PROJECT MUSE®

Index



Published by

Weeden, Scott, et al.
Organic Writing Assessment: Dynamic Criteria Mapping in Action.
Utah State University Press, 2009.
Project MUSE. muse.jhu.edu/book/9414.

For additional information about this book
https://muse.jhu.edu/book/9414

[52.15.59.163] Project MUSE (2024-04-26 05:20 GMT)

INDEX

Adler-Kassner, Linda and Heidi Estrem 33
argument 140, 143-144
assessment
  alternative 3, 4, 38, 120, 149
  culture 2, 37
  grounded assessment theory 9, 10, 37, 42-3, 46,57-8,60-1, 125-127
  local 3, 4, 38, 47, 52, 54, 158
  meaningful 15, 23, 46, 50, 123, 158
  programmatic 14-19, 16, 33-34, 37, 45, 48, 54,67, 80-81
  quantitative 8, 17, 33, 34, 68, 70, 125, 126, 155
  story-based 20, 21, 22, 38

Bawarshi, Anis 18, 24, 27, 34
Boyd, Michael 120-121
Broad, Bob 4, 23, 24, 120-121, 122, 126, 135, 136, 139, 144, 145

Charmaz, Kathy 126
contexts
  cultural 3, 40, 50, 138
  and genres 15, 18, 19
  institutional 7, 19, 38, 138
  place 15–23, 27-28, 34, 37-40, 58
Corbin, Juliet 126
criteria
  textual 126-130, 137, 140, 142-143, 147-148
  contextual 126-130, 137-143, 145, 147-148
  community college 4, 37-38, 49-50
  complementarity 50, 120-121
  constructivist theory 121-122, 126
  conversations about student writing 18, 20–25, 28, 33, 38, 56-58,70-71,75, 79-80, 92-93
  critical thinking 41 (fig. 1), 45, 52-8, 45, 63, 65 n5, 68-72, 88, 134-135

de Certeau, Michel 26, 27
Diederich, Paul 149
dynamic criteria mapping (dcm)
  criticism of 5
  concept map 25, 26
  dcm method 10, 19–21, 23, 25, 27–33
  discomfort with 12, 23, 29, 31, 95
  and generative space 23
  maps 41, 83-85, 87-88, 100, 127, 128-130, 137, 140, 149
  and program assessment 14, 16, 95
  process 18-33, 41-46, 55-64, 84-86 124-135
  and traditional rubrics 5, 10–11, 37, 40, 60-1

focus groups 19, 20, 21, 62-4
frames of reference 19, 23, 25, 49

genre 15-16, 18-19, 95, 143-145, 148
Glaser, Barney 126
grading 63, 75-76, 81-82, 86, 89-91, 93, 95-96, 115-117, 133, 150
Guba, Egon G., and Yvonna S. Lincoln 2-3, 5

Harrington, Susanmarie 120, 121
Haswell, Richard 3, 4, 121, 142
Huot, Brian 4, 17, 24, 142, 157, 159

Lynne, Patricia 23, 26, 2, 121

Miller, Richard 27
Moss, Pamela 3, 123

narrative 12, 82, 86-87, 102, 105, 108, 128-129, 132, 143-145, 148-149

O'Neill, Peggy 123

Palmer, Parker 75
persuasive writing 124, 143, 148
placement 120-127, 131-135
Pollan, Michael 1, 157-158
portfolios 19, 23-24, 27-33, 39, 52-54, 61-63, 66-72, 82-84
program goals 15, 37, 58, 65, 72
professional development 14, 18, 53

qualities of good writing 11, 18, 24–26, 30-33, 49, 52, 59, 61, 72, 93-94

Ray, Ruth 126
reliability 25, 68, 120
rubrics
  critiques of 4-5, 12, 58, 76-78, 135,
  new approaches to 10, 46, 48, 60-68, 86-89, 90-92, 95-96, 110-117, 134, 148
  unrubric 11, 89–91, 96

Smith, Barbara 89
Smith, William 121
Strauss, Anselm 126
stakeholders
  campus-wide communities 24, 76
  competing voices of 23

directors, deans, and other administrators 12, 15, 33
outsiders 3, 17
student services personnel 18, 20,
staff 18, 19, 119

validity 5, 17, 25, 50, 120, 122-123, 136-139, 143-150

writing assignments 123, 142, 144

values
faculty 37, 39, 45-47, 50, 72, 80-81, 93, 96
language 87, 88, 89, 143-149
program 16-17, 22, 58-64, 85, 87, 89, 94, 122-127, 135-137
reconciling 24-28, 41-42, 62-64, 87-92

White, Edward 122