

# Reading Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

## February 4, 2016

**Attendees:** Robin Arehart, Matt Cheung, Susan Corbin, Pete Marcoux, Rose Ann Cerofeci, Judy Crozier

### Agenda

#### 1. English 82 pilot results

- We discussed the results of the annotation pilot from fall 2015. All instructors agreed that the annotation was valuable and that the exercise is something we should add to the assessment.
- <https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1JrmRSrClhxeDj2cXmP3cD8108jtUjqeq-K8taUUrtI/edit?usp=sharing>  
According to the results (linked above), the students passed the new SLO 1. The only standard that did not meet department expectations was “locate two supporting details.” However, students only needed to meet three of the four markers to pass the SLO.
- The discussion about the results indicated that there are challenges associated with consistency. Each instructor administered and graded the test somewhat differently. The rubric was helpful, but raised many legitimate questions and concerns:
  - i. Do we write the instructions on the test? How explicit?
  - ii. Do we provide a different sheet or administer it on a different day?
  - iii. What types of questions /comments are needed for credit?
  - iv. Should we require supporting details from one particular paragraph that we identify or can they highlight any supporting details?
  - v. Can they highlight the same vocabulary words that are assessed on the multiple choice portion of the test or should they identify two different words?
- These questions prompted further discussion on the purpose of annotation. If the students are identifying the main idea, vocabulary and supporting details by answering the questions, can't it be assumed that they are able to identify them in the text?

#### 2. Next Steps

- The team realized that there are many questions to be answered, but also felt that annotation is a positive component of the test and should be implemented.

- To reconcile the issues, we decided to move forward with training the faculty on this new component using the simple rubric that was created. In doing so, we will allow faculty to use some personal judgment when assessing the outcomes. However, a faculty norming session will be conducted next year to ensure consistency. The faculty will have to grade and implement the assessment before we can make those decisions.
  
- The annotation project will include the following instructions:
  - i. All students will annotate the same passage
  - ii. Instructions for grading will be placed on the test
  - iii. Instructors will use the rubric created for the pilot
  - iv. Pete will collect data on a spreadsheet
  - v. Norming will take place after implementation