

**MLS Assessment Committee**  
**November 3, 2021, 1:30 – 2:30 via WebEx**

Present: Drs. Dotson, Jones, Marson

The purpose of this meeting was to continue to formulate changes to the current portfolio procedures. One concern is that students can score below proficient on a posted artifact and still “pass” the portfolio. Another concern is the reflection process and a need to make it more engaging and meaningful.

- 1) Marson shared with the committee the procedure that both Kawanna and Laura use and suggested it as a possibility. The student **must** score at the proficient level for the artifact before this portion of the portfolio is considered a Pass. If the assignment has already been graded in Canvas, that does not change. Students would need to be provided with detailed and clear instructions on the importance of scoring at a proficient level and that not doing so **will** (not may) impact graduation. They would be given the opportunity to bring the artifact content to the proficient level.
- 2) The committee members agreed that this same policy should apply to the reflection scores as well. We discussed whether to retain the reflection template and agreed to do so. We also agreed with Africa’s suggestion to post links to the applicable standards on the program website for easy reference by students.
- 3) The last portion of the portfolio process revolves around adding a more engaging reflection process that ties back to the student’s beginning in the program. The committee agreed that either the statement of purpose or the assignment in LIBS 6010 “Why do we still need libraries and librarians” would be posted on Taskstream while the student is enrolled in LIBS 6010. In the semester of graduation, we agreed that a final reflection that looks back on the initial impressions would be a valuable addition to the portfolio process. Marson mentioned the idea of having the advisor of each potential graduate meet virtually with the student and developing a means of assessment at this point. There had been previous discussions of students being able to include videos. Dotson and Jones felt that the entire faculty should be involved, and that this procedure would strengthen the outcome, which would not be reliant on one person. Marson expressed concerns about scheduling, but it was suggested that an entire day or two days be set aside each semester for this faculty review with each upcoming graduate. It was agreed that 30 minutes per student would suffice. The point was made that if this process became official and was publicized for all students, schedules could be arranged. Marson agreed that we should bring this suggestion to the entire faculty.