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The idea of editing a collection of research papers about higher education in Saudi Arabia has been a long-standing goal of mine. When I was a graduate student in humanities—in education, writing my Master’s thesis and then my doctoral dissertation in Philosophy of Education in Canada—there were no books in English, to my knowledge, that discussed the Saudi education system. I depended mostly on the unpublished research of Saudi graduate students studying in the United States, whose research was compiled in the Directory of the Doctoral Dissertations of Saudi Graduates from US Universities (1964–2005) by the Saudi Arabian Cultural Mission to the United States.

This book is the first anthology about higher education in Saudi Arabia, written by scholars from seven universities in Saudi Arabia. Some contributors are Saudi national professors and some are scholars and faculty members who work in higher-education institutions in Saudi Arabia but are originally from India, the United States (of Arab and non-Arab origin), Sudan and Yemen.
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Higher education in Saudi Arabia is undergoing unprecedented changes (Al-Anqari, 2014). The government’s current effort in developing its higher education system is moving into the direction of worldwide recognition. From expanding the number of institutions over the last decade to accrediting the highest number of students on scholarships across 75 countries abroad – east and west – all efforts are aimed at making education in Saudi Arabia world-class. Saudi Arabia now has 28 public universities and 30 private higher-education institutions. Transformations in the higher-education system have been influenced by an increasing student population, shifting demands of the job market, and international higher education (Al-Anqari, 2014). These changes in the education system primarily serve to advance the country and its citizens.

The expansion of higher education and the expected growth in the coming years should meet proper documentation of research efforts about education and teaching and learning in Saudi Arabia.

The chapters in this anthology provide an overview of the research on teaching and learning in Saudi Arabia. As the first book of its kind on the topic, it provides a unique contribution to the field of education and the current knowledge base in higher education reform and research in Saudi Arabia, spanning theoretical, historical, and domain-specific perspectives to provide readers with a broad scope of the field. The book reflects the methodologies that are used by researchers in Saudi Arabia, offers practical applications to researchers and educators, and provides valuable insight into what initiatives are needed to improve the higher-education system in Saudi Arabia.

The chapters focus on a variety of subjects, such as preparatory year in Saudi Arabia, best methods of statistical analysis used by faculty, cooperative learning, use of technology, the effect of intensive use of the Internet and Smartphones and analysis of university student writing using digital rubrics. This may encourage other scholars to document the research happening in Saudi Arabia and how scholars and researchers view the changing education system in one of the fastest growing systems of education, not only in the Middle East and North Africa, but also worldwide.

Chapter 1, by Professor Reima Al-Jarf of English language teaching at King Saud University, sets the scene for the book. Al-Jarf reflects on the traditional and new modalities of teaching and learning. In doing so, she highlights the use of digital rubrics – i.e., a scoring guide that consists of specific pre-established performance criteria used for evaluating students’ and teachers’ performance – to ensure the reliability of teacher-performance assessments. Digital rubrics have been created for evaluating English as Foreign Language college teachers’ linguistic and professional competencies using the iRubric building tool of the RCampus language management system.
INTRODUCTION

In Chapter 2, Khadijah Bawazeer introduces a new take on an established methodology of learning English based on innate learning processes and the intensive use of the Internet and Smartphones. Such innate language processes are used by children to learn their first language. This methodology is based on using the innate language-learning skills of the learner’s first language, with the added difference that the learner is older and more experienced with language acquisition because of their first language-learning experience and experiences accumulated over time. It is hoped that learning English adds to, rather than subtracts from, the fluency of either one’s native or second language. Plus, this innovative system can change the attitudes of learners from relying heavily on others to being more autonomous, and changing their study skills from rote memorization to incorporating memorization with the array of skills described by Bloom (Bloom’s Taxonomy). Furthermore, the researcher discovered that this system is compatible with the concepts of multiple intelligences, thinking-based learning, as well as with Smartphones used to create group follow-up. All four aspects – multiple intelligences, study skills, Smartphones, and Internet use – are essential for producing autonomous learners, an important goal for education in Saudi Arabia.

Chapter 3, by Philline Deraney, is an analysis of written texts from a university in Saudi Arabia using the paradigm of systemic functional linguistics (SFL) and genre-based writing pedagogy focusing on the textual meta function. The research methodology was mainly a description of the patterns that emerged in the female students’ writing related to features of coherence and cohesion with basic frequency tables to support the qualitative data. However, similar to several international and regional studies, elements of academic writing related to the textual metafunction were used inappropriately or lacked language complexity. The participants’ writing was limited and, at times, over-simplified, shown through the lack of accurate paragraphing, logical coherence, clear understanding of the genre requested, overuse of basic cohesive devices, and underuse of more complex ones. Implications for EFL writing education are discussed to assist students in creating more meaningful texts.

In Chapter 4, Barb Toth describes her teaching, learning, and administrative experiences in Saudi Arabia. More specifically, she narrates her experiences in building an English writing program over the last four years in the College of Languages and Translation at Princess Nourah bint Abdulrahman University for Women (PNU) in Riyadh. The students, however, are the main characters and the focus of her story.

In Chapter 5, Mona Al-Sheikh highlights the concept of cooperative learning as an innovative method of teaching that helps students work not only for their own benefit, but for others, too. The idea is that students cannot succeed alone; they need to cooperate with peers to achieve shared goals in learning and to excel in the classroom. They can excel in their respective fields, if trained in positive interdependence and individual accountability. The main objective of this project is to develop a cooperative learning model at the University of Dammam, which would include learning strategies to aid the university deliver its vision and mission as well
as apply cooperative learning within university departments. This project, designed to transform students from passive spectators in the classroom to partners in their own learning, will benefit higher education as well as broader society. Students will enter the world of work equipped with the essential skills of teamwork and accountability for their actions.

In Chapter 6, Abdulghani Ali Al-Hattami and Arif Ahmet Mohamed Hassan Al-Ahdal discuss how scientific research plays an important role in creating growth and progress in developing countries. Many Arab countries, including Saudi Arabia, are trying to encourage faculty members at all universities to write as many good-quality research papers as possible and thereby benefit from the results that can serve society better. This study examines the relationship between university faculty members’ competence to statistically analyze data and their production of research. Results explain why many academics revert to writing qualitative research. The authors recommend that faculty members in Saudi universities improve their knowledge about the use and implementation of statistical tests.

In Chapter 7, Akram AbdulCalder discusses how faculty motivation is a key factor in the success of academic programs in higher education. His study analyzed 34 years of research conducted on numerous variables affecting faculty motivation in Saudi Arabia’s higher education institutions. A meta-analysis of 1,560 journal articles resulted in 35 relevant studies that identified eight factors: 1) monetary incentives and wealth, 2) leadership and management, 3) recognition, 4) technology, 5) students, 6) local culture and language, 7) physical environment, and 8) nepotism. The majority of studies indicated that advances in technology, including distance learning, had an impact on motivation. The role of leadership in motivating faculty was highlighted in 71.42 percent of studies analyzed, indicating a need for those in academic management to more effectively motivate their faculty. A model was developed based on the synthesis of 35 articles used in this meta-analysis study.

In Chapter 8, Tariq Elyas and Abdullah Al-Garni reflect on the ways integrating new technology in the Saudi education system has stirred a desire to move from traditional teacher-centered methods to participatory classrooms. Over the last decade, considerable progress has been made in the development of distance education across the world. Despite the numerous advantages of distance education, universities face several challenges, including the quality of distance education programs (Galusha, 2011; Stephens, 2007). For some students, the lack of a formal classroom setting, and the potential distractions that come with studying at home, may hamper their concentration and motivation to study (Galusha, 2011). In recent decades, Saudi Arabia has developed its human resources considerably in order to become less dependent on foreign labor. A critical aspect of this development has been the establishment of a strong higher-education infrastructure, including developing distance education programs, most notably the Saudi Electronic University (SEU), an institution accessible across the country. Given the recent establishment of the SEU and the dropout rate of students, there is a strong impetus to develop and
design higher quality curricula for distance education programs at SEU. Further, in order to take measures to address the challenges faced by SEU, the Ministry of Higher Education (MoHE) needs to be able to identify these challenges. This chapter explores this gap in the literature in terms of theoretical and methodological frameworks.

In Chapter 9, El-Sadig Yahya Ezza and Nasser Al-Jarallah discuss how English for Academic Purposes (EAP) is thought to stem from foreign learners’ need to overcome academic problems caused by the use of English as a medium of instruction. The study explores EAP practice at Majma’ah University (MU), focusing on the current EAP syllabus and subject-specific stakeholders (administration, faculty and students). EAP faculty were interviewed to discover how MU approaches and practices EAP and how subject-specific faculty and students at Colleges of Applied Medical Sciences and Medicine perceive the need for EAP skills. Major steps have been taken to improve students’ EAP skills to be able to deal with specialist materials and follow classes conducted in English. On the other hand, interviews with students and subject-specific faculty identified that no EAP courses were offered despite the urgent need for advanced EAP skills. Also, researchers have recently extended the scope of EAP to include the enculturation of students into their respective academic fields. This approach introduces students to the academic discourse used by doctors, engineers, and programmers, for instance, so that they can succeed academically.

In Chapter 10, Mubina Rauf reflects on the Preparatory Year Programs (PYP) in Saudi Arabia, which are designed to equip pre-university students with 21st-century skills and to enable them to communicate effectively with the rest of the world. English language is the most significant part of these programs and is taught following the communicative method. This approach is also practiced in the University of Dammam PYP. This study explores the assessment practices in the English department at the PYP. The chapter discusses and compares current assessment trends to best practices in this field; it also reviews best practices in exam procedures starting from types of tests and their suitability to the current program at UoD, best practices in item writing, trialling, writing exam specifications and rubrics, and administration of exams. An assessment framework based on the test qualities, most importantly validity and reliability presented by Bachman and Palmer (1996) and adapted to the needs of Saudi students, has been suggested for use. Assessment based on time-tested theories is a strong indicator of the quality of a language-learning program like the PYP. Students should be exposed to various kinds of testing methods, as this will bring out their best performances, depending on their proclivities and needs.

In Chapter 11, Osama M. Nurain, Ahmed T. Braima, and Barakat H. Makrami discuss teaching operations management using hands-on educational tools and interactive games. Although technology has been widely used for enhancing language teaching and learning since the 1960s, some EFL faculties are still reluctant to use it on a large scale. In light of this, the present study attempts to determine the factors that cause EFL teachers not to use technology in their classes. The study
used a quantitative method; 152 EFL instructors at Jazan University were given a questionnaire designed to measure their perception of technology-integration strategies. The study identifies a number of issues that discuss the scale of technology-integration strategies – among them, lack of experience with technology or, in some cases, resistance to technology. The most critical factor that hinders the use of technology is inadequate training programs. Therefore, the researchers suggest that EFL faculties be exposed to technology-implementation strategies, which will assist them to more successfully integrate these strategies into classroom instruction.

All papers went through double blind review anonymously by scholars in education.
REIMA AL-JARF

1. ASSESSING EFL COLLEGE INSTRUCTORS’ PERFORMANCE WITH DIGITAL RUBRICS

INTRODUCTION

Teacher performance appraisal (TPA) is an indispensible part of educational systems around the world. It constitutes an important element of a university’s vision of achieving high-level student performance. For example, at King Saud University, in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, TPA is an integral part of the teaching/learning process. Instructors of all levels are annually evaluated by college administrators. They are also evaluated by students enrolled in every course they teach. Standard evaluation forms are used in all subject areas throughout the university. Other institutions perform TPA through ratings made by the students, peers, principals, supervisors, and self-ratings made by the teachers themselves (Alicias, 2005). Many use rubrics that document teacher candidate accomplishments of basic teaching skills and content knowledge. The purpose of TPA is to produce high quality teaching, improve student-learning outcomes, bridge gaps in their achievement and provide instructors with meaningful evaluations that encourage professional learning and growth. It fosters their professional development and creates opportunities for additional professional support where needed. According to Yonghong and Chongde (2006), the purpose of TPA is to improve the quality of instruction, to prescribe professional development activities, and to develop a foundation for administrative decisions. Ideally, the evaluation process produces qualified teachers who meet the needs of their students (Adams, 2009).

Despite the importance of teacher performance appraisal, some experts consider it a challenge and a difficult issue in educational reform. Findings of prior research revealed some problems and abuses of TPA such as: subjectivity, and vulnerability to the “politics of teacher evaluation,” as well as professional incapacities of the raters (Alicias, 2005). Most teachers do not feel that they benefit professionally from TPAs, although they are in favor of being evaluated (Adams, 2009). Pimpa (2005) reported three problems related to the national teacher performance appraisal system in Thailand: mismanagement of the system; problems arising from the evaluators; and problems arising from the applicants.

For more objective and effective TPA schemes, several researchers proposed some guidelines such as: (i) mutual goal setting, use of objective criteria for classroom observation, alternative data collection, evaluator training, teacher involvement, peer
observation, classroom improvement, in-service training, availability of resources, emphasizing the positive qualities of teacher evaluation, and use of a reward system (Whyte, 1986); (ii) training evaluators to become better evaluators of teachers’ performance (Weast et al., 1996); (iii) viewing videotaped lessons and applying evaluation standards to enable comparison of outcomes of evaluation (Kuligowski et al., 1993); (iv) implementing a teacher performance appraisal process that encourages self-directed learning, which teachers consider the most effective and meaningful (Rowe, 2000); (v) use of feedback from students, peers, self-evaluation, supervisors, parents, and student achievement (Manatt & Benway, 1998); (vi) use of constructs of teacher performance to diagnose problems and plan appropriate strategies for professional improvement (Yonghong & Chongde, 2006); (vii) using evaluation systems on the web such as the educational electronic performance support systems (EPSS) (Park, Baek, & An, 2001) and the Teacher Performance Appraisal System;1 and (viii) use of TPA rubrics.

To obtain objective, valid, reliable, and meaningful evaluations of instructor performance, rubrics can be of special importance. They are tools for assessing performance according to a set of predetermined scaled expectations and criteria. In a review of empirical research on the use of rubrics at the post-secondary level undertaken in a wide range of disciplines and for multiple purposes, such as student achievement, improving instruction and evaluating programs, Reddy and Andrade (2010) found that student perceptions of rubrics were generally positive. Teachers also reported positive responses to rubric use. Kearns, Sullivan, O’Loughlin, and Braun (2010) created a valid and reliable teaching statement scoring rubric to investigate and document the progression of graduate student instructors as scholarly teachers. The rubric was found to be a useful tool for faculty mentors and instructional consultants who wish to quantify the scholarly progression of writers and modify mentoring practice accordingly. In a third study, performance assessment tasks and rubrics were successfully used in assessing secondary school mathematics preservice teachers’ pedagogical content knowledge and skills (Koirala, Davis, & Johnson, 2008). Similarly, Clinical Experience Rubrics (CER) were found to be effective in rating preservice teachers’ professionalism, teaching quality and relationship with others (Flowers, 2006).

In English as a foreign language (EFL), there is a need for using rubrics in assessing teacher performance objectively and reliably. For example, instructors working at the College of Languages and Translation (COLT), King Saud University are evaluated by college administrators (program coordinators, department heads and vice-deans) at the end of the academic year and by the students at the end of each semester. The following types of TPA forms are used for these purposes:

i. a student TPA form that consists of 27 statements with a 5-point scale “strongly agree, agree, slightly agree, disagree and strongly disagree.”

ii. an administrator TPA form for PhD holders which consists of ten statements under 3 categories: teaching performance (60 points), publications (20 points),
and academic services (20 points). Each statement is allocated a maximum score of between 4 and 20 points.

iii. an administrator TPA form for teaching assistants and lecturers which consists of 20 statements under 3 categories: professional competence (72 points), personal qualities (16 points) and relationship with others (12 points). Each statement is allocated a maximum score of between 4 and 10 points.

NEED FOR STUDY

Despite the importance of TPA, an exploratory study with a sample of 25 instructors at COLT showed that the majority are dissatisfied with and feel underrated in the PTA reports prepared by the college administrators. Generally speaking, TPAs do not accurately and dispassionately assess instructors’ performance. There are discrepancies and biases in the TPA reports. Evaluations do not reflect their actual performance, as they are not based on classroom visits and observations, samples of teaching practices, course portfolio, course reports, exams and assignments. They are not based on caliber and competence but on favoritism and the instructor’s relationship with the evaluator. They are also affected by clashes and prior conflicts. The currently used TPA forms lack scales for describing excellent, average and poor performances. Statements in the form are not operationally defined and are subject to personal interpretation, especially because administrators are not trained to make the evaluations. Scores given for each statement are not based on criteria for discriminating excellent, average and poor performances. Instructors do not know on what basis they get a score of 4 or 5 out of 10 or 20 points for a particular item on the TPA form.

Another exploratory study with a sample of 50 students at COLT, in addition to a survey-report about students’ evaluations of instructor published in the King Saud University student newspaper Risalatul-Jami’aa, showed that 75% of the students participating in the survey do not take the end-of-course TPAs seriously, and do not respond to the items accurately. Some have a friend respond to it on their behalf; some just tick a rating randomly without reading the statements; and others tick the same rating for all the items on the TPA form, as evaluations are conducted during final exams, and students cannot view their course grade until they complete the TPA forms. They also believe that their evaluations have no real effect on teachers and are not taken into consideration in decision-making. They consider them “a routine procedure.” As a result, student TPAs do not reflect an instructor’s actual performance. Both good and poor instructors receive an overall average rating. The currently used TPA forms do not really discriminate an “excellent, average and poor” performance. Students in different sections of the same course taught by the same instructor give significantly different ratings of the instructor and ratings correlate with the grades the students get. The more the failures are in the course, the worse the ratings. Many students do not know how much of behavior marks the difference between “agree” and “slightly agree” or
“disagree” and “slightly disagree.” As it is in the case with administrator TPAs, instructors are also dissatisfied with students’ ratings.

To help COLT administrators avoid biases, unfair ratings, personal interpretation of assessment statements, and follow reliable and valid criteria when evaluating teachers, this chapter proposes the use of digital rubrics to assess teachers’ linguistic and professional performance using the iRubric tool of RCampus (www.rcampus.org). It aims at converting the currently used TPA forms at COLT to digital rubrics. The proposed digital rubrics consist of the following versions: (i) a TPA digital rubric to be used by the students; and (ii) a TPA digital rubric to be used by administrators. These digital rubrics will help both administrators and instructors at COLT diagnose problems and plan appropriate strategies for professional improvement.

Digital rubrics are believed to have several advantages. According to RCampus, digital rubrics show levels of performance and what is expected from EFL instructors; serve as a guide for assessors; save time, and empower programs with an easy-to-use system for monitoring teaching performance and aligning with standards. They can be collaboratively assessed with colleagues. Their scores can be automatically adjusted to the teaching assessment scale.

In addition, use of rubrics in assessment has numerous benefits: they set the standards and help specify the criteria to be used in evaluating teachers’ performance. They constitute a purposeful and appropriate construct that articulates varying levels of proficiencies. They guide teachers in their work and help them evaluate its quality. They are easy to use and explain. They communicate department and college expectations clearly, provide instructors with constructive feedback, and support teaching, skill development and understanding (Andrade, 2000).

DEFINITION OF RUBRICS

A rubric is a scoring guide that consists of specific pre-established performance criteria, used for evaluating performance. It is a tool that formalizes the process of evaluation by explicitly stating the criteria and standards to be used for evaluating performance. It is a rating scale – as opposed to checklists – that consists of specific pre-established scaled performance criteria, used in assessing skill levels and/or performance. It also provides guidelines laid out for judging work on performance-based tasks (Luft, 1998; Kist, 2001; Arter, 2000).

Rubrics are generally divided into holistic, analytic, task-specific, general or developmental. A holistic rubric presents a set of generalized descriptions of what “above average, average, and below average” performances are in the developer’s mind; an analytic rubric allows one to measure something against several different criteria; in a developmental rubric, what is being evaluated is put on a continuum of stages; and a metarubric is a rubric for rubrics with four traits: content, clarity, practicality and technical soundness (Kist, 2001; Arter, 2000).
WHAT IS IRUBRIC?

iRubric is a comprehensive digital rubric development, assessment and sharing tool that shows the major competencies and sub-competencies to be achieved or skills and subskills to be mastered, the different competency levels and marks allocated to each level. It consists of the following:

i. *rubric criteria*, which show the characteristics of a performance; they are generally listed in rows

ii. *criteria descriptors*, which describe what is expected at each level of performance

iii. *levels of performance*, which describe the quality of work; they are generally listed in columns

iv. a *divider*, which is a special row that divides a rubric into sections; it can be *simple*, dividing the section without changing the levels, or *weighted*, allowing changes in level titles and weights for a rubric section

BUILDING THE TPA DIGITAL RUBRICS

According to Kist (2001), Moskal (2003a, 2003b), Marshall (2006), Marzano (2007) and Brown (2008), the process of developing a rubric consists of several steps:

• identifying the purpose or objectives of the activity in measurable outcomes; the scoring rubric should be clearly aligned with the requirements of the task and the program goals and objectives; they should be expressed in terms of observable behaviors or product characteristics, and should be written in specific and clear language;

• identifying the qualities that need to be displayed in a teacher’s work, i.e., expectations for both process and product;

• identifying which type of rubric should be used (analytic or holistic);

• defining the performance levels (excellent, average, poor), using observable behaviors and descriptions of the work (rather than judgments about the work) and marks (points) allocated to each level; scoring rubrics should be written in specific and clear language and a clear separation between score levels.

Based on the above criteria, the author converted (re-designed) the TPA forms currently used by COLT students and administrators to digital rubrics using the iRubric tool of RCampus, an Online Course Management System. The study does not aim to construct new TPA tools from scratch.

The author pooled the items of the administrator TPA form for PhD holders and the one for teaching assistants and lecturers into a single *Administrator TPA Rubric*, as there are overlapping items that measure the same skill or behavior. Duplicate statements were deleted. The new *Administrator TPA Rubric* consists of 26 statements selected from the original TPA form. The statements were grouped under six categories: *linguistic competence, teaching performance, professional achievements, academic services, relationships with others* and *personal qualities*.(See Rubric 1.)
Similarly, the new Student TPA Rubric consists of the same 27 statements in the original TPA form. The items were grouped under six categories: teaching skills, assessment, feedback, punctuality, relationship with students and overall opinion. (See Rubric 2.)

Each rubric consists of a grid with rows for the teaching criteria (indicators or skills) and columns for the performance levels (poor, fair, very good, excellent). Each statement in the original forms was re-formulated and changed into a criterion that describes the instructor’s behavior in specific, observable and measurable behaviors either by giving an operational definition or examples. Four performance levels were added in the columns and each was defined by describing the excellent, very good, fair and poor performances related to the given criterion. Points were allocated to each performance level: 4 points to the “excellent,” 3 points to the “very good,” 2 points to the “fair,” and 1 point to the “poor” performance. A subsection entitled “Professional Achievements” in Rubric 1 was added for evaluating instructors with a PhD degree. Different points were allocated to each performance level: 8–10 points to the “excellent,” 5–7 points to the “very good,” 3–4 points to the “fair” and 0–2 point to the “poor” performance.

The TPA rubrics, especially the detailed performance criteria that describe the instructor’s behavior, as well as the detailed descriptions of the performance levels, were based on the author’s 26 years of experience in teaching EFL at the college level and her administrative experience at the department and college levels. In addition, several TPA frameworks in the literature, such as Marshall (2006), Marzano (2007), list of teacher and principal practice rubrics approved by the New York State Education Department (NYSED) (2011), and the New York State United Teachers’ (NYSUT) (2011) teacher standards, were reviewed.

Both criteria and performance levels were entered in the rows and columns of the iRubric tool of RCampus, to create the digital rubrics for both administrators and students. The detailed Teacher Performance Appraisal Rubric by College Administrators and the detailed Teacher Performance Appraisal Rubric by Students are shown in Rubric 1 and Rubric 2.

VALIDATING THE TPA IRUBRICS

Both TPA scoring rubrics were validated by having ten professors specialized in EFL and evaluation look at the criteria and performance levels in each rubric and make sure the behaviors, operational definitions, and examples given reflect the important and desired teaching competencies of EFL college instructors and that the descriptions and scales under each performance level are discriminating. Clarifications and modifications were made based on the comments received.

To ensure usability and practicality of the rubrics in evaluating EFL teaching performance, both TPA rubrics were tried out. A sample of five administrators and 20 students used both rubrics to evaluate the teaching performance of a sample of six instructors (two PhDs, two MAs and two TAs). Disagreements in evaluating the
## Rubric 1. Teacher performance appraisal rubric by college administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Competence</td>
<td>Correct use of language</td>
<td>Makes many pronunciation, grammatical, spelling and/or usage mistakes</td>
<td>Makes some pronunciation, grammatical, spelling and/or usage mistakes</td>
<td>Correct pronunciation; makes few grammatical, spelling and/or usage mistakes</td>
<td>Native or near-native pronunciation, grammar, spelling, usage. Makes no mistakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge of subject matter: theories, specific language skills, grammatical structures, English phonology, and vocabulary</td>
<td>Little knowledge</td>
<td>Knows some aspects</td>
<td>Very good knowledge of most aspects</td>
<td>Excellent knowledge of all aspects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Performance</td>
<td>Course goals: can write specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, behavioral objectives; achieves pre-determined objectives at the end of class session, unit and course</td>
<td>Few</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Most</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content distribution over teaching weeks: balanced weekly coverage of skills, texts, exercises</td>
<td>Covers less than 2/3 of the chapters and exercises</td>
<td>Covers 2/3 of the chapters, skills and exercises</td>
<td>Covers 3/4 of the chapters and exercises</td>
<td>Covers 90–100% of the required material and exercises</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
### Presentation of material and skills
- Uses advanced organizers, explanation, lecture, translation, graphic organizers, technology, PPT presentation; gives real-life, concrete, clear, familiar examples; gives extra information not in textbook
- Rarely. Same technique; lecture; explanation; translation
- Half of the techniques
- Most techniques mentioned; most of the time
- All techniques mentioned; always

### Leads discussions skillfully
- Calls on all students; prompts and motivates students to participate and generate ideas; gives extra credit; accepts disagreements, encourages self-expression
- Rarely; does not welcome questions from students; does not accept arguments or disagreement; calls on few students
- Some of the aspects mentioned; sometimes
- Most of the aspects mentioned; most of the time
- All aspects mentioned; always

### Accommodates individual differences and different learning styles
- By using auditory, visual and tactile techniques, small group, pair work, oral presentation, variety of activities; uses remedial and enrichment exercises for poor and good students
- 1 technique; sometimes; no remedial and enrichment material
- 2 techniques; sometimes
- 3 techniques; most of the time
- More than 4 techniques; always

---

**Rubric 1. (Continued)**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of material and skills</td>
<td>Uses advanced organizers, explanation, lecture, translation, graphic organizers, technology, PPT presentation; gives real-life, concrete, clear, familiar examples; gives extra information not in textbook</td>
<td>Rarely. Same technique; lecture; explanation; translation</td>
<td>Half of the techniques</td>
<td>Most techniques mentioned; most of the time</td>
<td>All techniques mentioned; always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leads discussions skillfully</td>
<td>Calls on all students; prompts and motivates students to participate and generate ideas; gives extra credit; accepts disagreements, encourages self-expression</td>
<td>Rarely; does not welcome questions from students; does not accept arguments or disagreement; calls on few students</td>
<td>Some of the aspects mentioned; sometimes</td>
<td>Most of the aspects mentioned; most of the time</td>
<td>All aspects mentioned; always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodates individual differences and different learning styles</td>
<td>By using auditory, visual and tactile techniques, small group, pair work, oral presentation, variety of activities; uses remedial and enrichment exercises for poor and good students</td>
<td>1 technique; sometimes; no remedial and enrichment material</td>
<td>2 techniques; sometimes</td>
<td>3 techniques; most of the time</td>
<td>More than 4 techniques; always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Uses teaching aids:
- whiteboard,
- graphic organizers and mind-maps,
- pictures; audio,
- Smartboard,
- LCD projector, PPTs,
- mobile, podcasts,
- videos, online courses,
- blogs, forums

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uses whiteboard only</th>
<th>Uses whiteboard and 1 teaching aid</th>
<th>Uses whiteboard and 2 teaching aids</th>
<th>Uses whiteboard and 3 or more teaching aids</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Creativity in teaching techniques
- Uses teacher-centered techniques such as lecturing
- Sometimes uses a new teaching technique; changes Internet Web sites
- Uses Smartboard in class, PPTs, forum; selects and changes Internet Web sites
- Integrates and experiments with technology every semester (mobile, podcasts, videos, online courses, blogs, forums); uses Smartboard in class; role-play

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assigments: gives application assignments; checks assignments in class; gives individualized feedback, shows error location</th>
<th>Rarely; gives copious homework</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Most of the time</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment: exams cover all topics and skills; uses a variety of question formats; focuses on application questions; gives clear and specific instructions</td>
<td>Very few aspects; many weaknesses</td>
<td>Some aspects; numerous weaknesses</td>
<td>Most aspects; few weaknesses</td>
<td>All aspects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
Rubric 1. (Continued)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Poor (1)</th>
<th>Fair (2)</th>
<th>Very Good (3)</th>
<th>Excellent (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to improve course</td>
<td>Just follows textbook</td>
<td>Follows textbook; borrows supplementary material from colleagues</td>
<td>Recommends Web sites; prepares supplementary material</td>
<td>Diagnoses weaknesses in curriculum, textbooks, exams, students' skills; adapts or supplements curriculum to achieve course goals and meet students' linguistic and professional needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall teaching efficiency in:</td>
<td>Poor in all area; always</td>
<td>Good in some areas; sometimes</td>
<td>Very good in most areas; most of the time</td>
<td>Excellent in all areas; always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preparing presenting material in class, selecting and performing learning tasks, improving students' linguistic ability, giving feedback, constructing testing, assignments, focusing on higher-level skills such as application</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class management skills: sets class rules at the beginning of semester for mobile use in class, missing classes and exams, talking in class, coming late; teaches discipline, punctuality, commitment; seriousness and attentiveness in class</td>
<td>Little or no discipline; too lenient; no control over aspects mentioned</td>
<td>Some; sometimes</td>
<td>Most; most of the time</td>
<td>All; always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctuality</td>
<td>Goes to class late and/or dismisses students early (more than 10 minutes); cancels classes; does not make up for missed classes; misses more than 6 days per semester</td>
<td>Goes to class late or leaves early (5–10 minutes) once a week; misses 4–5 days per semester</td>
<td>Goes to class late or leaves early (5 minutes); few times; misses 1–3 days per semester</td>
<td>Always goes to class on time, leaves on time. No absences. Never cancels classes. Makes up for missed classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office hours and academic advising</td>
<td>Available occasionally; signs forms</td>
<td>Signs forms; gives academic advice; available most of the time</td>
<td>Always in office; signs forms; helps in registration; answers questions; listens to some problems</td>
<td>Always in office; signs forms; helps in registration; answers questions; listens to academic, social and psychological problems and gives solutions; welcomes and contains students; requires advisees to meet with her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with others</td>
<td>With boss: friendly; has a good sense of humor; cooperative; offers help; comfortable; trustworthy; respectful; avoids conflicts</td>
<td>Resentful; dissatisfied; avoids interaction; lack of trust; in conflict; uncooperative</td>
<td>Some qualities</td>
<td>Most qualities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With colleagues: works in a team; shares knowledge; material and resources; advises young colleagues; answers questions; friendly; has a good sense of humor; listens; helps with problems; open; covers classes for others when requested</td>
<td>Displays negative behaviors with most colleagues; in conflict with others; uncooperative</td>
<td>Displays some of these behaviors; sometimes; with some colleagues</td>
<td>Displays most behaviors; very often; with most colleagues</td>
<td>Displays all behaviors; always; with most colleagues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rubric 1. (Continued)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Poor 1</th>
<th>Fair 2</th>
<th>Very Good 3</th>
<th>Excellent 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Qualities</strong></td>
<td>With students and parents: <strong>friendly; helpful; courteous; respectful; encouraging; listens to problems; provides support and help</strong></td>
<td>Rarely; unfriendly; unhelpful; discourteous; discouraging; does not listen to problems; and/or unsupportive</td>
<td>Some qualities; with some students; sometimes</td>
<td>Most qualities; with most students or most of the time</td>
<td>All qualities; always; with all students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acting as a role-model: <strong>punctual, does not miss classes; professional; prepares; presents material in class; selects and executes learning tasks well; improves students linguistic ability; gives feedback; good tests and assignments; focuses on higher-level skills such as application</strong></td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Most of the time</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undertakes responsibility: <strong>takes care of own exams, course specifications and reports and other paperwork; carries out duties in time and as required</strong></td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Most of the time</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accepts remarks, guidance and feedback from superiors</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Most of the time</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Poor 0–2</td>
<td>Fair 3–4</td>
<td>Very Good 5–7</td>
<td>Excellent 8–10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes proper action in crises and solves problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refers to department head or coordinator, does not take action; escapes; ignores situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications:* books, research article (peer-reviewed), translated book, article, translated article, reviews and/or audiovisual documentaries</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Any 1</td>
<td>Any 2</td>
<td>Any 3 or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional self-development: gives conference presentations, workshops, public lectures, TV and radio interviews; subscribes to journals</td>
<td>Gives 1 or less</td>
<td>Gives any 2</td>
<td>Gives any 3</td>
<td>Gives any 4 or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic services: attends department and college meetings; serves on committees; attends workshops, conferences, public lectures, college events; writes reports</td>
<td>1 or less</td>
<td>Any 2</td>
<td>Any 3</td>
<td>Attends any 4 or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This section is for evaluating PhD holders only.
### Rubric 2. Teacher performance appraisal rubric by students

#### Teacher Performance appraisal rubric by students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Poor 1</th>
<th>Fair 2</th>
<th>Very Good 3</th>
<th>Excellent 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Skills</td>
<td>Provides students with course description</td>
<td>Provides students with course title and code, textbook, credit hours, level, pre-requisites, co-requisites, location, contact information, office hours, course description, material coverage, skills, assessment, marks, number of tests, related Web sites, a sample test, test dates</td>
<td>Provides students with course title and code, textbook, credit hours, level, contact information, office hours, course description, material coverage, skills, assessment, marks, number of tests, related Web sites, a sample test, test dates</td>
<td>Provides students with course title and code, textbook, credit hours, level, pre-requisites, co-requisites, location, contact information, office hours, teaching philosophy, course description, audiovisuals, material coverage, skills, teaching techniques, assessment, marks, number of tests, study skills, extension activities, technology, related Web sites, self-improvement, a sample test, test dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States objectives and skills</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Few times per semester or once a month</td>
<td>Some class sessions per week (once a week)</td>
<td>Every class session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comes to class well-prepared: ready handouts; knows tasks and sequence; moves from one step/skill to another smoothly; distributes class time on task</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Most of the time</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knows material very well: gives background information not in textbook; gives theory, rules, history; gives additional examples; writes supplementary material</td>
<td>sticks to material and exercises in textbook</td>
<td>occasionally; gives some exercises or text related to few topics or chapters</td>
<td>most of the time; most topics in textbook</td>
<td>always; all topics covered in textbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uses a variety of teaching techniques: explanation, lecture, translation, graphic organizers and mind-maps, pictures, online course, online Web sites, pair work, small group, students give oral presentation, PPT presentation, depending on content, skill and task</td>
<td>same teaching technique always; 2 or less techniques</td>
<td>uses 3 techniques</td>
<td>uses 4 techniques</td>
<td>uses 5 or more of those techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>connects material with real-life: tells us how material applies to our specialty and future career and with other courses</td>
<td>rarely</td>
<td>few times per semester</td>
<td>most of the time</td>
<td>always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gives clear, concrete, familiar examples and analogies to clarify and simplify material</td>
<td>rarely</td>
<td>occasionally</td>
<td>most of the time</td>
<td>always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instructor is enthusiastic and interested in what she is teaching</td>
<td>always bored; students fall asleep in class</td>
<td>occasionally</td>
<td>most of the time</td>
<td>always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speaks and reads clearly with a loud voice, good expression, moderate speed and a comprehensible accent</td>
<td>speaks with a low monotonous voice; speaks fast; reads fast and/or has a difficult accent</td>
<td>has numerous weaknesses</td>
<td>has few weaknesses in some aspects</td>
<td>perfect in all of these aspects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>encourages students to participate in class; calls on all students; gives bonus marks for participating; prompts</td>
<td>rarely; focuses on few students; asks those who raise their hands</td>
<td>some of these skills; occasionally</td>
<td>most of these skills; most of the time</td>
<td>always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
### Rubric 2. (Continued)

**Teacher Performance appraisal rubric by students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Poor 1</th>
<th>Fair 2</th>
<th>Very Good 3</th>
<th>Excellent 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourages students to read from multiple resources: books, e-books, online material, mobile, newspapers, magazine</td>
<td>Focuses on textbook only</td>
<td>Occasionally; recommends 1 source</td>
<td>Most of the time; recommends 2 sources</td>
<td>Always; recommends at least 3 sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourages critical and creative thinking such as giving reasons and solutions to problems; justifying; writing their own poetry or stories</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Most of the time</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Uses a variety of evaluation techniques: long test, short tests, pop-quizzes, short answer, essay, participation, online course, presentation, homework, class work and/or paper</td>
<td>Uses same evaluation technique; uses 2 in-term tests only</td>
<td>Uses in-term tests and quizzes</td>
<td>Uses 3–5 techniques</td>
<td>Uses 6 or more techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exam questions are comprehensive</td>
<td>Questions cover less than 50% of skills and content taught</td>
<td>Questions cover 66% of the skills and content taught</td>
<td>Questions cover 75% skills and topics taught</td>
<td>Questions cover more than 90% of skills and topics taught</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exam questions are clear and comprehensible</td>
<td>Most questions are confusing</td>
<td>Some questions; many are confusing</td>
<td>Most questions</td>
<td>All questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balanced distribution of marks over course requirements: in-term tests, pop quizzes, participation, online course, presentation, homework, class work and/or paper</td>
<td>Course marks cover only in-term tests</td>
<td>Course marks cover in-term test and 1 requirement</td>
<td>Course marks cover in-term tests and any 2 requirements</td>
<td>Course marks cover in-term tests and 3 or more requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspect</td>
<td>Fair in assessing students’ performance</td>
<td>Many inconsistencies; does not return papers to students; or students do not know why marks were deducted</td>
<td>Some inconsistencies</td>
<td>Few inconsistencies</td>
<td>All of those; no inconsistencies in allocation of marks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair in assessing students’ performance</td>
<td>Many inconsistencies; does not return papers to students; or students do not know why marks were deducted</td>
<td>Some inconsistencies</td>
<td>Few inconsistencies</td>
<td>All of those; no inconsistencies in allocation of marks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>Occasionally; some feedback to whole class</td>
<td>Some feedback to some students</td>
<td>Most of the time to most students</td>
<td>Always; to every student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follows up students’ progress; gives comments on areas of improvement; provides self-improvement tips</td>
<td>Occasionally; some feedback to whole class</td>
<td>Some feedback to some students</td>
<td>Most of the time to most students</td>
<td>Always; to every student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides students with their grades; shows students their test papers</td>
<td>Occasionally; some feedback to whole class</td>
<td>Some feedback to some students</td>
<td>Most of the time to most students</td>
<td>Always; to every student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctuality</td>
<td>Always; comes to class on time</td>
<td>Always; comes to class on time and leaves on time</td>
<td>Always; comes to class on time and leaves on time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abides by class duration</td>
<td>Always; comes to class on time</td>
<td>Always; comes to class on time and leaves on time</td>
<td>Always; comes to class on time and leaves on time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Teacher Performance Appraisal Rubric by Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship with students</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respects students; uses polite</td>
<td>Poor 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expressions such as “please, thank you, excuse me, I am sorry” listens to students’ problems; accepts criticism and complaints</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcomes queries from students</td>
<td>Rarely; very few queries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interacts with students through email, SMS, a ChatBox, Messenger and/or Facebook/Twitter</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can be reached during office hours</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall opinion</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
same instructor’s performance were noted and necessary amendments were made on the criteria and descriptions of performance levels.

APPLYING THE TPA DIGITAL RUBRICS

The digital form of the TPA rubrics can be used in evaluating a teacher’s performance using the iRubric tool of RCampus. Steps in applying the digital rubric to an instructor’s performance, entering the scores, for viewing the instructor’s scores, sharing and discussing the rubric with other instructors, and categorizing the rubric are shown in Web pages 1–19 in Appendix A.

To report an instructor’s performance assessment summary, all of the scores given to criteria (indicators) according to the selected performance levels are added up. In addition to that, the percentage of students marking each performance level for each criterion (indicator) is given.

CONCLUSION

This chapter proposed the use of digital rubrics using the iRubric creator tool of RCampus for evaluating EFL college instructors’ linguistic and professional performance by administrators and students to ensure the reliability, accuracy and fairness of assessments. The proposed iRubrics consist of pre-established performance criteria, four performance levels and marks allocated to each. Performance criteria can be modified and performance levels can be adjusted easily. The effective use of iRubrics requires that they be explained to administrators, teachers and students ahead of time and that training be provided in their use. Guidance should be offered for using the ratings, in scoring, interpreting and using the results. With the rubric as a guide, teachers learn to monitor their own progress and make improvements in a timely manner. Involving teachers in creating rubrics encourages them to think about the criteria of quality work and promotes ownership of the assessment process. Revising and modifying EFL instructors’ evaluation policies, procedures and tools at COLT by using digital rubrics, as those devised in the present study, will lead to more satisfaction and better achievement of teaching and learning goals.

NOTES

1 http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/teacher/appraise.html
2 Risalatul-Jami’a, issue#1078, p. 38, December 10, 2011.
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APPENDIX A

Steps of Creating and Applying Teacher Performance Appraisal (TPA) iRubrics

Web page 1: The RCampus iRubric Homepage

Web page 2: Go to the RCampus iRubric homepage (http://www.rcampus.com) and register for an account. All teachers must be enrolled in a group, like a class.
Web page 3: To build a new digital rubric, click “Build a rubric” and click start for Option A

Web page 4: The rubric building page. Fill in the required information, the criteria and performance levels in the row
Web page 5: These action buttons appear underneath the rubric after saving it. Click any of the links if you need to preview, edit, copy, print, categorize, bookmark, test-run, grade, collaborate, publish, email, or discuss the rubric that you have built. An explanation of each action button is given.
Web page 6: To apply the rubric to a teacher’s performance, click “apply to” in the blue horizontal menu above
Web page 7: Select ‘Apply the rubric to a coursework’ for assessment by an individual assessor or ‘Apply rubric to an object’ for assessment by a group.

Web page 8: Before starting a teacher’s assessment by a single assessor, define the coursework properties. Select the assessment title and type of coursework to be evaluated, i.e., ‘teacher assessment’ from the drop-down menus. The rubric will be attached to assignment as in a regular course assignment.
Web page 9: For collaborative assessment, fill in the information

Web page 10: For collaborative assessment, fill in the information to select the assessment evaluators and ‘Building group’ for group of instructors to be evaluated
ASSESSING EFL COLLEGE INSTRUCTORS’ PERFORMANCE WITH DIGITAL RUBRICS

Web page 11: To enter a teacher’s assessment and score, click on the rubric icon adjacent to his/her name. This will transfer you to the rubric page below:

![Web page 11 screenshot]

Web page 12: To assess a teacher’s performance, go through the criteria/indicators row by row. Click on the relevant performance level per criterion/indicator to select it. Once finished, click on “show score” below the rubric. The teacher’s total score will be automatically calculated and entered in the gradebook:

![Web page 12 screenshot]
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Web page 13: Comments can be entered by clicking on a teacher’s name in Web page 14

Web page 14: To view all teachers’ assessments scores, click ‘gradebook’
Web page 15: For a single teacher’s assessments details, click on his/her name in the list.

Web page 16: Discussing the rubric and evaluations with other administrators or teachers.
Web page 17: To share a rubric with other administrators or teachers, select one of the 4 options listed

Web page 18: To categorize the TPA rubric, select the subject area (foreign languages) and the type of task (assessment) to which the rubric will be applied