This week, I began my school week by assessing the written assignments of my peers from last week. I found that although I was following the rubric for assessment carefully, my grading of their work was less positive than I would have liked. I felt that their answers were adequate and substantive, but the specific criteria on which I needed to grade the assignments left me with no choice but to dock points for not having the required length or for not including research citations. Two of the 3 students had 1 of their three responses be shorter than required, but the other two responses being longer. Had the rubric simply asked was the overall length met, they would have gotten full points. That the rubric broke each essay down individually seemed unfair to me. Even though I have taken many courses at UoPeople, I still find the peer-assessment portion of the coursework very painful. I want my fellow mates to be successful and wish that I could grade them based on criteria I find relevant to the questions.

After assessing the written assignments, I did the readings and drafted my discussion post. Although I paraphrased well and wrote a complete answer, I cannot say I was particularly proud of my discussion post. I felt I was simply regurgitating what was in the readings. Sure, I could have added information from outside research, but this would have diluted the response and perhaps taken it off track. I think I sacrificed some creativity in order to stay on point. Let’s just say it is not my best work, and I prefer prompts that are not directly answered by the readings so that outside research is encouraged.

With regard to the material from the discussion post itself, I am not at all surprised that the Waterfall method is not practical as it is described. I don’t think I have ever planned anything that has gone exactly according to plan, unless the plan was vague enough. And perhaps that is what the waterfall method needs to be more effective. Sticking to a plan is more likely to happen if the plan is not fully detailed at the outset.

After posting my discussion post, I took the self quiz to assess my understanding of the readings. This did not go well at all. I found two questions in particular confusing even after seeing the correct answer. They seems to me to be asking exactly the same thing, but had slightly different answers to choose from. I had assumed the questions were supposed to have the same answer, but it turns out that the answers were indeed supposed to be different. It took some time before it dawned on me how this could be. I obviously didn’t understand the point of the questions fully. As for other questions I got incorrect, I looked over the material again to see where the answers were. I simply could not find the material. I have a feeling I missed or misunderstood some material that I should have covered this week.

Later in the week, I read over the responses that students had for my discussion post. I was surprised to see so many students’ responses. The one that caught my attention compared the waterfall method to having to use a locksmith to get back into one’s home. I found the scenario quite amusing.

Lastly, two professor interactions surprised me this week. First, was the comment on my previous learning journal which stated the length of my journal was not adequate. I found this a bit odd as I had exceeded the minimum required length. The second was a message regarding my discussion post. The questions in that message were already answered by my initial discussion post. I had wondered if perhaps the message had been meant for a different student or if there was a form message that was sent all students with the same question to drive home several points about the waterfall method. Later, however, another such longer message leads me to believe that the instructor is simply being very involved. That is a nice change.
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