

April 15, 2005

Subject: *Measuring Change*

Last fall, I wrote a teaching tip about the value of introducing students early on in your course to activities that were stimulating and exciting. For example, instead of just covering a syllabus the first day of class and doing routine tasks during that first week, engage students in ways that show them how the subject matter for the course is relevant to their lives and interest levels. In other words, use those first few meetings with your students to intrinsically motivate them and to set the stage for a course that begins with asking the right questions and ends with showing students how they have developed as learners seeking to answer challenging questions. As the semester is winding down, it seems an appropriate time to revisit this issue so that we may be prepared for the next time we teach a course and so that we can see how those activities we do in the beginning of the semester can be integrally linked to those activities we engage in at the end of the semester. In the end, it is all about student learning

Loyd Bond, a senior scholar from the Carnegie Foundation, describes for us an activity done at the beginning of the semester that not only sets the stage for what students can expect in a course, and the kinds of questions they should ask and seek to answer, but also serves as the foundation and lead in for all activities throughout the course. In this tip, Bond presents to us a cogent argument about the value of measuring change in student learning from the beginning of a semester to the end. In “Who Has the Lowest Prices? (March, 2005), Bond writes:

“If one wished to know what knowledge or skill Johnny has acquired over the course of a semester, it would seem a straightforward matter to assess what Johnny knew at the beginning of the semester and reassess him with the same or equivalent instrument at the end of the semester.... The power of change scores to reveal important aspects of teaching and learning is best illustrated by example. I was fortunate to have had a remarkable teacher for my first statistics class. He began the class by assigning us to teams of three each. We were given a week to answer a simple question, and we had to describe and justify the things we did to arrive at an answer. The question was, ‘Among the three local grocery stores, Kroger, A & P, and Hi-Lo, who has the lowest prices?’ How do novice statistics students go about answering such a question? My team was typical. We began in a haphazard and utterly frustrating way, proposing one inefficient strategy, then another. One member should take canned goods, another fresh fruits and vegetables. Maybe one could take aisles 1, 2, and 3, another aisles 4, 5, and 6. We quickly realized that no matter how we broke the task down, a census of every item in each store would take weeks. One of us had a vague notion about sampling! , but we had no idea of how to conduct a scientific sample, let alone one weighted by purchasing patterns. We thought only of the average (arithmetic mean) price, never considering other measures of central tendency, and standard errors were not a part of our vocabulary. Nor did we consider the sampling implications of price changes from one day to the next.

Although we were initially enthusiastic about answering this simple question, by the end

of the second day, we complained bitterly about the impracticality of it all. The instructor's response was always the same, "Well, just do the best you can."

For those of us who survived the course, the same question was assigned again toward the end of the semester. The instructor gave us minimal feedback on our responses the first time around. He simply put our reports away and they were never mentioned. Both sets of responses, along with detailed comments, were returned at the end of the semester. The difference in quality between the two sets of responses to the same question was stunning.

Our responses to the question did not figure in our final grade. Grades were awarded on the basis of other quizzes, examinations, and projects. The instructor used the results to grade his own teaching. (In retrospect, one would think that such effort expended on an activity that had no immediate grade payoff would have been resented. To my knowledge there was not a single complaint.) The instructor told me years later that that simple question, "who has the lowest prices?", was in the back of his mind during the entire portion of the course devoted to inferential statistics. It brought a certain coherence to the way he sequenced successive ideas central to the novice student's understanding of what is required when making statistical inferences.

In passing, it is noted that the grocery store question is a powerful example of what cognitive psychologists call "ill-structured" problems: problems that can rarely be solved quickly, that may have more than one defensible solution, that may have multiple routes to a single solution, and that may have many sub-problems that must be solved before arriving at an answer. By contrast, "well-structured" problems (e.g., solve for x in the equation $3x + 2 = 17$) have a unique answer, can usually be solved quickly, and have a very limited number of ways to a solution. The grocery store question also has enormous "pulling power." It evokes a variety of different answers and different approaches to the answers, and it provides deep insight into students' thinking, into how they organize what they know into a coherent argument.

For years I have argued that measurement and assessment should have a more prominent place in teacher education curricula. I still believe that. But beyond a good knowledge of the essentials, teachers need not be assessment experts. Nor need they fret over measurement specialists' admonitions about measuring change. Rather, teachers could spend their time more productively by concentrating on what they want their students to know and be able to do at the end of the year. Often this implies something as simple as asking the right question of their own teaching.

.....

Lloyd Bond, a senior scholar at the Carnegie Foundation, has extensive experience in the construction, validation, and scoring of performance measures of teaching. He was a faculty member at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro and the University of Pittsburgh before joining Carnegie.

