Meeting Notes

Test Scoring Working Group

Tuesday, August 11, 2015  2:30 – 4:00 pm
Hickman Building  Room 128

Present:  Stephen Lindsay, (Chair), Shawn Cure, Teresa Dawson, Fred Grouzet, Elliott Lee, Tracey MacNeil, Dave McKercher, Chris Nelson, Svetlana Oshkai, Martin Smith

Guests:  Greg Beaulieu, Mark Laidlaw and Erin McGuire.

Recorder:  Marg MacQuarrie

1. Welcome and Introductions
   Steve Lindsay opened the meeting at 2:30 pm and asked everyone to introduce themselves.

2. Terms of reference and purpose of Test Scoring Working Group Phase II
   The change to the University of Victoria’s test scoring was initiated by requests from faculty and instructors who indicated the old software was no longer meeting their needs. Phase I, which started in September 2014, was well received. Phase II has now started. Questions to answer: a) how well is it working? A systematic survey is needed. b) how can we address any problems with it? Martin Smith asked that our thanks to the implementation team be recorded. It is anticipated that a maximum of three to four meetings this term should complete the mandate of the Phase II group.

3. Update on usage and volume
   About 100,000 forms per year have been scanned centrally in recent past years. Biology, Psychology, and MATH/STATS are some of the top users. Several committee members have the Remark software and are creating and scanning exams. Others are using the standard process and finding it working for them. An intermittent issue with the look-up function was reported by Dave McKercher

   There were some very thoughtful tips shared regarding best practices in using the system for other kinds of exams and for other purposes such as an IdeaFest feedback assessment. Fred Grouzet offered to kindly work with the LTC to generate a tip sheet for the creative way he uses the system to tailor exams to student choices for the website. The suggestion was to add tip sheets as ideas arise and make them available on the website.

4. Review and feedback from the departments
   There were some issues with students not putting in their correct V00 numbers and the student names not being there to enable checking. Upon discussion, this needs further investigation since those very familiar with the system believe there may be some ways around this. Making the Remark Archive (ROA file) automatically standard as part of the report generation was suggested as a way out of this problem. This would require people to have the software loaded but, as agreed in Phase I, there are enough licences purchased
to allow this to be possible for major users and departments.

It was noted that Mac computers need to do an extra step in order to read the reports correctly. Remark is not designed for Mac users but those using it on Macs report it seems to work for most aspects. Any issues around this would require follow-up by Shawn with the vendor since this is a bigger development issue.

Regarding any forms beyond the current standard UVic-approved forms of green and blue versions, these are currently either generated by users operating the system themselves locally or have to be printed through Printing Services. Because of the current low numbers of users of these forms (though this could change) the cost is 33% higher than for the standard forms. Prices are set by Printing and the Bookstore and depend on volume and cannot be determined by this committee. The new blue and green forms are cheaper than the old versions. As established in Phase I, this is one advantage of the new system.

5. Invited guests
Greg Beaulieu, Mark Laidlaw and Erin McGuire spoke to their experiences with the system and the issues for them of very large classes. They would like greater redundancy in the form with regard to having both the VOO and the names actually bubbled in by students. This is because they find their students sometimes forget the VOO or get it wrong. They would like the committee to explore an additional form which has the ability to bubble in names on the front as well. They have been piloting such a form. It would be a different (pale) colour to the other two. They would like the form recognised by the university and thus to be part of the official processes through the bookstore, the Registrar’s Office, RCSD and so on. The Committee endorsed them continuing to use this pilot form while it works to resolve the issues they have raised. The goal is to find a university-wide approach that will work for everyone and that addresses their needs at a feasible cost for all (in terms of time and money and personnel).

6. Developing an assessment plan and timeline for the project as well as next steps and to-do items (yellow highlight indicates those taking the lead)

   a) Check with Janni about possible support options in collaboration with TIL. (SL)

   b) Establish a consistent approach to tech support for the campus in consultation with Teresa, Janni, Shawn, Tracey and Elliot (SL). The issues identified so far:

      i) Is there a way to produce a report that, along with the students’ bubbled-in data, has a graphic of the region of the form in which they write their names? If so, perhaps the redundancy problem is solved. (SL to consult EL and SC)

      ii) Problem with look-up function (SL to consult with DM and then pass on to SC for resolution with Remark).
iii) Question as to whether it is feasible to send each student an email of the image of his/her test. Note that this might require using look-up or adding an email address to the form. SC has contacted Remark to ask this question. The software does not do this. It would require an entirely new program to be written, which is not within the current scope of the committee or the project mandate.

c) Ask the Psychology departmental secretary for the price of departmental printing of double-sized 8.5 x 11. Any cost to scanning? (SL has done this: PSYC charges $0.05 per side; usually SL just uses a single side so his in-house printed customized bubble sheets cost less than the standard form; a double-sized, in-house, printed customized bubble sheet would cost $0.10, which is comparable to what the bookstore charges for the standard sheets. PSYC does not charge for scanning.)

d) Contact bookstore to ask about “official” sheets, and ask that person about pros and cons and costs of adding two new versions. Also find out if we are essentially stuck with the current versions (i.e., have they already purchased large volumes of them?). (SC to follow up and report back to ctee).

e) Putting 1 and 2 together, estimate cost of having four official forms (SL and SC).

f) Change order form for reports for Ops so that by default it sends instructors the Remark Archive file (but they can select not to get it if they don’t want it) and put an info sentence to tell users they need the software to use it and how to access it). (SL consulting with TM; SL follow up with the HelpDesk re training of staff there on intake end).

g) Draft survey of adopters and potential adopters (Shawn to develop current user list), get feedback from committee, polish and finalize. Develop a clever way to inspire respondents to complete the survey. (All at next meeting).

h) Seek feedback on all the bubble sheet forms from qualified personnel at the RCSD (SC/TD once forms finalised. Note: there are currently large numbers of blue and green printed so would need to get through that backlog before changes are made, but we should get it on the radar now).

h) Follow up with Fred Grouzet to generate a tip sheet for the creative way he uses the system to tailor exams to student choices. (SC to consult with FG and bring draft to next meeting).

i) Stephen will set up a schedule for group members to consult with Elliott Lee if they wish help. Teresa will explore funding.

7. Next steps and other business

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:55 PM. The next meeting is scheduled for Monday, August 24, 2015 from 12:30 ~ 1:30 PM. Please respond in your calendar if you are on Outlook. If you do not use Outlook, please tell Marg so she can work with you by email. Marg is ltcsec@uvic.ca