Approved by the Faculty Senate on March 26, 2024.

Grading Policy Conditions

Summary:
The VPAA and CTLT will create a working committee to devise a plan that ensures the quality of grading at AUCA focused on student learning, which meets the following conditions:

1) Create a self-grading instrument for each program to identify its individual needs for its faculty to adapt to the new grading policy for the courses of the program.
2) Develop a training plan for each program. Focus on workshop-oriented sessions, where faculty develop or revise grading instruments within their classes and / or syllabus.
3) Create an evaluation system to monitor the implementation of the grading instruments that align with the grading policy.
4) Conduct a series of training sessions for each program faculty by division. (I. **Timeframe**: March - general session for all divisions. II. **Sequence**: two weeks for each program, April-June 2024).

Details:

(1) conducting to each program a <u>separate series of training sessions oriented toward the program specificities</u> toward the grading instruments toward implementation of the policy with assignments <u>faculty shall perform and adopt it toward their courses they teach</u>.

(2) The program f<u>aculty should learn how to adopt grading instruments</u> toward the new grading scale via maybe some fundamental materials on the grading instruments that could be provided beforehand to learn and then use them in a training; perhaps say that faculty will develop at least one grading instrument in the training to demonstrate growing proficiency in adapting to the new grading scale (make it measurable, as the learning will take place over time)

(3) <u>There should be a practical part of the use of grading instruments</u> adopted toward different programs - conducting sessions to check how the grading instruments might work (maybe having experimental tools employed in a class to check); this might include, after faculty have given an assessment with the new tool and used it, a time for the department to meet again and provide peer feedback (for example, from one class, the professor might pull one high work sample, one medium work sample, and one low-level work sample along with the grading instrument for peers to review. Review might include using the tool to grade the work themselves, analyzing the professor's feedback and or grading decisions and making suggestions, etc.

(4) to develop a training curriculum with a number of hours to perform certain activities who has a great experience in this sense to approve with Chynara Sheisheevna and maybe have some specialists to help us develop it as well. Consider checkpoints throughout the process--trainings / checklist to do before implementation of the grading policy in a new course / semester; trainings / checklist to do mid-semester; trainings / checklist of what to do after the semester, to reflect on practice and make revisions for the next semester.

(5) <u>As a result, faculty can develop their syllabi to incorporate the grading instruments</u> that could help to have such a scale to be effective.