

GSLIS Assessment Committee Meeting, Oct 18, 2013

MINUTES

Present: Ben Alexander, Roberta Brody, Ping Li, James Marcum, K. B. Ng, Claudia Perry

Issues discussed:

1. We discussed COA's expectations for assessment measures.
 - a. COA expects us to use exact measures; they are less interested in indirect measures like surveys
 - b. Among the measures that appear to meet these criteria are the following:
 - i. The tables laying out course objectives, GSLIS objectives, & assignments ("the grid") in each course syllabus, which can then be used for programmatic assessment
 - ii. ePortfolios presenting student coursework in the GSLIS learning matrix
 - iii. The evaluative exams in all four core courses
 - iv. Potentially SLOAR—use to revise course objectives
2. We submitted a detailed schedule indicating our expected deadlines; what is needed instead is a cyclical timeline by month/season indicating how we plan to use the measures to shape the program
3. This will be used as the basis of a focused Program Presentation with an emphasis on each standard on the planning process
4. The bulk of the meeting addressed issues relating to the Evaluative Exam in the four core courses, using the questions posed by C. Perry via the faculty listserv. These followed up on initial queries regarding the Exam posed by K.B. Ng. After careful examination of the evaluative exams taken by students of core courses in the last semester, the committee believed there were strong deficiencies (in terms of time constraint, difference in emphases of instructors, and implementation logistic) in this method and we recommended not to use this method for program assessment.

Respectfully submitted,

K.B.Ng

Oct 17, 2013

Appendix: Issues regarding the Evaluative Exam

It is difficult to make sure different questions will be administered in different course sections, but all will address the same course learning objective.

It would ideal if the course coordinator worked in consultation with adjuncts and FT faculty teaching the course. Each semester a different course learning objective(s) could be assessed, so that over time, students' grasp of all course learning objectives should have been measured. However, it is very difficult to implement.

Ideally a new exam will be created each semester, comprising two essay questions requiring approximately 40 minutes to complete. However, it increases a lot students' burden at the end of the semester.

Enforcing issue: Core Course Coordinators will need to send a reminder to all faculty teaching course sections in all the four core courses that this evaluative exam is required and must be scheduled at the end of the semester. The Chair will need to issue a stern reminder to all faculty teaching core courses in Week 8 that the exam is required. Course instructors will need to submit the graded exams after grades have been submitted. Grading will be on a Pass/Fail basis.

The exams needed to indicate the name of the instructor so that if there is a differential pass rate by section, it will be clear who taught each section in which perhaps the pass rate was lower.

How we handled students who fail the evaluative exam? Could it be retaken? How many times? Must the student repeat the course to retake the exam? If so, do they pay tuition again?

Does the primary grading responsibility fall to the instructor for that section? Does the course coordinator or the Curriculum Committee or the Assessment Committee have an oversight role?

Further discussion is needed on how much weight the exam will be given in the final grade. For example, if it is 40 minutes and the total final exam lasts for two hours, and the final exam counts for only 10% of the overall grade, this might lessen the degree to which the evaluative exam is taken seriously. A student might do well on the rest of the final exam, but the requirement that the evaluative exam be passed would tend to counter that likelihood.