Name: Michelle Allen  Faculty Assignment: Composition Learning Outcomes Assessment (Third Reader)

Note: Please take a moment to review the letter you received from the Office of the Provost. That letter describes your faculty assignment in detail. As you complete this document, please refer to the specific tasks that you were asked to complete.

Section 1: Report of Accomplishments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Accomplishments</th>
<th>List and briefly describe the most significant impact of your accomplishments.</th>
<th>List and briefly describe any barriers you encountered.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Composition Learning Outcomes Assessment</td>
<td>I completed my assignment on June 28, 2014. I reviewed the agreement rates for EN 097 and EN 101 essays and evaluated the essays with a split score. EN 097 readers reached 90% agreement after reading the first ten essays and did not require additional rubric training. I read and scored three EN 097 essays. EN 101 readers reached 80% agreement after an additional conversation about plagiarism and research conventions. I read and scored sixteen EN 101 essays.</td>
<td>This is a valuable opportunity for faculty to reflect on the Learning Outcomes for the courses they teach. My work on the LOA project is directly related to what I do in the classroom, so it improves my teaching and lesson planning. This project gives me a holistic sense of student writing (common strengths and weaknesses) and I'm able to anticipate which areas I need to spend more time on. For EN 101 this fall, this means more instruction on research skills, citations, and proper acknowledgement and integration of source material.</td>
<td>The EN 101 readers required an additional discussion about the rubric because we encountered two plagiarized essays in the first set of ten, making our initial rate of agreement 60%. We were able to come to a consensus after discussing where we saw evidence of plagiarism in each essay. Next spring, we might consider discussing what readers should look for when making the determination about plagiarism during our training session. (This varies from essay to essay. Plagiarism might mean a lack of in-text citations, a missing Works Cited page, in-text citations not matching the Works Cited page, information from a source that is not paraphrased correctly, etc.) 101 readers had to make several tough calls about plagiarized essays.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 2 – Reflect on your EOL/Release work this semester and respond to the three items below.

| Please list and describe no more than three activities or accomplishments that went particularly well. | The first and second readers for both EN 097 and EN 101 worked efficiently to meet deadlines. Both groups communicated frequently via email. We’ve developed strong working relationships that we can carry into the academic year.

The training session was a valuable professional development opportunity. We discussed the rubric in great detail and whether sample papers passed each category (ideas/content, organization, style, and conventions). It’s helpful to evaluate papers for each composition course (EN 097, 100, 101, 102) because it gives us a sense of the exiting outcomes for all classes in the composition sequence. Many people tend to focus on teaching one or two courses, and it’s helpful to meet with other instructors who teach classes we are less familiar with, as this generates meaningful discussion. |

| Please list and describe how your particular efforts could have been better supported. | The Program Review Committee supported readers throughout the reading and scoring process. When I had a question, I received an answer within a few hours. |

| Please use this space to document any other concerns, suggestions, or comments. | It may be helpful to have more English faculty on board with SafeAssign. We know that there is a high rate of plagiarism (whether intentional or unintentional), and this interferes with our LOA results since many essays are disqualified. We would likely have more accurate data if we could evaluate 50 essays that had no evidence of plagiarism. While we need a random sample, it might be worth discussing whether we should run essays through SafeAssign before readers score them. (Or, require sections that have to submit essays at the end of the semester to also submit these papers to SafeAssign).

The transition to scoring online made this process more efficient for readers. Readers were saved at least two trips back to campus since everything was available online. As the Third Reader, I completed my work more quickly since I did not have to drive to campus to pick up paper copies of the scores, and I could immediately start scoring one the first two readers emailed me their results. Anthony (Tony) Dykema-VanderArk created online scoring forms for our work this summer, and I appreciate all of his efforts to make this process more efficient. |