The Case for Standardization

IMSA Educational Review Team

Proponents of standardization argue that a uniform grading system across departments ensures fairness and comparability. According to Cross & Frary (1999), standardization can mitigate the discrepancies in grading standards and expectations between different departments. This approach aims to ensure that an 'A' in one subject signifies a similar level of achievement as an 'A' in another, facilitating a more equitable assessment of student performance.

However, the standardization of grading faces challenges due to the inherent subjectivity and discipline-specific criteria that characterize different fields of study. As highlighted by Sadler (2009), assessment in subjects like English and foreign languages often involves subjective evaluation of skills such as writing and oral proficiency, contrasting with the more objective, right-or-wrong nature of many science and math assessments. This diversity in assessment types raises questions about the feasibility and appropriateness of a one-size-fits-all grading system.

The impact of standardization on learning and teaching methodologies is another critical aspect to consider. Research by Rust, O'Donovan, & Price (2005) suggests that standardized grading can influence teaching styles, potentially leading to a more homogenized educational experience. This could limit the flexibility teachers have in tailoring their teaching methods to the unique demands of their discipline and the needs of their students.

One of the arguments in favor of standardization is its potential to address grade inflation. A study by Rosovsky & Hartley (2002) pointed out that grade inflation, where higher grades are

awarded more frequently, is a concern across many institutions. Standardizing grading could provide a framework to moderate grading practices, ensuring consistency and maintaining academic standards across departments.

To bridge the gap between standardization and the need for discipline-specific assessment, some educators advocate for the use of detailed rubrics and clear assessment criteria. Jonsson & Svingby (2007) emphasize the role of rubrics in providing transparency in grading, which can be tailored to meet the specific requirements of different disciplines while maintaining a level of standardization.

Standardization also intersects with concerns about equity and diversity. As noted by Young & Young (2019), standardizing grading practices could potentially reduce biases and inconsistencies that may disadvantage certain groups of students. However, it is also crucial to consider whether standardized systems adequately accommodate the diverse learning styles and backgrounds of students.

The practical challenges of implementing a standardized grading system across departments cannot be overlooked. As observed by Guskey (2011), aligning grading practices requires significant coordination and collaboration among faculty, as well as ongoing professional development to address the nuances of different disciplines.

In conclusion, while the standardization of grading systems across various academic departments offers potential benefits in terms of fairness and comparability, it also presents significant

challenges related to subjectivity, teaching methodologies, and the unique characteristics of different disciplines. The use of rubrics and clear assessment criteria may offer a viable middle ground, allowing for some degree of standardization while respecting the distinct nature of each academic field. As educational institutions continue to grapple with these complex issues, it is imperative to strike a balance that upholds academic standards, promotes equitable assessment, and recognizes the diverse needs and talents of students. The dialogue on standardizing grading practices is a critical one, reflecting broader questions about the goals and values of education in a diverse and rapidly changing world.

References

Cross, L. H., & Frary, R. B. (1999). Hodgepodge grading: Endorsed by students and teachers

    alike. *Applied measurement in Education, 12*(1), 53-72.

Guskey, T. R. (2011). Five obstacles to grading reform. *Educational Leadership, 69*(3), 16-21.

Jonsson, A., & Svingby, G. (2007). The use of scoring rubrics: Reliability, validity and

    educational consequences. *Educational research review, 2*(2), 130-144.

Rosovsky, H., & Hartley, M. (2002). *Evaluation and the academy: Are we doing the right thing.*

    Cambridge, MA: American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

Rust, C., O'donovan, B., & Price, M. (2005). A social constructivist assessment process model:

    how the research literature shows us this could be best practice. *Assessment & Evaluation*

    in Higher Education, 30(3), 231-240.

Sadler, T. D. (2009). Situated learning in science education: socio‑scientific issues as contexts

    for practice. *Studies in science Education, 45*(1), 1-42.

Young, N. D., & Young, D. M. (2019). Understanding and Addressing Bias in Classroom

    Assessment: Promoting Fairness Through Equitable Grading Practices. *Acceptance,*

    Understanding, and the Moral Imperative of Promoting Social Justice Education in the

    Schoolhouse, 93.