Rationale

Most college level courses, in particular STEM courses, use a traditional approach to grading. Here a grade is assigned for a particular evaluation instrument (e.g., quiz, homework assignment, test, project, presentation), the material is reviewed following the grading process (in class directly or presumably by the student) and the class moves on to new materials. The student presumably learns from his or her mistakes. Despite the assumed improved knowledge, the student's grade for the assessment only represents what he or she "knew" at the time of the evaluation. Furthermore, the overall course grade is typically a composite of these separate evaluations, and therefore, probably not a measure of the level of a student's knowledge at the completion of the course. Nonetheless these final course grades are typically used as an indicator of a student's achievement in job applications and applications for graduate education, scholarships, and more. Moreover, it is not clear what the real purpose of grades is-whether they are an indicator of a student's knowledge, effort, ability, or some combination of all three.

For many students, grades are an important motivator. Various models of learning suggest that grades can be used to increase learning. Mastery grading is one approach that has become increasingly popular and as more research is done, greater evidence of the effectiveness of this approach compared to other grading approaches on learning outcomes for students is shown.

Motivations

Ultimately as an professor my goal is for my students to learn the course materials and not just "pass" the class. This motivation is often not shared by the students who typically are focused on passing with a certain grade on their transcripts and may not be interested in a full understanding of the course materials. (Sad but True)

So,

How do I motivate my students towards learning and not just passing?

How can I set up my course so that the grade students receive does actually reflect their knowledge leaving the course?

How can I use grades as a motivator for mastery of learning?

These are questions I asked of myself and these same questions motivated me to attempt mastery based grading for my Calculus and Analytic Geometry Course Fall 2019.

Set up Mastery Based Grading Homework Assignments:

Level 2: Building on Procedural, Exploring more conceptual – Analyze/Evaluate Level 3: Building on Procedural and Analyzing abilities, more abstract conceptual –Analyze/Evaluate Mastery: Usually 1-3 problems that involves read/exploring something new and combining past knowledge to find a

Level 1: Mainly procedural/Calculations Based assignments – Remember, Understand, Apply

This is the text as it appeared on the course syllabus accompanied by the two graphics of Bloom's taxonomy for learning.

The course was broken up into 4 different sections: Functions, Limits, Derivatives, Basic Integration

Each section consisted of 4 levels of mastery which consistently contained the same elements:

Level 1: Writing Assignment, Problems solved on a mathematical software Edfinity Level 2: A worksheet typically given in class

Level 3: A shorter more involved worksheet (typically 3-4 problems that extend the concepts

Level 4: The concepts in a new situation (typically an application of the calculus concepts)

Student Comments:

solution to a new problem - Create

"She gave to much homework for no deadlines. Because be realistic we are college students we are not going to do them to much ahead of time." "Nobody knew what was due until about week 6."

"With multiple types of homework and no deadlines, it was easy to lose track of what assignments needed to get done. In addition, her demands for complete mastery of assignments to earn any credit seemed unreasonable and her feedback was often vague." "While I understand and appreciate that she was trying to get us to put in effort and work through problems on our own, I feel that her expectations were too high considering this was the first calculus course many of us took" "if this class was supposed to be set up as a mastery class, where students could redo assignments until mastered, I feel like more effort needed to go into returning these assignments quicker. Either that or assign less."

"The way the course was structured with "mastery" was a new experience for me. I have taken. I have taken. I have taken. I have taken several calculus class and the way they were given with mastery made me feel like I was finally being challenged in a real college classroom"



Wells and Woes of my first attempt at becoming a Master at Mastery Grading

Sample Mastery Assignments Level 4

Functions Mastery Level 4

brains do every day.

f(4), and f(5).

Did you know that there is an entire research community dedicated to finding functions that fit based on different given information about the function!!!! They essentially try to make computers do what our

i I asked you to find a function such that f(0)=0, f(1)=1 and f(2)=4, you might right away come up with $f(x) = x^2$. However there are thousands of other functions that meet this same requirement. How can we get a computer to pick x^2 from the long list of functions that fit?

ps://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/2ec5/1dd13<u>32ab05837729ed0ee091e4657df4c20.pdf?ga=2.1046973</u> 44.1882868688.1569245035-1506140662.1566481336 The link above will take you to a book chapter about Systematic Synthesis of Functions authors Koopman and Plasmeijer. YOU DO NOT NEED TO READ THE ENTIRE CHAPTER!!!

1. Read the abstract and write a short reaction to it including what you think the researcher are trying to do. (Be brief no more than 1 paragraph) . Read the first paragraph. Notice the function defined in the paragraph. Write the function

using piece-wise notation. Show that this function actually represents a factorial 4. Examine the table 3.1 for the input and output. Pay special attention to the given examples and generated functions column. For the given functions verify that they work by finding f(2), f(3),

Mathematical connections between bond-stretching potential functions Teik-Cheng Lim Dean's Office, Faculty of Engineering, National University of Singapore, 9 Engineering Drive 1, Singapore 117576, Singapore Received 22 October 2002 Mathematical connections are useful in enabling a set of parametric data from a chemical bond-stretching potential function to be applied in a computational chemistry software that adopts a different potential function. This paper establishes connections between four poten tial energy functions in stretching and compression of covalent bonds. The potential function that are mathematically connected are: (i) harmonic potential, (ii) polynomial series potential tial, (iii) Morse potential, and (iv) Murrell-Mottram potential. Two methods are employed in obtaining the relationships between the four potential functions. The expansion approach enables the relationships to be made at large bond-stretching, whilst the differential approach allows for the connections to be made only at infinitesimal bond-stretching. For verification parametric data from the Murrell-Mottram potential is converted to parametric data of the harmonic, polynomial series and Morse potentials. For comparison, the bond-stretching ener gies for these functions are plotted. Discrepancy between the Morse and the Murrell-Mottram potentials at large bond-stretching is discussed in terms of the assumed infinitesimal deforma-KEY WORDS: bond-stretching, potential functions, molecular mechanics, force fields, mathematical connection . Introduction With recent advances in nanotechnology and molecular-scale engineering, the scientific community sees ever increasing importance of computational chemistry in sim-

nano-scale devices. Though improvement of computer speed has enabled increasing application of quantum mechanics-based computational chemistry software, the very ame improvement enables faster computation by the molecular mechanics approact

Wells and Woes:

Cheating: It quickly became clear that many students were cheating so that once one person mastered the assignment (typically by going to the SI instructor) a whole group of them would "magically master" the assignment with all the same mistakes.

Due Dates: Assignments were not given with due dates so students could turn in a mastery attempt at any time. Special mastery days were schedule for the class so that students could work towards Mastery. On these days students were encouraged to turn in at least two assignments for mastery check. However, most students procrastinated.

Return/Feedback: I was not able to return mastery assignments in a timely fashion so many students were waiting for feedback. I attempted to combat this by always having something for students to do in the interim, but that did not sit well psychologically for some students.

Grading Scale: The mastery grading scale was 0/1 which would indicate that you mastered a level or did not. However, this grading scheme was daunting and did not reflect the different levels of student mastery. I need to extend it to include progressive levels of mastery.

For Future Iterations

Overall Mastery Grading did motivate some students to be more focused on learning. So it is a keeper.

Levels: The different levels worked well and using Bloom's Taxonomy as a guide was another bright spot. Also a keeper.

Due Dates Do over: Instead of allowing assignments to be turned in at any time. I plan to set a mastery by date for each of the sections. Additionally, I plan to keep Mastery Thursdays but put a cap on the number of assignments that can be turned in per week. So that students should submit a minimum of two and a maximum of four assignments per week.

Assignments Grading: I plan on making some assignments shorter and requiring explanations only for a subset of the problems in an assignment so that students are not overwhelmed with the volume of assignments and having to write an explanation for every problem. This will hopefully help with returning assignments sooner as well since I will not have to read all of the explanations.

Cheating: I have no solution for this at this time, but I welcome suggestions.

Iournal of Mathematical Chemistry Vol. 33, No. 1, January 2003 (© 2003)

ulating physical properties of nano-structured materials and working performance of