

Issues in Education

Ratnawati Mohd Asraf

IIUM PRESS

INTERNATIONAL ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY MALAYSIA



ISSUES IN EDUCATION

Ratnawati Mohd Asraf



IIUM Press

Published by:
IUM Press
International Islamic University Malaysia

First Edition, 2011
©IUM Press, IUM

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without any prior written permission of the publisher.

Perpustakaan Negara Malaysia

Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

Edited By:
Ratnawati Mohd Asraf
Issues in Education
Ratnawati Mohd Asraf

ISBN: 978-967-418-055-3

Member of Majlis Penerbitan Ilmiah Malaysia -- MAPIM
(Malaysian Scholarly Publishing Council)

Printed by :
IUM PRINTING SDN. BHD.
No. 1, Jalan Industri Batu Caves 1/3
Taman Perindustrian Batu Caves
Batu Caves Centre Point
68100 Batu Caves
Selangor Darul Ehsan

TABLE OF CONTENT

1. Ibn Khaldun on the Role of Knowledge, Skills, and Values in the Rise and Fall of Civilizations: Implications for Muslim Educators in the 21st Century
Siraje Abdallah Ssekamanya 1
2. The Concept of Literacy
Kamal J. Badrasawi & Noor Lide Abu Kassim 21
3. Character Development and Islamic Civilization in Uganda: Implications for Muslim Educators
Ssekamanya Siraje Abdallah 35
4. Education for All and Children's Right to Education in Malaysia
Zaleha Kamaruddin, Ismail Sheikh Ahmad, and Syahnaz Sulaiman 53
5. Balancing Cultural Plurality and National Unity Through Education: The Case of Malaysia
Rosnani Hashim 75
6. Standards in Education
Noor Lide Abu Kassim 99
7. Standards in Education: The Meaning of Grades
Ratnawati Mohd Asraf 121
8. Standard Setting Methods
Noor Lide Abu Kassim and Ahmad Zamri Khairani 137
9. Islamic Higher Education: Ensuring and Maintaining Quality
Ratnawati Mohd Asraf 165
10. Quality Assurance in Higher Education: A need for Students' Direct Involvement
Mwebesa Umar 177

STANDARDS IN EDUCATION

Noor Lide Abu Kassim

INTRODUCTION

Over the years, considerable efforts have been made towards ensuring that the process of setting standards is a rational and defensible one. This is evidenced by the voluminous literature on standard setting methods (e.g., Berk, 1986; Cizek, 2001; Jaeger, 1993; Wright, 1993) and the validation of set standards (e.g., Hambleton, 2001; Kane, 1994, 2001; Norcini & Shea, 1997; Pellegrino et al., 1999; Stone, 1996;). However, to date, the issue of the “right” method has remained unresolved. For many, it may never be resolved as it has been clearly established that different standard setting methods yield different results (e.g., Jaeger, 1993; Kane, 2001; Zieky, 2001).

With the increasing use of standardized testing, increasing concerns pertaining to fairness in testing and legal issues, and emphasis on meeting rigorous cut scores, the selection and use of the “right” standard setting method has become more complicated and pressing. To meet these new demands, methods which were initially developed for use with selected-response items have now been modified to deal with constructed response items (CR) and other item formats (Mitzel, Lewis, Patz & Green, 2001). New methods, such as the Bookmark Procedure, the Body of Work Method (BoW), the Analytic Judgment Method, Cluster Analysis, the Integrated Holistic Judgment Method, the Item-mapping Method, and the Objective Standard Setting Method (OSS) have also been developed to meet the more rigorous requirements in the setting educational standards (see Cizek, 2001).

Given the significant role of standards in educational monitoring and assessment, the primary purpose of this paper is to review the use of