

PAGE 1

PANEL 1

KARAH

Hello! I'm glad you're here to learn about my pedagogical artifact: an assessment of revision. But first...my inspiration for this comic. I have long suspected that a number of college students don't act on, read or even understand essay feedback.

PANEL 2

KARAH'S VOICE

Over the years, I've begun to question why.

KARAH

So... Um... Did u get a chance to read my feedback?

STUDENT 1

I didn't have time.

STUDENT 2

I couldn't find it.

STUDENT 3

I thought the grade was it!

PANEL 3

KARAH'S VOICE

As revision is a vital part of the writing process, this is a problem. And the problem is not just limited to composition studies.

PAGE 2

PANEL 1

KARAH

Hey, the professor told me you could

revise your last paper on a famous chef. I know you got a low grade, and I'm here to help. Do you plan to revise?

PANEL 2

STUDENT 1

No, I just plan to move on.

STUDENT 2

Me too. Besides...feedback is scary.

FEEDBACK MONSTER

Let me mark your paper!

PANEL 3

KARAH'S VOICE

I can count on one hand the number of students who have claimed laziness as the reason they don't revise. But I strongly suspect other barriers lie beneath that claim. I came to wonder: How can I help students overcome these barriers and value the revision process, thus gaining more room to succeed as writers?

PAGE 3

PANEL 1

KARAH'S VOICE

Assessment creates value in classrooms.

KARAH

This comic is about my metacognitive journey to unearth a pedagogical artifact: an assessment rubric of revision as a discrete part of the writing process.

PANEL 2

KARAH'S VOICE

Along the journey, I found that time and space to teach and practice

revision, providing regular assessment of peer feedback, and designing rubrics in collaboration with students to assess revision...

KARAH

...can enrich students' value for revision and confidence as writers.

FEEDBACK MONSTER

No!

PAGE 4

PANEL 1

KARAH

I'll share my revision process of the part of my original rubric that assessed the students' revision process for a writing portfolio in an advanced ESOL* writing course at the community college level.

*English speakers of other languages

FEEDBACK NOTES ON RUBRIC FROM TOP LEFT TO BOTTOM RIGHT

Wouldn't it make sense to review the process first?

Not part of my artifact.

Do I want students to fill this in?

PAGE 5

PANEL 1

KARAH

I began by examining the nature of the revision process itself.

BUTTERFLY WING

Planning, organizing, goal-setting, translating, evaluating, revising

KARAH'S VOICE

The revision conversation seems to have

gained steam in the 1980s.

BUTTERFLY

Don't worry, no butterfly was harmed.

PANEL 2

KARAH'S VOICE

Researchers wanted to pinpoint observable strategies that mature writers use in revision to help teachers teach and assess revision as part of the writing process.

KARAH

Hmmm... That's exactly what I want my rubric to achieve.

PANEL 3

SOMMERS

Hi! I'm Nancy Sommers.

FLOWER ET AL.

Hello! We're Linda Flower, John Hayes, Linda Carey*, Karen Schriver, and John Hayes.

BRUFFEE

And I'm Kenneth Bruffee.

KARAH'S VOICE

These researchers' theories form the bedrock of values underlying current studies, theories, and best practices today.

*Author was unable to find images of Linda J. Carey for the purposes of illustration.

PAGE 6

PANEL 1

BUTTERFLY WING

Planning, organizing, goal-setting, translating, evaluating, revising.

KARAH'S VOICE

Sommers' study begins with a critique.

SOMMERS

"...the linear models [of the writing process] reduce revision ... To no more than an afterthought" (Sommers, 1980, p.397). "The writing process appears to be more like a seed than a line" (Sommers, 1980, p. 386).

PANEL 2

KARAH'S VOICE

A seed does not grow linearly, at the same rate, or in an orderly fashion.

PANEL 3

KARAH'S VOICE

Sommers found in her study that mature writers had a better sense of their writing as a whole as well as in detail. They better understood the recursive nature of revision, seeing their writing from many angles.

SOMMERS

When students are taught to see and re-see their writing this way, they will revise more successfully.

PAGE 7

PANEL 1

KARAH'S VOICE

In 1986, Flower et al. Conducted a study similar to Sommers'.

FLOWER ET AL

Hmmm....

PANEL 2

FLOWER ET AL

"The key process [in revision] may not be reading but building a working image

of the text" (Flower et al. 1986, p.18).

KARAH

As an artist, I find this idea of revision as closer to seeing rather than reading... intriguing.

PANEL 3

KARAH'S VOICE

I move backwards and forwards in constant effort to gain consonance, balance in the whole piece. This is another useful metaphor.

KARAH

Perhaps understanding will lead to value.

PAGE 8

PANEL 1

KARAH'S VOICE

Being experts in Cognitive Process Theory, Flower et al. (1986) wrote in more detail about the process of revision. They found mature writers have two revision qualities. Knowledge and intention.

PANEL 2

KARAH

A revisor's intention is defined in two parts: a sense of what is being asked and a plan for how to accomplish it.

YOGA TEACHER

Let's move into Ardha Chandrasana.

PANEL 3

KARAH

Ardha Chandrasana = Half moon. 1. Engage core, 2. Push off back foot, 3. Arch back, 4. Lengthen torso, 5. Don't

panic.

PAGE 9

PANEL 1

KARAH

Providing steps to leverage both knowledge and intention in revision, Flower et al. present this useful heuristic based on their research.

FLOWER ET AL

1. Detect problems in a text. 2. Diagnose those problems, 3. Select a strategy to solve the problems.

PANEL 2

KARAH'S VOICE

Detect: man eating chicken; Diagnose: man () eating chicken; Select: man-eating chicken.

PANEL 3

KARAH

For my artifact to work, I need to give students space to practice building the skills for each part of the revision process. Since I'm evaluating them on their abilities to participate in the process, it's only fair I give them space and time.

PAGE 10

PANEL 1

KARAH'S VOICE

So I have begun to take more time throughout the semester to teach revision and where it fits in the writing process.

PANEL 2

SYLLABUS

Most assignments can be revised for a better grade within a time students and I negotiate.

KARAH

I've also given students more space to revise.

COLLEAGUE

But isn't all that re-grading overwhelming?

KARAH

It's not bad actually.... Not everyone revises. And since time is negotiated, students take it more seriously.

PANEL 3

KARAH

I have found that these two practices have normalized revision as part of the writing process rather than a punishment for "failed" writing.

STUDENTS

This is ok.

FEEDBACK MONSTER

But can they participate in the revision process effectively? Rawr!

PAGE 11

PANEL 1

KARAH

One of the most valuable ways of re-seeing or revision is in peer review.

BRUFFEE

"Writing is not an inherently private act but a displaced social active we perform in private for the sake of convenience" (Bruffee, 1980, p.745).

KARAH'S VOICE

Peer review makes the social nature of writing... visible.

PANEL 2

KARAH'S VOICE

Building knowledge and intention collaboratively, we can explore many kinds of writing and make room for more voices.

STUDENT 1

Why did you put that flower there?

PANEL 3

SCOTT AND INOUE

Students will value the process more because they are empowered to participate in it.

BRUFFEE

The teacher is decentered as the only voice of instruction too!

KARAH

But does peer review lead to better writing?

PAGE 12

PANEL 1

KARAH'S VOICE

To test for a correlation between peer review and improved writing, Lundstrom and Baker (2009) conducted the following study.

STUDENT 1

Read, give no feedback

STUDENT 2

Read, give feedback

LUNDSTROM AND BAKER
Interesting.

PANEL 2

LUNDSTROM AND BAKER
We found it was better for low-level,
L2 writers to give feedback, especially
on global errors, than to receive
feedback.

SOMMERS
"...the evidence from my research
suggests that it is not that students
are unwilling to revise, but rather
they do what they have been taught to
do in a consistently narrow and
predictable way" (Sommers, 1980,
p.383).

STUDENT 1
Giving feedback helps me revise my own
writing!

STUDENT 2
Thanks!

PANEL 3

KARAH
So, students writers need to be trained
to evaluate others' writing in a less
linear fashion in order to see their
writing through others' eyes?

LUNDSTROM AND BAKER
Exactly!

PAGE 13

PANEL 1

KARAH'S VOICE
So, my pedagogical artifact creates
value for this practice of building
knowledge and intention by
collaborative learning in peer review
which improves one's ability to see

one's own writing through others' eyes.
But I'd like to hear more about
training student writers to give
feedback so I can more fairly assess
them.

PAGE 14

PANEL 1

KARAH'S VOICE

A few years after Lundstrom and Baker's
study, Cho and MacArthur (2011)
conducted a similar study to test their
hypothesis of "Learning by Reviewing."

CONDITIONS:

Reading: students read peer work in
genre; Reviewing: reading and
commenting on a peer's work in the
genre; Control: reading various other
texts.

PANEL 2

CHO

We trained students in the reviewing
condition to use a genre-based rubric
as a map to evaluating student writing
and giving feedback.

MACARTHUR

And the reviewing students' writing
improved the most! This is because
"peer reviewing requires students not
only rate peers' writing but also
provide comments that explain
particular problems and suggest
solutions" (Cho & MacArthur, 2011,
p.78).

PANEL 3

STUDENT 1

Will you give me feedback?

STUDENT 2

Of course!

KARAH

Hmmm... I'd like to hear more about using a rubric to evaluate a specific genre....

PAGE 15

PANEL 1

KARAH

There are many definitions of what a genre is.

PARFITT

I think genre can be defined as a specific form of discourse within a specific context with specific rhetorical choices (Parfitt, 2012).

PANEL 2

PHILIPPAKOS AND MACARTHUR

We define genre more specifically as types of writing that have a specific organizational structure (Philippakos & MacArthur, 2016).

PHILIPPAKOS AND PARFITT

We both affirm the need for specific instruction in genre helps student writers to give successful feedback in peer review (Philippakos & Parfitt, 2017).

MACARTHUR

Ouch.

PANEL 3

PHILIPPAKOS

I worked collaboratively with student to build rubrics evaluating genre elements (Philippakos, 2017).

STUDENT 1

Your flower is missing some teeth. (I wonder if mine is missing teeth too?)

KARAH'S VOICE

Results: Genre knowledge + rubric = better writing (Philippakos, 2017).

PAGE 16

PANEL 1

KARAH'S VOICE

I've been taking time to teach peer review using genre rubrics in my advanced ESOL writing classes. There have been some interesting takeaways.

STUDENTS

Not too close.

KARAH

See the parts of good feedback?

GOOD FEEDBACK RUBRIC

Describe, Evaluate, Suggest. (ELI Review) Doesn't bite!

FLOWER ET AL

This resembles our heuristic.

PANEL 2

KARAH'S VOICE

I was surprised by the extent students don't know what a rubric is...or how to use one.

STUDENT 1

We don't use these in my country.

STUDENT 2

I've been out of school so long, I don't remember this.

KARAH'S VOICE

More space and time was necessary than I thought to build knowledge of this

assessment and teaching tool. And time to practice too. But it is worth it.

PANEL 3

KARAH'S VOICE

Understanding how to use a rubric empowers students to give better feedback and...to value each others' feedback more because I give them feedback on their feedback so they can grow.

STUDENTS

If I were the teacher....

KARAH

I also get valuable data on what the students have learned.

FEEDBACK MONSTER

Since simply teaching what rubrics are is so tough, good luck writing them collaboratively!

PAGE 17

PANEL 1

KARAH

Collaborative building of a genre-based rubric leads to increased student engagement as well as recognition of audience and genre.

FEEDBACK NOTES ON RUBRIC FROM TOP LEFT TO BOTTOM RIGHT

Still thinking I want students to fill this in? Part of whole essay assessment. Is this harsh? Should "0" be on the rubric?

KARAH

Being part of the larger writing assignment, my artifact has value. But how can I keep the assessment itself from being another scary thing?

FEEDBACK MONSTER
Paper! Mark! Paper!

PAGE 18

PANEL 1

ADSANATHAM

The answer lies in collaborative assessment! (Adsanatham, 2012).

INOUE

"I have tried to [empower students to evaluate their own writing] by engaging them in the full cycle of writing assessments" (Inoue, 2015, p.17).

PANEL 2

INOUE

Have students participate in revising the rubric itself!

PHILIPPAKOS

"Once students have developed, with the support of the teacher, an understanding of the genre elements and relevant evaluation criteria, they can co-develop with their teacher evaluation criteria for other writing tasks" (Philippakos, 2017, p.17).

PANEL 3

ADSANATHAM

"By involving students in the grading process, I want to help them see that their voice matter and can make a difference in their learning environment as well as society at large" (Adsanatham, 2012, p.156).

PAGE 19

PANEL 1

KARAH

In fall 2019, I tried collaborative rubric-building in my advanced ESOL writing class for the first time. It was strange to leave my old rubric behind in hopes of unearthing a new one.

PANEL 2

KARAH'S VOICE

It was quite an adventure: Read about genre elements; Look at strong and weak examples; Build a simple rubric together; Peer Review, revise, repeat.

PHILIPPAKOS

This was adapted from my work!

PAGE 20

PANEL 1

STUDENT 1

We have the skills to see and revise genre elements for ourselves.

STUDENT 2

Because we understand the genre and how to evaluate it, we can access new speech communities and maybe change the rules!

STUDENT 3

We are better able to help each other and that makes feedback less scary because we are using standards we created or found together.

STUDENT 4

We have confidence that we can transfer these skills of seeing genre elements to other kinds of writing!

STUDENT 5

We are empowered to give valuable feedback!

REVISION MONSTER

Mark paper, not me!

KARAH

Besides these comments paraphrased from student feedback after participating in collaborative rubric building and assessment, students said they felt a strong sense of community. For me, it was the strongest community I had encountered in a writing class...ever. #Winning.

PANEL 2

KARAH'S VOICE

The pedagogical artifact we unearthed led to stronger feedback, increased value for revision, and more confident writers. I hope future efforts at assessing revision this way will demonstrate significantly stronger finished writing too.

PAGE 21

PANEL 1

KARAH'S VOICE

This pedagogical artifact, an assessment of revision as a discrete part of the writing process, produces value for revision and confidence in student writers when it is a living document. Like Sommers' seed, it is only a beginning. A space we all, as part of the learning community construct. It takes time, but teaching students the genre of assessment cultivates their ability to critically and creatively assess their own writing and value giving and receiving of feedback. Revision becomes a garden of discourse in which communities can grow...open and accessible to all.