

AI Writing & Human Review

Dr. Trevor C. Meyer, Ph.D.

Asst. Professor, Dept. of Language, Literature, & Writing

tmeyer@nwmissouri.edu

Presentation Contents

- Background & Goals
- Writing Process, AI Tools
- A Process Report Memo
 - Meet or Exceed the Paragons (2 parts now)
- Peer Review Ethics & Expectations
- Re-Writing Assignment Sequence
 - Peer Review, Partner Evaluation,
 - Eval Average, Self-Awareness Reflection
- Q&A

Background & Goals

- Asst. Professor of Rhetoric & Professional Writing
 - Year 7, waiting for March...
- Writing Studies & Rhetoric
 - Expository writing, “more than English class stuff”; theory and history (10,000-year perspective)
- Advent of AI, Writing as Technology
 - Forces at work hostile to my position, but like all great technological changes, rhetoricians adapt
 - Agnostic/Cynical Approach to AI: No tools are ideologically neutral; radical changes to Labor
 - Been working on it myself, Prompt Engineering Course in the future AI Minor

Writing Process, AI Tools

- Writing as a Process
 - Invention, Arrangement, Drafting, Revision, Editing; (*we all do this already*)
 - Various versions from 700 bce to now: Canons of Rhetoric, Arts of Composition, Post-Process
- Rhetorical Concerns: Audience, Purpose, Context
 - *Central to Prompt Engineering too: ethos/audience; purpose; genre, medium, mode, format)*
- Post-Process
 - Recursive and Dynamic, not simply linear; e.g. *finding new sources following a review from peer.*
 - Individual, but Conventional; like the rest of communication, balancing *haecceity* and *nomos*
 - Genres, Disciplinary concerns, Style, and Audience dynamics, all affect the Process

Writing Process, AI Tools

- AI takes over Process (*post-human, post-truth too*)
 - For Invention: “brainstorming” or “getting ideas” (prevents practice in idea generation)
 - For Drafting: content generation (common in industry, but the main struggle of writing, for me)
 - For Revision: changing format, changing the text itself: style, voice, tone, length, detail. (anything!)
 - For Reading, annotating, summarizing; e.g. turning articles into podcasts, create study guides.
- AI Writing exploits the Difficulty of Writing, the Reward of Economy
 - So, it can be used from start-to-finish, with no human work beyond prompt engineering!
 - When used well, it can be indistinguishable from human writing; prompt tuning for “humanizing”
 - So far, I’ve noticed the more students lean on it, the worse it all is (surprise, surprise)
 - Since “Efficient Content Delivery” is a strong motivator, that’s how Power Goes...

Process Memo, Paragons

- Establish Bounds to Work
 - It's not enough to have a satisfactory product, but proof of the process
 - Writing as/is a form of thinking; reward working in that way; *more hardcopy work too...*
- Process Report Memo
 - *See attached*
- Pass the Paragon: the following examples provide the “minimal passing effort”
- Paragon of Writing Process, Paragon of AI Usage
 - *See attached.*

Re-Writing Assignment Sequence

- Peer Review Protocol
 - *See Attached*
- Partner Evaluation
- Eval Average
- Self-Awareness Reflection

Peer Review Rubric

Criteria	Ratings					Pts
Comments How well was this assignment Reviewed with Margin Comments?	7 pts Excellent Includes 10+ Comments with substantial suggestions	5.6 pts Not Bad! Includes 8+ Comments with substantial suggestions, or more Comments with minimal substance	4.2 pts Attempted Includes at least 7 Comments, but fails to provide much substantial feedback	2.8 pts Minimal Minimal and/or ineffective comments	0 pts No Try Not submitted.	7 pts
Edits & Revision Suggestions How well was this assignment Reviewed, as Track Changes?	7 pts Excellent Revision suggestions show attention was paid to entire document	5.6 pts Not Bad! Review is completed pretty well, but more attention could be paid to parts of the document.	4.2 pts Attempted Review is attempted but fails to address most of the document.	2.8 pts Minimal Minimal review attempted	0 pts No Try Not submitted.	7 pts

Peer Review Rubric

<p>Tone & Support</p> <p>How supportive and critical was the review? How did it balance kindness and honesty?</p>	<p>7 to >0 pts</p> <p>Kindness & Honesty</p> <p>This holistic score captures the tone of your review.</p>				<p>0 pts</p> <p>No Try</p> <p>Not submitted.</p>	<p>7 pts</p>
<p>End Comment</p> <p>How well did the End Comment accomplish its Purpose?</p>	<p>4 pts</p> <p>4/4 Parts</p> <p>Your End Comment is included, it meets the Target Range, It provides major points or themes from the review, and it includes your Secret Identity.</p>	<p>3 pts</p> <p>3/4 Parts</p> <p>Your End Comment is included, but it is missing one of the following: making the Target Range, major points or themes from the review, or it includes your Secret Identity.</p>	<p>2 pts</p> <p>2/4 Parts</p> <p>Your End Comment is included, but it is missing 2 of the following: it meets the Target Range, It provides major points or themes from the review, and/or it includes your Secret Identity.</p>	<p>1 pts</p> <p>1/4 Parts</p> <p>End Comment is included, but it doesn't meet the Target Range, provide major points, or include your Secret Identity</p>	<p>0 pts</p> <p>No Try</p> <p>Not submitted.</p>	<p>4 pts</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Total Points: 25</p>						

Partner Evaluation

You will use the Scoring Guide below to evaluate both yourself and your classmates. Also, you must explain and justify your evaluations with substantial claims, effective evidence, and reasonable reasoning.

Peer Review Scoring Guide

- 5 Feedback was very helpful, thorough, and detailed. Excellent work here!
- 4 Feedback was mostly helpful, some places needing some more. Well done!
- 3 Feedback as a little helpful, but could be better in some ways. Solid effort!
- 2 Feedback wasn't much help at all, lacking detail, but they were trying!
- 1 Feedback was minimal, confusing, lacking effort. Not much help at all!
- 0 Peer Review not Completed. Instructor will track this.

Each review and reviewer will be different, so take each on their own terms, and respond to it accordingly. Give your reviewers the same respect you want to receive. Be as honest as you need to, and as kind as you can.

This feedback will be shared anonymously with each Partner, and in the Peer Feedback Assignment, you will also receive an average score. This system works best when everyone fully participates, but missing Evaluations will not be factored into feedback.

If you're concerned about your feedback from classmates, please see me, but if you're not doing well enough for your classmates, you'll most likely need to modify your approach.

Failure to meet a Question's Required Length will result in a 10-point compounding penalty for this Assignment.

Partner Evaluation: Self-Eval

Question 1

1 pts

Use the Scoring Guide below to provide **what you expect your Average Evaluation** to be.

Peer Review Scoring Guide

- 5 Feedback was very helpful, thorough, and detailed. Excellent work here!
- 4 Feedback was mostly helpful, some places needing some more. Well done!
- 3 Feedback as a little helpful, but could be better in some ways. Solid effort!
- 2 Feedback wasn't much help at all, lacking detail, but they were trying!
- 1 Feedback was minimal, confusing, lacking effort. Not much help at all!
- 0 Peer Review not Completed. Please note, but Instructor will track this.

☐ 5

☐ 4

☐ 3

☐ 2

☐ 1

Question 2

1 pts

For this question, **reflect on how helpful you think you were as a reviewer, and explain and justify your contributions** in at least 300 words.

It's important to thoroughly reflect on and account for your own effort, before you evaluate your partners. and make sure to identify what you could and/or might do differently.

Edit View Insert Format Tools Table

12pt ▾ Paragraph ▾ | **B** *I* U **A** ▾  ▾ T^2 ▾ | :

p



0 words

</>



Partner Evaluation: Self-Eval Qs

1. Use the Scoring Guide to provide what you expect your Average Evaluation to be;
2. Reflect on how helpful you think you were as a reviewer, and explain and justify your contributions in at least 300 words.

Reminder: It's important to thoroughly reflect on and account for your own effort, before you evaluate your partners. and make sure to identify what you could and/or might do differently.

Partner Evaluation: Scoring Peers Qs

1. Who was your first Peer Reviewer? *(Repeated with each Peer)*
2. What is their Score on the Peer Review Scoring Guide?
3. Provide a detailed and specific defense of your score of at least 100 words. Remember, these comments will be provided anonymously to your peer.

Eval Average Score

- I provide the Partner Evaluation comments, scores, and their average out of 5.
 - Sometimes I've synthesized, sometimes I've revised, sometimes I left it as is.
- The most controversial, but most realistic of the Re-Writing Assignments: evaluation grade
 - "General Classmate" is a good audience to practice with, develop "professionalism"
 - If something isn't working, then folks need to be made aware; however, "they hate me!"
 - Without this pressure, many folks won't even complete peer review; "make them do it!"
- This semester, it's worth the same as a Peer Review (x3 per Draft), so less grade impact

Self-Awareness Reflection

One of the most challenging parts of writing, and life really, is that what we intend to do doesn't always match up with what we did. How we think we are with others isn't always how others view us, and while our knowledge can never be perfect, working to better understand ourselves and how we are read as writers (and as people) is very valuable. That is, writing can help us be better humans!

Therefore, you will review and explain your Self-Evaluation and the Average Score you received from your Partner Evaluations, then compare them and explain the difference between them. Use this information to keep doing what you do well and/or modify your approach in future reviews.

Failure to meet Required Length on a Question will result in a 10-point penalty to this Assignment.

- Questions 1 & 3 are linked to the other assignments
- Questions 2 & 4 are Essay, with 100 words minimum each
- Question 5 involves math, Questions 6 & 7 are 200 words minimum.

Self-Awareness Reflection Qs

1. What did you Score yourself in the Self-Evaluation part (Q1 & 2) of the Peer Review Partner Evaluation?
2. Paraphrase your Self-Evaluation to explain why you gave yourself that Score.
3. What was the Average Score you received from your Partners in your Partner Feedback?
4. Paraphrase and condense your Partner Eval feedback to explain why you earned your Average Score.
5. What is your Average Score minus your Self-Eval Score? (*"it's not fair, this isn't math class"*)
6. Is the difference positive (meaning you did better than you thought, e.g. +1) or negative (meaning you did worse than you thought, e.g. -1)? Why do you think that is?
7. Based on the difference between your Average & Self-Eval, what did you do well and what do you need to do differently in the future Reviews?

Thanks for listening!

Any questions?