

## Holistic Rubric for IPSQA 3027 Public Safety Diving

### Task 1: Research Paper

<b>Excellent (85-100%)</b>	The research paper demonstrates comprehensive understanding of public safety diving concepts. It thoroughly contrasts recreational and public safety diving, providing in-depth explanations of personal preparedness, incident management, specialist equipment, psychological impacts, key activities, best practises with affected families and media, components of a dive operation plan, drowning considerations, rescue mode determination, and basic search procedures. The paper is well-structured, uses appropriate terminology, and cites relevant sources using APA 8th style. Critical analysis and synthesis of information are evident throughout.
<b>Good (70-84%)</b>	The research paper shows a good understanding of most public safety diving concepts. It adequately contrasts recreational and public safety diving and covers most required topics with sufficient detail. Some areas may lack depth or critical analysis. The paper is generally well-structured with minor organisational issues. APA 8th referencing is mostly correct with a few minor errors
<b>Satisfactory (50-69%)</b>	The research paper demonstrates basic understanding of public safety diving concepts. It provides a basic contrast between recreational and public safety diving and covers most required topics, but some areas lack detail or depth. The paper's structure may have some inconsistencies. Critical analysis is limited. APA 8th referencing is attempted but contains several errors.
<b>Unsatisfactory (0-49%)</b>	The research paper shows limited understanding of public safety diving concepts. The contrast between recreational and public safety diving is superficial or missing. Many required topics are either not addressed or lack sufficient detail. The paper's structure is disorganised or unclear. Critical analysis is absent. APA 8th referencing is incorrect or missing.

# Analytical Rubric for IPSQA 3007 Emergency Vehicle Operator

## Task 1: Research Paper

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>
	<i>85-100%</i>	<i>70-84%</i>	<i>50-69%</i>	<i>0-49%</i>
<b>Content and understanding</b> (40%)	Comprehensive coverage of all required topics. Demonstrate deep understanding and critical analysis of concepts.	Covers most required topics with good depth. Some areas may lack detail or critical analysis. Overall demonstrates solid understanding.	Addresses most required topics but lacks depth in several areas. Basic understanding demonstrated with limited critical analysis.	Many required topics missing or superficially covered. Limited understanding evident.
<b>Research and quality of resources</b> (20%)	Utilises a wide range of relevant, current, and authoritative sources. Information is synthesised effectively to support arguments.	Uses a good range of relevant sources. Most information is well-integrated to support arguments.	Uses some relevant sources, but may rely too heavily on basic or outdated materials. Integration of sources is inconsistent.	Few relevant sources used. Poor integration of information from sources.
<b>Structure and organisation</b> (20%)	Logically organised with clear introduction, well-developed body paragraphs, and strong conclusion. Smooth transitions between ideas.	Generally well-organised with some minor structural issues. Most transitions are effective.	Basic structure present but some sections may be disorganised. Transitions between ideas are sometimes unclear.	Poorly organised with no clear structure. Lacks logical flow of ideas.
<b>Writing quality and referencing</b> (20%)	Clear, concise writing with proper grammar and spelling. APA 8th format followed correctly throughout.	Generally clear writing with few grammatical or spelling errors. Minor APA 8th format errors.	Some clarity issues in writing. Several grammatical or spelling errors. Multiple APA 8th format errors.	Unclear writing with numerous grammatical and spelling errors. APA 8th format not followed or contains major errors.

## Reflection

Thank you for the additional guidance. I'll revise my response to use only journal articles as references and UK English spelling. Here's an updated reflective statement on the pros and cons of holistic versus analytic rubrics, with a final preference for analytic rubrics:

As an educator reflecting on rubric types, I've come to appreciate the nuanced strengths and limitations of both analytic and holistic rubrics for writing assessment. Analytic rubrics offer detailed feedback by breaking down writing tasks into specific components, allowing for targeted evaluation of areas like thesis, organisation, and mechanics (Jonsson and Svingby, 2007), so ideal for public safety related assessments such as driving and diving. This granularity enables students to understand expectations clearly and provides a roadmap for improvement. Additionally, analytic rubrics can enhance grading objectivity and consistency across multiple assessments (Reddy and Andrade, 2010). This is important with assessment within a certification scheme to ensure consistency as part of moderation requirements.

However, analytic rubrics are not without drawbacks. They can be time-consuming to create and apply, potentially limiting their practicality for large-scale assessments (Brookhart and Chen, 2015). There's also a risk that overly prescriptive criteria might stifle creativity or discourage students from taking risks in their writing.

On the other hand, holistic rubrics offer a more streamlined approach, evaluating writing as a cohesive whole rather than dissecting it into components (Sadler, 2009). This method can be more efficient for graders and may better capture the overall impact of a piece of writing. Holistic rubrics can also encourage students to focus on the broader effectiveness of their work rather than fixating on isolated elements.

Yet, holistic rubrics have their own limitations. They often provide less specific feedback, which may leave students uncertain about areas for improvement (Panadero and Jonsson, 2013). The broader criteria can also lead to more subjective assessments, potentially reducing consistency across different graders or grading sessions.

After careful consideration, I find myself leaning towards a preference for analytic rubrics in most writing assessment contexts. While they require more initial investment in terms of development time, analytic rubrics ultimately provide a more consistent and defensible assessment framework. The detailed criteria allow for more transparent grading decisions, which is particularly valuable when justifying grades to students or administrators (Andrade, 2005). This forms part of risk mitigation to avoid unnecessary appeals as the criteria is more transparent and not open to being as subjective as holistic rubrics.

Moreover, the specificity of analytic rubrics aligns well with the goal of fostering metacognition in students. As research has shown, students who engage with detailed rubrics during the writing process demonstrate improved performance and more accurate self-assessment (Panadero and Romero, 2014). This metacognitive development is crucial for long-term growth in writing skills.

While holistic rubrics have their place, particularly in quick assessments or when overall impression is paramount, the benefits of analytic rubrics in providing consistent, detailed, and actionable feedback make them my preferred choice for most writing assessments, particular in the area of public safety. Their ability to support both formative and summative assessment goals while maintaining a high degree of transparency and fairness tips the scales in their favour.

## References

**Andrade, H.G.** (2005). Teaching with rubrics: The good, the bad, and the ugly. *College Teaching*, 53(1), 27-30.

**Brookhart, S.M. and Chen, F.** (2015). The quality and effectiveness of descriptive rubrics. *Educational Review*, 67(3), 343-368.

**Jonsson, A. and Svingby, G.** (2007). The use of scoring rubrics: Reliability, validity and educational consequences. *Educational Research Review*, 2(2), 130-144.

**Panadero, E. and Jonsson, A.** (2013). The use of scoring rubrics for formative assessment purposes revisited: A review. *Educational Research Review*, 9, 129-144.

**Panadero, E. and Romero, M.** (2014). To rubric or not to rubric? The effects of self-assessment on self-regulation, performance and self-efficacy. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 21(2), 133-148.

**Reddy, Y.M. and Andrade, H.** (2010). A review of rubric use in higher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 35(4), 435-448.

**Sadler, D.R.** (2009). Indeterminacy in the use of preset criteria for assessment and grading. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 34(2), 159-179.