

English 1C Consistency Project: Norming Workshop

October 9, 2013

In attendance: Barbara Jaffe (workshop leader), Sue Bachmann, Kevin Degnan, Elise Geraghty (associate dean), Tom Lew (dean), Jeff McMahon, Meagan Madigan, Shannon Sims, Cindy Tino-Sandoval, Joy Zhao

Review of Rubric and Revised SLOs

- A couple of typos were noted (and will be fixed) on the rubric.
 - There was much discussion about the wording of SLO #2, the “critical thinking SLO.” Some felt that the current language might be too specific and that “such as” language might allow more flexibility in assessment. All agreed to revisit this after the final assessment and consider revision at that time.
1. **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.**
 2. **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.**
 3. **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.**

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 SLO checklist when evaluating the sample essays.

Norming

- Providing a comparison to the October 4 1C workshop, Kevin Degnan piloted the new SLO check forms for assessment:

SLO Check Form

English 1C

SLO 1 (Thesis, Support)	Essay <u>shows an ability to support a claim using analysis, elements of argumentation, and integration of primary and secondary sources.</u>	Acceptable Unacceptable
SLO 2 (Critical Thinking)	Argument <u>reflects an 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.</u>	Acceptable Unacceptable
SLO 3 (MLA, grammar)	Essay is <u>well organized in proper MLA format</u> and is <u>technically correct in paragraph composition, sentence structure, grammar, spelling, and usage.</u>	Acceptable Unacceptable

The 7 participating faculty members used the new SLO check form. In terms of pass/fail, the results were fairly consistent with those of the October 4 norming, for which faculty members used the grading rubric.

Results of October 9 norming using SLO Check Form

Essay (estimated grade)	SLO 1		SLO2		SLO3	
	acceptable	unacceptable	acceptable	unacceptable	acceptable	unacceptable
Doe/Cloning (A/B)	7	0	7	0	7	0
Public/Drugs (C/C-)	5	2	2	4	4	3
Student/Family (D/F)	0	7	0	7	0	7

vs.

Results of October 4 norming using English 1C rubric

Essay (estimated grade)	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

- For the strongest essay (Doe), faculty agreement regarding pass/fail or acceptable/unacceptable was consistent. Using the SLO checklist, faculty were in 100% agreement that the essay was acceptable. Using the rubric/grades, the majority (86%) deemed the essay to be passing while the minority (13%) deemed it a failing essay.
- The marginal essay (Public) revealed the most variety in faculty assessment. Using the SLO checklist, the majority found the essay acceptable for SLO 1 and SLO 3, but SLO 2 yielded the opposite: the majority found that the essay did not meet SLO 2, the “critical thinking SLO.” Using the rubric/grading, the faculty were divided: 86% gave it passing grade while 13% gave it a failing grade. While the essay was marginal, most considered it a marginally *passing* essay.
- The weakest essay (Student) was found unanimously unacceptable by faculty using the SLO checklist. The majority of the faculty (73%) using the grading rubric gave the essay a failing grade, but 4 faculty members (26%) gave it a low C.

Analysis of Results

The SLO checklist yielded results fairly consistent with those of the grading rubric. The rubric, lacking a clear a description of critical thinking standards, should be revisited during Course Review.

