Welcome

Chair Dr. Lynch called the meeting to order and welcomed guests.

Presentation on Informational Literacy- Jami Yazdani and Kerry Cotter

Mr. Cotter distributed a document which described a new rubric created by the college librarians to help academic divisions map their courses to student learning outcomes for NOVA’s Information Literacy General Education Goal.

Course Content Summaries (CCSs) are used in lieu of the impracticality of reviewing the syllabi for each section of a course in order to determine what opportunities exist for students to achieve any General Education Goal. The rubric is meant to be used holistically to identify the potential a course has for addressing SLOs and then includes specific practices and the mastery expected in a given course. He also indicated that a plan is being developed to provide a best practices “how to tools” for all faculty.

Committee members suggested that it would be beneficial for clusters to see how their courses met these informational literacy goals and to see if faculty are following the suggested practices. It was felt that this rubric could be used to help disciplines improve their course content summaries and to think about and explicitly acknowledge informational literacy goals their courses were meeting.

Ms. Yazdani presented a power point on a project the Annandale LTR Artifact Assessment Committee (LTRAAC) is doing with the Annandale English Department Composition Program.
Assessment Working Group (CPAWG). CPAWG assesses a random sampling of final essays from both ENG 111 College Composition and ENG 112 College Composition II courses each year. LTRAAC was granted access to compare essays of students receiving library instruction and/or Writing Center support to those not receiving these services to assess service effectiveness and learning outcomes. A rubric was designed to determine what library services were used if they were appropriate for every topic area within English 111 and 112 and includes a recommendation section that maps directly to library services that are determined to be needed. Each essay is anonymized and assigned to 2 members of LTRAAC at random for scoring and only co-chairs have access to student and course data to determine whether services were used. In Spring of 2014, CPAWG shared 48 ENG 112 essays (from Fall 2013) with LTRAAC. Six of 48 students had used Writing Center services. For Fall 2014, CPAWG shared 113 ENG 111 essays (from Spring 2014) with LTRAAC and 14 of 113 students had used Writing Center services and 44 of 113 students had library instruction for the course associated with that essay. They found that students did slightly better if they visited the Writing Center and met the assignment requirements. Many of the students who take advantage of the writing center are already good students with grades generally moving from B’s to A’s.

Moving forward results will be used to evaluate the level of the library instruction program. They will continue to work with CPAWG and will look for opportunities for collaboration and additional assessments and expansion to other departments. The overall goal is to assess library instruction and then work with faculty to tailor library instruction to the specific course. They also hope to look at reference assistance in the libraries themselves, to see whether students who receive this assistance do better. Finally, they will hope to then look at whether library instruction increases retention.

A question arose over how information literacy is currently evaluated. Ms. Yazdani reported that the current VCCS practice requires 50 volunteer students to take the Madison assessment, which is also a SHEV requirement. The college is currently looking at what else NOVA can do in addition to the Madison assessment, which they feel is not as good as it could be and does not include sufficient numbers of students to be statistically valid. More extensive assessments will require the support of OIR.

Dr. Lynch reported that Manassas has a Writing Center referral form for students in English classes. Some faculty are specifying in their syllabus that students can be required to visit the Writing Center. The Writing Center then verifies that students have visited the center for the recommended assistance. Ms. Yazdani suggested that it would be valuable for faculty to ask the Writing Center specialists to visit their classes.

Hybrid Courses Final Exams

Dr. Lynch raised the issues of the use of the Testing Center for entire hybrid classes for final exams. Committee member consensus was that there was inconsistency among the campuses, some allowing the use of the Center, other campuses not permitting the practice. Policy states that entire classes cannot be sent to the testing center all at once. It is unclear where an entire class can be sent to the testing center to take an exam sometime over the course of a week.

Committee members recommended that the policy be reviewed. Committee members Preston Davis and Molly Lynch will review the policy, change or rewrite the policy on use of the testing centers, and bring the rewritten policy back to ISSC Committee members for approval.
Adjunct faculty survey

Comments were solicited by Dr. Lynch on the pilot survey of adjunct faculty done by OIR at the Alexandria Campus in the Spring of 2014 that was designed to better understand the role, satisfaction, and commitment of Adjunct faculty at that campus. Four hundred thirty-nine Adjunct faculty were surveyed with 168 responses to six areas: employment, instruction, professional development, work environment, income and benefits, and job satisfaction.

With the exception of two areas Committee members noted that the response rates were favorable with results showing that 74% of those who responded reported that considering all aspects of adjunct work at NOVA, they were either very satisfied or satisfied. The two areas that reported less than favorable results were the Commonwealth of Virginia's policy cap that limits the adjunct teaching load to a 1 a-credit maximum (37% reported being affected); and, the level of pay at NOVA (54% reported being unsatisfied).

Committee members felt strongly that NOVA should implement a college-wide orientation program for adjuncts.

A motion was made that a college-wide faculty, adjunct and support staff working group be formed to look at the adjunct orientation practices at the college and recommend a proposed standardized design for a college-wide adjunct orientation, seconded without objection and carried.

Approval of 1-16-15 Minutes

A motion was made, seconded, without objection and carried to approve the January 16, 2015, committee minutes.

Topics for Future Meetings (in priority order):

- Update on Developmental English – Susan Givens and Ray Orkwis
- Update about Implementation of Student Success Policy Changes
- Hobson’s CRM and QEP Update
- Parking
- VA etranscript
- ELI Compensation and Intellectual Rights
Future Meeting Dates:

Friday, March 6
Friday, April 17