

English 1C Consistency Project: Norming Workshop

October 4, 2013

In attendance: Gene Armao (workshop leader), Leeanne Bergeron, Ron Brutti, Mary Duffield (Compton), Elise Geraghty (associate dean), Lauren Gras (Compton), Jeremy Hector, Chelsea Henson, Delia Juarez (Compton), Laura Knox, Tom Lew (dean), Stephanie Merz, Thomas Norton (Compton), Ruth Roach (Compton), Kim Runkle, Ryan Shiroma, Jennifer Triplett (Compton), Stephan Waterworth, Nikki Williams (Compton)

Rubric Review

- Gene noted that while the current rubric shows one SLO, that one SLO has been broken into three:
 - **Students will compose an argumentative essay that shows an ability to support a claim using analysis, elements of argumentation, and integration of primary and secondary sources.**
 - **This argument will also reflect students' ability to identify and assess bias, credibility, and relevance in their own arguments and in the arguments of others, including primary and secondary outside sources.**
 - **The essay will be well organized in proper MLA format and will also be technically correct in paragraph composition, sentence structure, grammar, spelling, and usage.**
- The faculty members focused on the line between passing and not passing (C vs. D/F).
- A couple of typos were noted (and will be fixed) on the rubric.
- Several faculty noted that the rubric does not address critical thinking or analysis, both of which are in SLO #1.

Review of assignment criteria and prompt

- The faculty reviewed the 1C SLO-aligned assignment criteria and the prompt that was used for the sample essays and agreed to use the assignment criteria and the rubric when evaluating the sample essays.

Norming

- The faculty, working individually, read each of three essays and assigned a grade to each. The facilitator selected the essays so that one would likely be an A/B essay, one a C/C- essay, and one a failing essay. Fifteen faculty members participated in the norming; the results were as follows:

Essay	A	B	C	D/F
Doe/Cloning (A/B)	6	4	3	2
Public/Drugs (C/C-)	0	4	9	2
Student/Family (D/F)	0	0	4	11

The Results

The results showed the following:

- The biggest discrepancies were found in the “strongest” essay: most faculty members agreed it was a passing essay (13/15), but the quality of the pass was up for debate.
- The borderline C essay showed that most faculty (13) agreed that the essay was passing, though some considered it a B rather than a C.
- The failing essay showed the most disagreement in terms of whether the essay was a pass or fail (a focus of our workshop). Four faculty members felt it was a low C while 11 saw the essay as clearly failing.

Analysis of Results

- A follow up conversation revealed that while some faculty members were focused on mechanics, topic sentences, and quotation integration, others were equally focused on analysis and demonstration of critical thinking. It was noted that the rubric includes no analysis/critical thinking, and a discussion of a need to revise the rubric followed.
- If the SLOs include a skill to be assessed, faculty agreed that such a skill should be addressed in the rubric.
- The faculty will revisit these issues during the follow-up post-semester meeting to discuss the results.

The meeting ended with Elise reminding faculty that they are to collect two copies of all student essays so that one can be returned to the student and one can be retained for our records. More directions for SLO assessment will be emailed and slotted.