished? Frankel et al. (2014) also mentioned that these teachers expressed success with inclusion, including adaptable teaching methods, collaboration with other teachers and increased communication for children with DD. It appears that these teachers are in favor of inclusion when the proper support systems are in place; however, there may also be some unique situations when inclusion does not meet the needs of the classroom, and especially the needs of the child with DD.

There may be circumstances when inclusion may be a challenging option, however, that should not circumvent the option for all children with DD who are able to succeed in a *perceived*regular classroom.

Frankel, E. B., Hutchinson, N. L., Burbidge, J., & Minnes, P. (2014). Preservice early childhood educators’ and elementary teachers’ perspectives on including young children with developmental disabilities: A mixed methods analysis. *Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education, 35*(4), 373-391. https://doi.org/10.1080/10901027.2014.968300