

GWAR Committee

discussed GVAR portfolio courses, with Pastrana sharing anecdotally that her courses are currently under-enrolled.

Brown sought a recommendation for our work in the spring semester. Do we work on getting an online test piloted? Do we want to focus on improving and adapting the test, or on thinking about different possibilities for the GVAR?

Klink argued in favor of piloting the online GPE. The “Directed Self-Placement” being used elsewhere might be an option. Matuchniak argued that an online pilot is worth it. It would give us data, even if it’s data that says the test doesn’t work. It would also buy us time to consider the work of re-writing policy.

Brown asked whether we would accept a test with one reader if the double reading is not possible. Matuchniak and Aubele both said they would not.

In hopes of solving the technical hurdles, several committee members suggested alternatives or supplements to BeachBoard for the online GPE. Matuchniak asked whether the exams could be printed and graded by hand using social distancing. Klink suggested InfoReady, reporting its efficient use in tenure-track searches. Baker said they asked about exporting and photocopying and were denied. Matuchniak suggested a Qualtrics survey where the readers would enter the student ID #s. Baker agreed to set up a meeting with ATS to discuss these possibilities, but asked for help and direction from the committee.

Exam integrity came up once again. Klink discussed widespread cheating and plagiarism in the remote learning, and Hatami raised concerns about the integrity of an online GPE. Brown was uncomfortable with a test that doesn’t verify student identity, and brought up the possibility of requiring students to be on camera. (Aubele concurred that he had no issues with camera use during testing.) Golden reiterated the idea of an integrity statement. He also argued for tailored prompts that might take students’ background and interests into account. In a position of triage right now, and rethinking the exam might be too much. Later in the chat, Golden expressed interest in “exploring more meaningful policy alternatives” while also being concerned about “what changing policy would entail . . . I would love to get a greater sense of this whenever possible.”

The meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Lindau