

JCS High School Shared Grading Policy and Practices (Final, 2-25-2020)

Common Beliefs

As a district, we hold these common beliefs around grading practices:

1. Grades and grading practices should provide meaningful feedback to students, document their progress, and help teachers make decisions about what instruction a student needs next.
2. Grades should have a multi-dimensional focus that measure and report both academic and non-academic, with an emphasis on student mastery of standards.
3. A system must be in place across all schools so that grading practices are consistent and fairly assess the student's mastery.
4. Grading should allow for students that learn at different rates to still be successful.
5. What is graded must be taught.

Graded Academic and Non-academic Factors

There are two broad categories for which we assign grades: academic factors, which relate directly to student mastery of standards and skills taught, and non-academic factors, which relate to the academic enablers, or the student behaviors that allow them to be involved in and benefit from education. The chart below shows the academic and non-academic factors that are graded in Jessamine County high schools:

Graded Academic Factors	Possible Examples
Summative assessment of academic and occupational content (CTE) standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Unit tests ● Summative projects - academic and occupational content components ● Summative performance tasks/CTE skills assessments
Formal formative assessments (provides recordable information for each student; graded for accuracy)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Quizzes ● Formative projects - academic and occupational content components ● Formative performance tasks/CTE skills assessments
Graded Non-Academic Factors:	Mastery Descriptors (see non-academic factors rubric)
Collaboration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Usually listens to, shares with, and supports the efforts of others; sometimes steps into leadership roles.

Participation (Academic Perseverance)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Usually focuses on in-class work and what needs to be done. Mostly self-directed.
Responsibility*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completes most assignment(s).

*Homework and NTI work completion will fall in this category.

Frequency of Grading

Teachers will update grades each week with at least one grade, academic or non-academic.

For each 9-week window, each weighted category should have multiple grade entries except for the Cumulative Assessments category, which may only have one grade entry per 9 weeks.

Weighting of Grades

All high school grade books shall be set up with the following categories and weighting system:

<u>Category:</u>	<u>Weight:</u>
Summative	70%
Classwork (Formal Formative)	10%
Non-Academic	10%
Cumulative Assessments (i.e., mid-terms, finals, benchmarks)	10%

Dual Credit grades will be assigned and weighted based on the policy of the awarding post-secondary institution, not on the cooperating high school.

Grading Scale

Jessamine County high schools use a five-point scale for communicating student performance on both academic and non-academic measures. To promote accuracy of grading and communication, teachers can award .5 between each of the points to show high level work within a specific category. Mastery, as defined by Jessamine County teacher leadership, is when a student can consistently and independently (with IEP/PSP/504 accommodations as needed) demonstrate complete understanding of the entire standard or skill, while proficiency denotes the point at which a student can demonstrate understanding of the standard or skill most of the time, but may not yet be consistent. This scale shall be used to grade all academic factors and to determine final grades.

5	A	Exceeding mastery/Exceptional
4.5	A	
4	A	Mastery
3.5	B	
3	B	Meets expectations/Proficiency
2.5	C	
2	C	Approaching expectations/Developing
1.5	D	
1	F	Below expectations/Limited demonstration of knowledge/skills
0.5	F	
0	F	No evidence of knowledge/skills

Final grades should be calculated as follows:

A: 4-5

B: 3-3.99

C: 2-2.99

D: 1.5-1.99

F: 1.499 and below

Non-academic factors are graded with the following rubric:

Factor	5 Exceeds Mastery	4 Mastery	3 Proficiency	2 Developing	1 Below Expectations	0 No Evidence
Collaboration	Consistently listens to, shares with, and supports the efforts of others; exhibits leadership.	Usually listens to, shares with, and supports the efforts of others; sometimes steps into leadership roles.	Often listens to, shares with, and supports the efforts of others; good team member.	Often listens to, shares with, and supports the efforts of others; sometimes is not a good team member.	Rarely listens to, shares with, and supports the efforts of others; often is not a good team member.	No evidence of listening to, sharing with, or supporting the efforts of others; no evidence of attempt to be a good team member.
Participation (Academic Perseverance)	Consistently stays focused on in-class work and what needs to be done. Very self-directed.**	Usually focuses on in-class work and what needs to be done. Mostly self-directed.**	Focuses on in-class work and what needs to be done most of the time with few reminders or redirects.**	Focuses on the task and what needs to be done some of the time. Often must be reminded by the teacher about staying on task.**	Rarely focuses on class work and does not complete in-class assignment(s) in a timely manner.**	No evidence of focus on classwork and/or no evidence of work completion.**
Responsibility	Completes all assignment(s)*	Completes most assignment(s)*	Completes some assignment(s), but has some gaps that do not interfere substantially with communication of student work.*	Completes some assignment(s), but has gaps that interfere with communication of student work.*	Does not complete the majority of assignment(s) OR rarely completes assignments.*	No assignment(s) completed.*

**For students with an 504 or IEP with prompting and cueing, the rubric would include students getting these prompts and cues for the rubric descriptors to be valid.

*For students with 504 or IEP, assignment timeline modifications apply.

Retake Procedures

Providing students with opportunities to retake assessments and redo activities is sound educational practice that is in the best interest of our students. We recognize that all students learn at different rates and should be granted opportunities to correct mistakes and demonstrate their learning.

Retake Guidelines	Rationale and Clarifications
Only summative assessments are eligible for retakes. Cumulative assessments (i.e., end-of-term, finals, benchmarks) are not eligible for retakes.	<p>Summative assessments typically happen at the end of a unit and measure a student's independent mastery of the course standard(s) for that unit.</p> <p>The objective of cumulative exams is to promote and measure retention of course content over time and do not lend themselves to a retake.</p>
Long term summative assignments that have segmented multiple due dates, such as research papers, are only eligible for a retake if the student has completed the formal formatives related to the summative (i.e., outline, rough draft, peer review). For this type of assignment, the eligibility for retake must be communicated in writing when the assignment is given.	It is not feasible for students to complete and receive feedback on formal formatives for a long term project within the 10 school-day retake window.
All students attempting a retake must complete the JCS Remediation and Retake Contract with the teacher. The student should initiate the request for the contract.	The contract makes clear to everyone what the expectations are for the retake so there is no confusion.
At a minimum, students must complete formal formatives assigned by the teacher to be eligible for a retake; additional remediation and reteaching activities may be required and assigned by the teacher on an individual basis. These should be outlined in the remediation and retake contract.	<p>Formal formatives are assignments or interim assessments given throughout a unit of study that provide recordable information regarding each student's individual progress toward mastery of the standard and are graded for accuracy. Examples of these include, but are not limited to, quizzes, checks for understanding, formative projects and performance tasks, interim CTE skills assessments, and independent classwork.</p> <p>Formative practice and feedback is necessary in order to successfully master content prior to a summative test. Therefore, this requires students to complete this formative practice to emphasize the importance of these tasks as a part of preparing for</p>

	a summative assessment.
Students should not be denied the opportunity for a retake for disciplinary reasons. Students who abuse the retake policy may be referred to administration for a conference and possible disciplinary interventions.	Behavior and academic performance should be considered separately. If the purpose of the summative grade is to measure and communicate the student's knowledge of the standard(s), then behavior penalties would distort or mask the student's actual performance level. It is expected that behavioral issues will be dealt with through disciplinary interventions and through the non-academic grading factors.
Students have 10 school days from the day a test is returned to complete the work outlined in the remediation contract once the initial summative assessment or retake assessment is returned to the student.	Often, course content scaffolds and builds on prior learning over time, so this guideline is in place to prevent students from falling behind in their learning. This guideline provides students ample time to complete reteaching and remediation activities to prepare for the retake.
Assessments are generally broken into sections around the standards being assessed. Students may not need to retake an entire assessment. Students will complete the sections of the assessment in which they did not achieve proficiency or wish to improve.	It is not necessary for students to demonstrate skills and content knowledge that they have previously attained on the original assignment.
Retake assessments should always assess the same skills and standards as on the original assessment, but they may take a different format.	Administering the exact same test to a student within a short window of time could potentially lead to inflated grades simply because of familiarity with the format, not the content. To guard against this, a teacher may choose to utilize a different format for the retake test.
Upon completion of the retake, the highest grade for each standard assessed will be entered in IC.	Learning is an on-going process. Students learn at different rates and do not always perform at expected levels on their first attempt, in a set time, or on one method of assessment. If the purpose of the summative grade is to measure and communicate the student's knowledge of the standard(s), then grade penalties would distort or mask the student's actual performance level.

Transfer Grades

Transfer Grade Conversion			
Grade from Sending School	Grade Assigned in Jessamine County	Grade from Sending School	Grade Assigned in Jessamine County
100	5.0	72	1.85
99	4.9	71	1.80
98	4.8	70	1.75
97	4.7	69	1.70
96	4.6	68	1.65
95	4.5	67	1.60
94	4.3	66	1.55
93	4.1	65	1.50
92	4.0	64	1.45
91	3.9	63	1.40
90	3.8	62	1.35
89	3.7	61	1.30
88	3.6	60	1.25
87	3.5	59	1.20
86	3.3	58	1.15
85	3.2	57	1.10
84	3.1	56	1.05
83	3.0	55	1.0
82	2.9	50	0.9
81	2.8	45	0.8
80	2.7	40	0.7
79	2.6	35	0.6
78	2.5	30	0.5
77	2.3	25	0.4
76	2.2	20	0.3
75	2.1	15	0.2
74	2.0	10	0.1
73	1.9	0	0

References

Brookhart, S. M., Guskey, T. R., Bowers, A. J., McMillan, J. H., Smith, J. K., Smith, L. F., Stevens, M. T., & Welsh, M. E. (2016). A century of grading research: Meaning and value in the most common educational measure. *Review of Educational Research*, 86(4), 803-848. doi: 10.3102/0034654316672069

Feldman, J. (2018, October). *School grading policies are failing children: A call to action for equitable grading*. Crescendo Education Group.
<https://crescendoedgroup.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/Call-to-Action-for-Equitable-Grading-Oct-2018.pdf>

- Hanover Research. (2016, April). *Best practices for equity in grading*. Hanover Research. <http://www.gssaweb.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/Best-Practices-for-Equity-in-Grading.pdf>
- Johnston, H. (2011, December). *Research into practice: Best practices in grading*. Education Partnerships, Inc. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED538743>.
- Munoz, M. A., & Guskey, T. R. (2015, April). Standards-based grading and reporting will improve education. *Kappan*, 96(7), 64-68.
- O'Connor, K. (2018). *How to grade for learning: Linking grades to standards*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin, a SAGE Company.
- Timmons, B. A. (2017). *Challenging standard grading practices: A qualitative action research study*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/etd/4087>
- Townsley, M. & Buckmiller, T. (2016, January). What does the research say about standards-based grading: A research primer. *Faculty Publications*, 3. https://scholarworks.uni.edu/elpe_facpub/3
- Wormelli, R. (2011, November). Redos and Retakes Done Right. *Educational Leadership*, 169(3), 22-26.

Secondary Grading Committee, served 2019-2020

Adams, Denise, Board Member
Blanton, Maggie, WJHS Teacher
Brown, Jen, WJHS Teacher
Campbell, Hannah, Director of Secondary Schools
Gallutia, Val, Deputy Superintendent
Hack, Christi, JCTC Curriculum Resource Administrator
Hawboldt, Chris, EJHS Principal
Helton, Kelly, EJHS Curriculum Resource Administrator
Imel, Jennifer, EJHS Teacher
Jackson, Curt, JCTC Teacher
Jones, Matilyn, WJHS Student
Knight, Dexter, JCTC Principal

Landon, Katie, WJHS Teacher
Lowe, Adam, JCTC Teacher
McCarty, Megan, Assistant Director of Special Education
Moore, Matt, Superintendent
Mulcahy, Lindsey, EJHS Counselor
Peterson, Carrie, EJHS Parent
Reynolds, Dr. Michele, Assistant Superintendent/Chief Academic Officer
Riel, Dr. David, Post Secondary Representative, Asbury College
Simpson, Melinda, JCTC Teacher
Slone, Marie, EJHS Student
Smith, Marci, WJHS Curriculum Resource Administrator
Sowers, Eric, TPS Principal
Stewart, Chloe, EJHS Teacher
Thornton, Brady, WJHS principal
Tussey, Kathy, WJHS Parent
Yeary, Justin, TPS Curriculum Resource Administrator