

---

## Evaluating the Assessment Rubrics of an English Course

Rama Dwika Herdiawan  
S1 English Language Education  
Majalengka University, West Java  
E-mail: [rama\\_dwika@yahoo.co.id](mailto:rama_dwika@yahoo.co.id)

Received: 20 July 2017. Revised: 25 August 2017. Accepted: 20 September 2017

---

### Abstract

Evaluation needs to be conducted regularly in order to assist the institution enhance its own performance management. Thus, this study is focused on evaluating the assessment of questionnaire rubrics used by National English Course (NEC) based on the evaluation rubrics proposed by Marshall (2014) which were concerned with the four-rating scales and the six domains covering the whole aspects of lecturers' performances. They are planning and preparation for Learning, classroom management, delivery of Instruction, monitoring, Assessment, and follow-up, and professional responsibilities. The data gained from the lecturers' interview revealed that the NEC lecturers used some domains which contained aspects of lecturer's performance but not all aspects used in reality. Basically, they had considered the five domains of the rubric. However, few aspects were used in each domain, for example: in domain of planning and preparation; they only used aspects of knowledge, lessons, and also engagement. It needs further revision dealing with the assessment or evaluation on teacher's performance, materials, and so on. Meanwhile, the data gained from document observation revealed that the content of questionnaire did not cover all the aspects for the whole domains. It only covers some domains such as planning and preparation for Learning, and classroom management. This study indicated that providing the relevant aspects as well as the rating scale in the questionnaire is needed to be used in terms of teacher's evaluation rubric.

**Keywords:** assessment rubrics, questionnaire

How to Cite: Rama Dwika Herdiawan. 2017. Evaluating the Assessment Rubrics of an English Course. *Language Circle: Journal of Language and Literature*, 12(1), 75—82.

---

### Introduction

Assessing a course needs to be conducted annually in order to not only help the institution enhance its effectiveness in running it but also the students assess their own progresses during the instructional process, it is also defined as “a systematic process for gathering data about students'

achievement,” is an essential component of teaching (Dhindsa, Omar, & Waldrip, 2007:1261). Thus, there must be the related integration among the parties in the institution, and also approaches to the assessment itself. It is also mentioned by Robert, M. D (2008) that in the design process you should have stated all major

instructional outcomes for your course and for each instructional unit within it. You can now begin work simultaneously in two areas: the selection and design of the evaluation procedures and instruments that are necessary, and the design and production of the instructional units themselves. In addition, Brookhart (1997) states that classroom assessment is important because it has a strong impact on learning. The way an instructor approaches assessment influences the way students perceive the class, the material for study, and their own work. It is also supported by Doyle (1983) that assessment practices influence students by directing their attention to particular aspects of course content and by specifying ways of processing information. It is clear that what we need to consider is creating the main instructional outcomes which are relevant with the course unit as well as integrating the selection and design of the evaluation procedures and instruments which are also necessary to be done based on the overall effectiveness of the instruction. Therefore, this study is focused on evaluating the assessment rubric especially the questionnaire which is given to the students for the sake of evaluating the teachers' performances, the materials, and the classroom management strategies. It is aimed to assess the National English Course (NEC) in providing the assessment rubric which reflects the instructional aspects. National English Course is an informal institution which conduct a course to enhance the students' English proficiency in terms of English for specific purposes, and it focuses on having the corporation with the nursing and midwifery colleges.

In line with this, some findings revealed that the assessment conducted by

National English course seemed to be irrelevant with the instructional goals and also outcomes such as the content of the questionnaire did not state the whole points related to the instructional process, and also did not represent the design of evaluation procedures and instruments. Not only that, there was not any exact instrument that used to measure the students' performances. As we know, the success of a course is mostly determined by the performances of the students. This one is considered to be the key point in terms of assessment or evaluation procedures. Regarding the related problems mentioned, this study is carried out to redesign the form of the questionnaire which represents the whole aspects of instructional process, the appropriate numerical and alphabetical labeling system, and procedures of using it as the assessment rubric. The format and mechanism of the questionnaire are designed to provide the accurate feedback in revising the weaknesses related to the services of the English course. The questionnaire format is adopted by Marshall (2014), as he mentions that the rubrics have six domains covering all aspects of a teacher's job performance: planning and preparation for Learning, classroom management, delivery of Instruction, monitoring, Assessment, and follow-up, family and community outreach, and professional responsibilities. Meanwhile, the rubrics use a four-level rating scale: (4) *highly effective* means master teacher performance that meets very demanding criteria, (3) *effective* means solid, expected professional performance; teachers should feel good about scoring at this level, (2) *improvement Necessary* means performance is mediocre; no teacher should be content to remain at this level, (1) *does not meet standards* means unacceptable performance

leading to an improvement plan, intensive support and, if improvement isn't made within a reasonable amount of time, dismissal. In terms of the rubrics, the study is focused on five domains on the aspects of a teacher's job performance including planning and preparation for Learning, classroom management, delivery of Instruction, monitoring, Assessment, and follow-up, and professional responsibilities. And also applies the four-level rating scale.

Regarding the statements mentioned above, there must be an integrated evaluation or assessment in order to increase the students' performances as well as embody the teaching success. The reason why the researcher is eager to conduct the research which is focused on evaluating or assessing the whole elements in line with the instructional process as well as the instruments used in terms of assessing a course are first, this study is considered to be the new breakthrough in line with assessing the questionnaire as the assessment rubric. Second, this can be the assessment guidance which is concerned with evaluating the instructional aspects. This research is aimed to evaluate and design the content of questionnaire used in ESP class. It is also conducted to answer the following research questions: what is the appropriate content of questionnaire used to evaluate the instructional process National English Course?

### **Methodology**

The study deals with descriptive qualitative method which focuses on gathering the data in words rather than numbers. As stated by Merriam, B. (2009) also states "it is a descriptive study because words are used in order to express what the researcher learned

about the phenomenon, besides it is likely to have descriptions of the context and the participants". In addition, According to Wallace (1998) "qualitative is used to describe data which are not amenable to being counted or measured in an objective way, and therefore subjective". This study is closely related to document analysis as the design. Therefore, it focuses on evaluating the assessment rubrics of the questionnaire. The source of data is taken from the questionnaire used by National English Course which is concerned with evaluating the lecturers' performances during instructional process. In collecting the data, the researcher interviews the lecturer who is in charge of teaching the material as well as observes the format of the questionnaire in order to find out the strengths and weaknesses of it. Regarding the interview, there are ten related questions which are concerned with the assessment rubrics used in the questionnaire. It is also a part of surveys in line with this study because there are interviews which involve not only the lecturers but also the course coordinator in order to obtain the data which were relevant to design the rubric. In terms of analyzing the data, the researcher transcribe the interview script in order that the data are interpreted based on the questions given. After finding out the weaknesses related to the content of questionnaire, the next step is interpreting it with the whole findings found during the observation.

### **Results and Discussion**

Document observation and also lecturer's interview are employed to describe the content as well as form of the questionnaire used in National English Course. The evaluation rubrics are adopted from Marshall (2014). Thus, the study emphasizes on

describing the findings based on the six domains covering the whole aspects of lecturers' performances. They are planning and preparation for Learning, classroom management, delivery of Instruction, monitoring, Assessment, and follow-up, and professional responsibilities. Besides this, the evaluation is concerned with the four-rating scale also proposed by Marshall (2014). The content of the questionnaire used in National English Course are as follows.

#### ***Planning and preparation for learning.***

Based on the data gained from the lecturers' interview, it revealed that every lecturer made sure the condition of class before teaching the students, and also prepared the materials which were in the form of handout containing the related ones based on the students' necessities in line with nursery and midwifery content. The lecturers also designed the lesson or materials which were focused on achievable outcome related to the goals. Regarding the previous statement, it is clear that the lecturers created the lessons which were appropriate with the teaching goals. Furthermore, they also designed the motivating lesson which is likely to engage most students. In this case, the lecturers always motivated the students to study better, engage the students in the whole activities. Not only that, the lecturers were competent in teaching English for specific purposes because they were trained for ten days before they were ready to teach the students the materials. Regarding the document observation, there were only three aspects that covered the teachers' performances based on Marshall's rubrics, they were knowledge, lessons, and also engagement found. As stated by Marshall (2014), at least there must be ten aspects on the lecturer's evaluation rubric:

knowledge, standards, units, assessments, anticipation, lessons, engagement, materials, differentiation, and environment. Thus, the questionnaire only covers three aspects which are concerned with knowledge of the lecturer, the lessons, and also engagement. That's why the questionnaire needs to be redesigned by adding the related rubric points proposed by Marshall (2014).

#### ***Classroom managements***

In line with the classroom managements, the lecturers managed the class by making the seating arrangement in a group discussion, encouraging the students discipline and to be responsible for their own actions, and showing their caring, respect, and fairness for all students to build strong relationships. At least the lecturers were aware of the importance of employing good classroom management, for example: they embodied the importance of being discipline by coming to the class in time, they gave the feedback for the materials explained as well as the exercises given, and also they urged the students to provide the reasons when answering the questions (obtained from the lecturers' interview). Based on the document observation, it revealed that the questionnaire provided the aspects of responsibility, and also relationship. Point 9 and 2 from the questionnaire represents the aspects of responsibility and relationship. It is also supported by Marshall (2014) that evaluating classroom managements require at least ten aspects such as expectations, relationship, respect, social emotional, routines, responsibility, repertoire, efficiency, prevention, and incentives. Therefore, the questionnaire made by National English Course is necessary to be developed by using the aspects mentioned in order to obtain the

exact feedback for the students and also the institution.

### ***Delivery of Instructions***

In this point, the data are found based on the interview and document observation. The data are closely related to the way the lecturers teach the students. Based on the lecturers' interview, it revealed that the lecturers employed a clear explanation while teaching the materials, and they also asked the students to think actively during the discussion as well as explore their ideas in it, in addition, they summed up the materials taught at the end of the activity. Those represent how the lecturers provide the instructions to the students in order to make them fully understand it. Meanwhile, the data gained from the document observation revealed that the questionnaire contained aspects of clarity (mentioned in point 4), engagement (mentioned in point 6, 7, and 8). Thus, the questionnaire has attached two aspects in line with teacher's evaluation rubric. however, it should be expanded in terms of the content in order that it is very essential to evaluate the overall aspects of teachers' performances.

### ***Monitoring, Assessment, and Follow-up***

Regarding the domain of the rubric, it was found that the lecturers were responsible for the students' misconception toward the material given by giving some extra lessons outside the instructional process (it belongs to "tenacity", Marshall, 2014). They also provided the assessment related to the students' learning outcomes, concluded what they analyzed, and shared it to the coordinator (it belongs to "analysis", Marshall, 2014). Based on the document observation, the questionnaire did not provide the aspects mentioned by the lecturers from the interview.

Therefore, there are a number of plans in the study which is concerned with evaluating and also redesigning the questionnaire rubrics. In this point, the questionnaire should also describe the important aspects proposed by Marshall (2014) such as criteria, diagnosis, on-the-spot, self-assessment, recognition, interims, tenacity, support, analysis, and reflection. A good questionnaire needs to cover the whole aspects to achieve the goal of embodying an exact evaluation in line with the instructional process.

### ***Professional Responsibilities***

In this domain, there is an illustration regarding the data obtained from interview and also document observation. This one is also related to the second domain (classroom managements). From the interview, it is mentioned that most lecturers were categorized as the professional because they attended the class without permission or absence (aspect of attendance proposed by Marshall, 2014). On the other hand, they had near-perfect attendances. In addition, they also maintained the relationships with the other colleagues in terms of planning the units, sharing teaching ideas, and also revising the students' works (aspect of collaboration proposed by Marshall, 2014). From the document observation, there was no aspect used in the questionnaire as proposed by Marshall (2014). Those aspects are also crucial to be used in the teacher's evaluation rubric because it can be the reflection of the teacher's activities during the teaching and learning process.

### ***A Four-Level Rating Scale of Rubric***

Regarding this part, it was found from the document observation that the questionnaire did not use a level rating scale within the

categories such as highly effective, effective, improvement necessary, does not meet the standards. It only provided the scores for each point without the exact categories. This can lead to the students' misunderstanding to fill in the questionnaire properly. As stated by Marshall (2014) that there are four-level rating scales of a rubric in terms of teacher's evaluation rubric, they are *highly effective* with score (4) means master teacher performance that meets very demanding criteria, *effective* with score (3) means solid, expected professional performance; teachers should feel good about scoring at this level, *improvement Necessary* with the score (2) means performance is mediocre; no teacher should be content to remain at this level, *does not meet standards* with the score (1) means unacceptable performance leading to an improvement plan, intensive support and, if improvement isn't made within a reasonable amount of time, dismissal. Based on the rating scale of a rubric above, it is very important to provide the clear category as well as scoring in line with the questionnaire given to the students.

In line with the statements above, the appropriate content of questionnaire should cover at least 5 evaluation components as well as the four-rating scale that can be applied to assess the lecturers' performances properly. In addition, the institution should pay attention at creating the assessment rubrics which are relevant with the goals as well as instructional process. The strengths of NEC questionnaire are considering the instructional aspects such as the students' needs, lecturers' feedback, and teaching media. In addition, the assessment is held twice a year to obtain the

exact data which reflect the lecturers' performances. Meanwhile, the weaknesses are related to the content of the questionnaire as the assessment rubric which still has lack of instructional components and also the format needs to be developed by adding the four-rating scale proposed by Marshall (2014) such highly effective, effective, improvement necessary, and does not meet standards.

### **Conclusion**

This study indicated that providing the relevant aspects as well as the rating scale in the questionnaire is needed to be used in terms of teacher's evaluation rubric. The data gained from the lecturers' interview revealed that the NEC lecturers already used some domains which contained aspects of lecturer's performance but not all aspects used in reality. Basically, they had considered the domains of the rubric such as planning and preparation for Learning, classroom management, delivery of Instruction, monitoring, Assessment, and follow-up, and professional responsibilities. However, few aspects were used in each domain for example in domain of planning and preparation; they only used aspects of knowledge, lessons, and also engagement. It needs further revision dealing with the assessment or evaluation on teacher's performance, materials, and curriculum. Meanwhile, the data gained from document observation revealed that the content of questionnaire did cover all the aspects for the whole domains, moreover, it only covers three domains such as planning and preparation for Learning, classroom management, delivery of Instruction.



10   9   8   7   6                    5   4   3   2   1

6.    The teachers always use the instructional media :

10   9   8   7   6                    5   4   3   2   1

7.    The teachers motivate the students a lot:

10   9   8   7   6                    5   4   3   2   1

8.    The teachers always encourage the students to speak English a lot :

10   9   8   7   6                    5   4   3   2   1

9.    The teachers always come in time :

10   9   8   7   6                    5   4   3   2   1

10.   The teachers always dress up well :

10   9   8   7   6                    5   4   3   2   1

General opinion:

1)    The English class is generally :

a)    excellent            b) good            c) does not meet the standard

2)    The teachers are generally :

a)    excellent            b) good            c) does not meet the standard

3)    in terms of the institution improvement, write out your suggestions regarding our services:

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....