

WCHS, CPMS, CPI  
Assessment and Grading Policy

This policy is established to accurately and effectively turn grading into assessment-based practice that clearly shows student retention and knowledge. The grade makeup should eliminate barriers to accurate assessment of retention through non-indicators for success that are based on participation and over-emphasis of homework which is nothing more than practice. “A grade represents a valid and undiluted indicator of what a student *knows and is able to do – mastery.*” (Rick Wormeli)

**Overall grade makeup** as deemed appropriate by discipline:

- Not less than 90% Assessments: projects, quizzes, tests, writing, labs
- Not more than 10% Practice: homework, classroom activities, participation

**Scales:**

- WCHS and CPMS 4.0 scale
- K-6 12.0 scale
- Use the current grading scale that begins with a 64% failure for an F.

**Re-Assessment/Re-Do:**

- Teachers are expected to evaluate student learning by using a pre-assessment, teach, assessment, re-teaching, re-assessment model used as applicable by each discipline.
- Each discipline is expected to implement the same re-do practice as determined by mastery at the teacher discretion.
- The re-assessment must be preceded by a student to teacher intervention and offered at the discretion of the teacher.
- It must be within a reasonable time, students must have been given a sincere effort throughout the lesson or unit, and teachers reserve the right to use an alternative format for the re-do assignment.
- The student’s grade will reflect the highest of the grades for re-assessments as completed.

**Sources:**

“While high grades provide a small amount of motivation for some students, low grades do not motivate students to do better. In fact they usually lead to withdrawal.” (Rick Wormeli)

“In order for a grade to be a valid mechanism for feedback and instructional planning, we cannot let the number of attempts to learn concepts and skills significantly influence the grade as an accurate indicator of mastery.” (Rick Wormeli)

“When we turn students’ zeroes into sixties in our gradebooks, we . . . are adjusting the grade intervals so that . . . the pattern of grades is a valid indicator of mastery. . . . If a student gets a zero, it is a 60-point range for an F. . . . A failure is a failure, no matter the degree.” (Rick Wormeli)

“Grades as motivators breed dependence, reduce risk-taking, creativity, and value.” (Rick Stiggins)

“Taking the temperature more often doesn’t cure the patient.” (Rick Stiggins)

“Checking is diagnostic, teacher is an advocate. Grading is evaluative, teacher is a judge.” (Dr. Tom Guskey)

“There is not value to grading on a curve.” (Dr. Tom Guskey)

“A teacher’s professional judgment via clear descriptors on a rubric actually increases the accuracy of a student’s grade as an indicator of what he/she learned over strict numerical calculation of problems correct.” (Robert Marzano)

“If a student gets a zero, it is a 60-point range for an F. This is . . . not mathematically defensive.” (Doug Reeves)

“Healthy attitude for a teacher: Any grade below a C is always temporary.” (Doug Reeves)

“Are we interested more in holding students accountable or making sure they learn? Some accountability measures become ‘learn or I will hurt you’ measures.” (Nancy Doda/Rick Wormeli)

Revised September 8, 2008