

English 1B Consistency Project: Norming Workshop

October 18, 2013

In attendance: Kate Collins, Dana Crotwell, Ashley Gallagher, Elise Geraghty (associate dean), Nancy Guimaraes (Compton), Jeff Jung, Mary Ann Leiby (workshop leader), Tom Lew (dean), Christina Nagao, Thomas Norton (Compton), Ruth Roach (Compton), Chelvi Subramaniam (Compton), Laura Welsh, Rachel Williams (workshop leader)

Review of Rubric and Revised SLOs

- A couple of typos were noted (and will be fixed) on the rubric.
- The newly expanded SLOs were presented with the rubric and discussion led to clarifying revisions. For example, the term “identify” led to confusion, and the faculty agreed that the SLO-aligned assignment should assess the student’s ability to *analyze* literary elements rather than merely to identify them (which is naturally built into analysis). Also, because the new C-ID descriptors include in the objectives the need for students to “research appropriate primary *and secondary* sources,” faculty have incorporated secondary sources into SLO #3 and now must align the rubric with this added objective/SLO.
- The three 1B SLOs will now read as follows: *Upon successful completion of English 1B, students will be able to:*
 1. write an out-of-class, thesis-driven essay that effectively analyzes the literary elements of a primary text (such as plot, theme, setting, point of view, character, style, symbol, poetic devices, etc.).
 2. effectively incorporate quotes from a primary text.
 3. effectively utilize scholarly sources as secondary support.
- The rubric will require modifying in order to be consistent with the new SLOs. Rachel W. and Mary Ann will make the revisions and present to faculty for approval at the end of the assessment.

Review of assignment criteria and prompt

- The faculty reviewed the 1B SLO-aligned assignment criteria and the prompt that was used for the sample essays and agreed to use the assignment criteria and the SLO checklist when evaluating the five sample essays, which were selected to represent a range of grades (A-D/F).

Norming

- The 1B assessment leaders directed the faculty to use the rubric in order to assign each essay a grade and the SLO checklist to determine whether or not each SLO was met.
- *Several of the 12 participating faculty members noted that the term “identify” threw them off when deciding whether or not the student had at least partially met SLO 1; the subsequent decision to remove “identify” from the SLO was made. Also, the list in the parenthesis of SLO 1 caused some confusion, and a discussion led to the decision to use “such as” to preface the list as students should not be expected to analyze all of the listed items. The revised SLO checklist will be sent to all faculty for the actual assessment.

SLO Check Form

English 1B

SLO 1	Essay effectively analyzes the literary elements of a primary text (plot, theme, setting, point of view, character, style, symbol, poetic devices, etc.)	Acceptable Unacceptable
SLO 2	Essay effectively incorporates quotations from a primary text.	Acceptable Unacceptable
SLO 3	Essay effectively utilizes scholarly sources as secondary support.	Acceptable Unacceptable

Results of October 18 English 1B norming using SLO Check Form

Essay	SLO 1		SLO2		SLO3	
	acceptable	unacceptable	acceptable	unacceptable	acceptable	unacceptable
Doe-Eyed (<i>Yellow Wallpaper</i>)	10	2	12	0	11	1
Doe (<i>Frankenstein</i>)	8	4	2	10	0	12
Schmoe ("Misery")	9	3	12	0	10	2
Pseudonym ("Trifles")	7	5	1	11	0	12
Anonymous (<i>Andre's Mother</i>)	11	1	11	1	12	0

vs.

Results of October 18 English 1B norming using English 1B grading rubric

Essay	A	B	C	D/F
Doe-Eyed (<i>Yellow Wallpaper</i>)	0	6	5	1
Doe (<i>Frankenstein</i>)	0	0	0	12
Schmoe ("Misery")	5	2	2	3
Pseudonym ("Trifles")	0	0	0	12
Anonymous (<i>Andre's Mother</i>)	4	7	1	0

The Results

- For the strongest essay (Anonymous/*Andre's Mother*), faculty agreement regarding Pass/Fail is fairly consistent. Using the grading rubric, all 12 faculty members agreed the essay was passing, and 11 of those gave it an A/B. The SLO checklist was very consistent as well—SLO 1 and SLO 2 were deemed acceptable by 11/12 faculty members, and SLO 3 was deemed unanimously acceptable.
- The weakest essay (Pseudonym/"Trifles") was unanimously voted as a D/F essay, and using the SLO checklist, faculty found it 100% unacceptable for SLO 3, largely unacceptable for SLO 2 (11/12), but SLO 1 was divided with 7 finding it acceptable and 5 finding it unacceptable. It was later discovered that faculty were "giving credit" for the identifying (even if not analyzing) of literary elements. All later agreed that identifying should not be the goal for English 1B, which is why the faculty agreed to eliminate the term from the SLO.
- The other weak essay (Doe/*Frankenstein*) also yielded a unanimous fail using the grading rubric, but, like "Trifles" yielded some inconsistency in the assessment of SLO 1 and SLO 2, some of which was better understood after discussing the presence of the term "identify" in SLO 1.

- SLO 1, in fact, yielded the most disagreement—a tweaking of SLO 1 might improve the consistency.

Analysis of Results

- Workshop participants found that in terms of pass/fail, they are fairly consistent. The faculty acknowledge that the language on the SLO might need some tweaking to increase consistency. We will discuss further at our post-assessment workshop.