

Chapter XVII: MASTER PLAN AND ASSESSMENT WORKSHOP

1998 Annual Master Plan and Assessment Workshop July 13-14, 1998

Highlights

A long-standing practice at Truman has been a summer planning workshop open to the campus community which includes a review of current assessment data and the identification of an institutional improvement agenda for the forthcoming academic year. With the advent of the liberal arts and sciences mission in the mid 1980s, these annual workshops played an important role in the implementation of the mission as well as ensuring the involvement of a broad segment of the academic community in the evolution of the new mission. In the early 1990s these annual assemblages of faculty, administrators, and students were temporarily suspended, but they were reinstated by President Jack Magruder in 1994.

The 1998 Annual Master Plan and Assessment Workshop focused on the Freshman Experience at Truman, a proposal for an enhanced Residential Colleges system, a progress report on student learning in the major -- particularly in terms of student/faculty collaborative scholarship and senior test scores, and the Phi Beta Kappa application process Truman is pursuing. The workshop also included an examination of the characteristics of a public liberal arts institution, an overview and update on the campus planning process, a preview of the incoming student profile for the Fall 1998 term, and a summary of 1997 ISS and GSQ survey data.

President Magruder opened the workshop with a presentation regarding the nature of a *public* liberal arts and sciences university and the progress Truman has made toward the development of its distinctive synthesis as an institution that is both public and liberal arts. Dr. Magruder reported that Peter Ewell, a member of Truman's Board of Governors and a national authority on assessment, has identified several potential characteristics of a public liberal arts institution, including the following: accountable; self-regulating with publicly available indicators of success; and a clear focus on student learning and success with teaching and learning as the institution's top priorities.

President Magruder noted that Truman has clearly distinguished itself as a national leader in terms of the characteristics cited by Governor Ewell. The President also noted that Truman has made significant progress articulating in its University Master Plan the institution's values, priorities, and goals. At the same time Truman has developed an aggressive agenda for future development that includes the enhancement of its liberal arts program and culture, the attainment of a Phi Beta Kappa chapter, and improved institutional performance tied to its mission enhancement program. Key indicators of success include

increased graduation rates, improved senior test scores, and higher placement rates of graduates in graduate and professional schools.

Vice President Garry Gordon continued the workshop with an overview of Truman's planning process and an outline of priority emphases for the coming year. He noted that Truman's planning process is built around its four supportive institutional values: focus on students and student learning; academic rigor and intellectual challenge; affordability; and a commitment to assessment and continuous improvement. Vice President Gordon reported that Truman enjoyed a number of important achievements in 1997-98, including completion of the new University Master Plan, approval of the University's Mission Enhancement Proposal, approval of new LSP courses, a successful NCATE accreditation visit for the MAE program, and a strengthened student/faculty collaborative scholarship program. Planning priorities for academic year 1998-99 will include implementation of the new Liberal Studies Program, enhancement of the Residential Colleges program, strengthening Truman's Freshman Experience, improved student learning in the major, and enhanced support of the Master of Arts in Education program. The faculty for each academic discipline will be expected to develop an action plan for academic years 1999-2000 and 2000-2001 which addresses each of these issues. The action plans are due by November 2, 1998.

Candy Young and Todd Hammond made presentations and led a discussion regarding the importance of Truman's Freshman Experience Programs and the institution's plans to enhance these activities. The "Freshman Year Experience" is defined as everything that happens to freshmen from the day they arrive to the beginning of the sophomore year and includes curricular and co-curricular programs, University policies, and University values conveyed by faculty, staff, and upperclass students. It was noted that for the Fall 1998 term an extended freshman course that begins during Freshmen Orientation Week will be offered to *all* incoming freshmen through 66 special sections of both major and LSP courses. This initiative should be significant because both students and faculty involved in several pilot courses over the past two years have reported a number of positive benefits in terms of student/faculty satisfaction and student behaviors in comparison to the regular one-week orientation course. It was also reported in this session that current higher education research shows that "the main impact of the college is transmitted through the students' peer group, and the most powerful source of peer influence is the residential group" (Leonard Baird in *Structuring the Environment to Improve Outcomes*). In addition, a variety of national studies have shown that a very significant factor in increased student retention and success is meaningful student/faculty contact outside the formal classroom setting.

Although the evidence available on campus from Truman students is somewhat fragmentary, it is also highly consistent with these national results. As a consequence, Truman's University Master Plan calls for the expansion of the University's Residential Colleges Program to include all residence halls. Mary Ramsbottom and a panel of colleagues presented a summary report on behalf of the Residential Colleges Task Force which has been meeting throughout the Spring 1998 term to develop an implementation proposal for review by the academic community. The substance of this report is intended to form the basis of a campus-wide conversation in the Fall 1998 term about the enhancement of the residential colleges.

According to the task force report, Residential Colleges at Truman are envisioned as “*integrative learning communities* which seek to make a liberal arts education *personally vital and engaging* to the whole person” and which will foster enhanced student/faculty interactions outside the classroom. The proposal for an enhanced RC program is intended to be a highly collaborative, cooperative activity between the VPAA’s Office, Student Affairs, and the academic divisions. The preliminary report also suggests that the enhanced program would be led by an Associate VPAA and Dean of Residential Colleges who reports directly to the VPAA. The model in the draft report states that each of the five Residential Colleges should be led by a senior faculty rector who would provide leadership to a staff of faculty fellows, professional advisors, academic assistants, and student advisors. In order to assure active faculty involvement on a continuing, long-term basis, a system of incentives and rewards for faculty contributions has been recommended by the task force. In addition, the proposal suggests a significant restructuring of advising services available to freshmen and undeclared students that would be delivered through the Residential Colleges rather than Academic Planning Services. *Comments and suggestions for refinement of the draft proposal were solicited during the workshop, and the dialogue begun at the workshop is expected to continue through the Fall 1998 term.*

The second day of the workshop began with a presentation by Kathy Rieck regarding the incoming student profile and related information. The freshman class for Fall 1998 will be smaller than the unusually large class in Fall 1997, but it is consistent with expectations outlined in the University Master Plan. The preparation level of these students continues to be exceptional, with an average ACT score in excess of 27. Nearly 30 percent of the Missouri freshmen at Truman will hold a Bright Flight Scholarship. Most will have been active in one or more extra-curricular activities in high school. The percentage of freshmen who are members of racial minorities will be comparable to previous years, but their total will be less than the projection in the University Master Plan. Truman continues to reinforce its role as a statewide institution by drawing students from most Missouri counties as well as nearly 30 states. Truman’s primary competition for students continues to be UMC, SMSU, Saint Louis University, and out-of-state flagship campuses. Truman’s graduation rate for 1998 is expected to exceed University Master Plan projections, but early indications are that the progress will not be sustained in 1999. The placement rate for Truman graduates in graduate and professional schools in 1997 was higher than the previous year, but this figure lagged University Master Plan projections. The data show that Truman has an outstanding student body, but additional work remains to be accomplished if Truman is to attain its aggressive agenda for improvement.

Ruthie Dare-Halma provided the workshop with a quick overview of ISS and GSQ survey results for the most recent three years which are described in greater detail elsewhere in this report. A lively discussion was sparked regarding the rationale for reporting survey results in terms of percent of students answering with the highest level of satisfaction as well as whether the data reveal any institutional progress. It was noted that the University Master Plan includes both means and percents of students selecting highest satisfaction levels, based in part upon the recommendation of Peter Ewell. Both measures are necessary to interpret institutional performance completely, but the former is particularly useful in evaluating the

effectiveness of initiatives intended to produce high levels of student satisfaction. It was noted that much of the ISS and GSQ data will show some volatility from one year to another; as a consequence, long-term trend lines of 5 to 10 years are sometimes needed to confirm trends.

Don Kangas and David Christiansen delivered presentations which addressed mastery in the major through student/faculty collaborative research. Similarly, Stuart Vorkink and Val Larsen addressed the issue of senior test scores from the perspective of their disciplines. Kangas and Christiansen both noted that various legitimate models for student research exist at Truman which reflect the different demands and traditions of disciplines as well as the needs and aspirations of individual students. One key to fostering enhanced student research is to acknowledge the rich variety of models that exist and to recognize that the underlying constant is (in Kangas's words) "research as creative scholarship." It was also noted that the University Master Plan establishes a goal of providing all Truman graduates with the opportunity to engage in collaborative scholarly activity with faculty. Available data indicate that good progress is being made toward this goal. However, data regarding mastery of the major in terms of senior test scores (which appear to be varying randomly in a downward direction) and mean grade point averages (which are increasing) raise a complex series of questions regarding the possible existence of grade inflation accompanied by real declines in student learning relative to national user norms. Kangas concluded such issues will require careful analyses of test results and curricula to define the problem accurately and to discern potential solutions.

Vorkink and Larsen provided brief case studies of how senior testing has functioned in their respective disciplines, political science and business. Vorkink reported that both national research and local experience show that a variety of curricular and environmental factors impact student mastery in the major and senior test score performance. The clear implication of this situation is that improvement must typically be made through a systematic evaluation of the environment and student performance. Larsen noted, concurrently, that at Truman we often have a plethora of data available and that the *key* challenge can be to distinguish between strategically significant data and data most useful for monitoring and maintaining already acceptable performance levels.

The 1998 University Master Plan and Assessment Conference concluded with a report by Stephen Pollard regarding Truman's Phi Beta Kappa application. Pollard noted that Truman has applied several times previously but has never made the initial cut of institutions seeking admission to the organization. However, for the 97-00 triennium Truman has been identified as one of nine institutions that will receive an on-site visit. The visit is anticipated to occur during the Spring 1999 term. Prior to the visit, Truman will be required to submit a very detailed self-study in support of its application. Based on previous experience, a majority of -- but not all -- institutions which are identified for an on-site visit will receive a positive recommendation for membership. Thus, at this stage of the process Truman can be proud of its progress but should not be complacent about its ultimate success.

Based upon information already available, Truman can anticipate significant interest in its new LSP program by the site visitors. Since Phi Beta Kappa tends to consider

discontinuous change circumspectly, it will be to Truman's advantage to ensure the committee of visitors understands that the new program is a logical evolution of and extension of the previous program. Also, the visitors will also want to explore the impact of Truman's divisional structure on faculty governance. The evaluation committee has apparently received information from an off-campus source that the current structural arrangement may have a negative impact. As a consequence, it will be important for the visitors to have a full understanding of the faculty governance process at Truman. If Truman's application for Phi Beta Kappa membership is successful, the University will have attained one of its major goals in the new University Master Plan.

(A.) Average freshman / sophomore gain scores on an appropriate assessment of the liberal studies program, currently the CAAP.

(Anticipated Result: To increase average freshman / sophomore gain scores on the CAAP for each subtest in order to achieve the 80th percentile.)

AVERAGE SCALED SCORE GAIN, AVERAGE PERCENTILE RANK CHANGE CORRESPONDING TO MEAN SCALED SCORES AND PERCENTILE S CORRESPONDING TO AVERAGE SCALED SCORES ON VALUE-ADDED TESTING											
	FY	Actual 1993	Actual 1994	Actual 1995	Actual 1996	Actual 1997	Actual 1998	Projected 1999	Projected 2000	Projected 2001	Projected 2002
UNIVERSITY TOTAL – CAAP											
Critical Thinking											
Scaled Score Change		1.34	0.26	-0.68	1.10	-0.26	-1.19				
Percentile Rank Change		0.60	-6.50	-8.10	-2.70	-8.00	-9.60				
Post test Percentile		71.00	62.96	58.40	63.50	59.10	57.70	73.00	76.00	78.00	80.00
Mathematics											
Scaled Score Change		0.84	0.06	0.00	0.54	-0.29	-0.08				
Percentile Rank Change		2.50	-4.60	7.00	8.20	2.80	4.50				
Post test Percentile		78.50	73.90	73.20	76.60	76.00	76.30	74.00	76.00	78.00	80.00
Reading											
Scaled Score Change		0.46	0.41	-0.87	0.38	-0.27	-0.50				
Percentile Rank Change		-5.20	-4.00	-6.70	-2.60	-5.40	-5.20				
Post test Percentile		70.10	67.10	58.20	65.60	62.00	59.30	70.00	73.00	76.00	80.00
Science Reasoning											
Scaled Score Change		1.48	0.95	-1.01	0.08	-0.59	-0.18				
Percentile Rank Change		-9.05	0.12	10.44	-4.57	-4.11	0.87				
Post test Percentile		51.95	59.08	51.50	63.88	62.60	62.27	72.00	75.00	78.00	80.00
Writing Skills											
Scaled Score Change		-0.05	1.05	-0.96	0.13	-0.31	0.56				
Percentile Rank Change		-3.90	5.40	-5.70	-2.10	-2.70	11.6				
Post test Percentile		69.10	79.90	70.60	72.00	70.20	73.10	71.00	74.00	77.00	80.00

Percentiles are estimated using the closest fall user norms.

(B) Percentage of students reporting “Very Satisfied / Very Often, etc.” with selected measures of the liberal arts and sciences program on the Graduating Student Questionnaire.

(Anticipated Result: To attain an appropriate increase on each measure.)

SAMPLE QUESTIONS LIBERAL STUDIES COURSES - GSQ											
How often were your core courses challenging?											
	FY	Actual 1993	Actual 1994	Actual 1995	Actual 1996	Actual 1997	Actual 1998	Projected 1999	Projected 2000	Projected 2001	Projected 2002
UNIVERSITY TOTAL											
Very Often		N/C	N/C	21.2%	12.9%	11.1%	12.4%	25.0%	30.0%	35.0%	40.0%
Mean		N/C	N/C	3.00	2.74	2.672	2.738	3.00	3.10	3.20	3.30
How adequate do you feel your education and experiences at Truman have been in learning on your own?											
	FY	Actual 1993	Actual 1994	Actual 1995	Actual 1996	Actual 1997	Actual 1998	Projected 1999	Projected 2000	Projected 2001	Projected 2002
UNIVERSITY TOTAL											
Very Adequate		N/C	51.9%	N/C	52.7%	51.1%	54.2%	57.0%	59.0%	61.0%	63.0%
Mean		3.40	3.43	N/C	3.46	3.469	3.480	3.60	3.65	3.70	3.75

How adequate do you feel your education and experiences at Truman have been in understanding different philosophies and cultures?											
	FY	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
		1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY TOTAL											
Very Adequate		N/C	21.6%	24.3%	24.1%	24.4%	25.0%	28.0%	30.0%	32.0%	34.0%
Mean		2.94	2.88	2.68	2.95	2.977	2.979	3.06	3.14	3.22	3.30
How adequate do you feel your education and experiences have been in recognizing assumptions, making logical inferences and reaching correct conclusions?											
	FY	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
		1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY TOTAL											
Very Adequate		N/C	32.6%	26.8%	31.6%	32.4%	31.9%	35.0%	37.0%	39.0%	41.0%
Mean		3.21	3.21	3.03	3.22	3.242	3.231	3.32	3.38	3.44	3.50
How satisfied were you with the faculty enthusiasm for classes in the core?											
	FY	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
		1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY TOTAL											
Very Satisfied		N/C	N/C	25.3%	19.1%	16.8%	15.8%	29.0%	33.0%	37.0%	40.0%
Mean		N/C	N/C	3.03	2.83	2.812	2.768	3.08	3.16	3.23	3.30
How satisfied were you with the overall impression of the liberal arts and sciences courses?											
	FY	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
		1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY TOTAL											
Very Satisfied		N/C	N/C	18.8%	19.0%	17.3%	17.6%	26.0%	29.0%	32.0%	35.0%
Mean		N/C	N/C	2.98	2.88	2.850	2.874	3.12	3.18	3.24	3.30

(E.) Percentage of nationally competitive undergraduates who score at high levels on national assessments of achievement in the major.

(Anticipated Result: To increase the percentage of graduates scoring above the 50th percentile on senior tests such as the Major Field Achievement Test (MFAT) to a university-wide average of approximately 80 percent.)

PERCENT SCORING ABOVE THE 50TH PERCENTILE ON SENIOR TESTS											
	FY	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
		1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY		72.5	66.9	65.5	66.5	60.3	65.8	75.4	77.2	78.2	79.8

(F.) Percentage of nationally competitive undergraduates who have high rates of employment and entry into graduate or professional programs appropriate to the discipline.

(Anticipated Result: To ensure that more than 95 percent of all graduates obtain either relevant employment or continue their studies at a graduate institution, including the achievement of an average rate of at least 46.8 percent of all bachelor's degree recipients entering full-time graduate or professional school.)

PERCENT OF BACCALAUREATE RECIPIENTS EMPLOYED FULL TIME											
		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
	FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY		48.7	56.4	58.1	58.5	60.4	56.4	55.4	53.4	51.9	50.6

PERCENT OF BACCALAUREATE RECIPIENTS ENROLLED IN GRADUATE OR PROFESSIONAL SCHOOL FULL TIME											
		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
	FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY		36.2	38.5	36.9	35.7	36.5	40.8	41.8	43.9	45.4	46.8

- (G) Percentage of nationally competitive graduate students who score at high levels on national assessments of achievement in the major.
 (Anticipated Result: (a) To ensure that all Master of Arts in Education (MAE) graduates score above the mean on the National Teachers' Examination (NTE) as described on the following data table; and (b) as other measures of assessment for graduate programs are developed, to ensure that student performance is nationally competitive.)

PERCENT OF MAE DEGREE CANDIDATES SCORING ABOVE THE MEDIAN ON THE NTE											
<small>(Note--for fiscal years 1993 - 1995, the scale used was percent of degree recipients scoring above the 50th percentile on the NTE.)</small>											
		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
	FY	1993	1994	1995	1996*	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY		90.9	90.5	94.7	92.1	97.3	86.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
<small>*" = FY 1996 is defined as Summer 95, Fall 95, and Spring 96 graduates.</small>											

PERCENT OF MAE DEGREE RECIPIENTS SCORING AT OR ABOVE THE AVERAGE PERFORMANCE RANGE UPPER LIMIT ON THE NTE (ABOUT 75 %ile)											
<small>Note--for fiscal years 1993 - 1995, the scale used was percent of degree recipients scoring above the 80th percentile on the NTE.</small>											
		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
	FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY		48.5	60.8	65.8	69.8	54.8	56.1	67.0	71.0	73.0	75.0

- (H.) Percentage of nationally competitive graduate students who have high rates of employment and entry into doctoral degree programs as appropriate to the discipline.
 (Anticipated Result: To ensure that all graduates obtain either relevant employment or continue their studies at a graduate institution.)

PERCENT OF GRADUATE DEGREE RECIPIENTS EMPLOYED FULL TIME											
		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
	FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY		81.2	87.0	84.5	84.5	91.5	87.5	86.8	86.7	86.2	86.9

PERCENT OF GRADUATE DEGREE RECIPIENTS ENROLLED IN DOCTORAL OR PROFESSIONAL PROGRAMS FULL TIME											
		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
	FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY		14.5	9.4	8.7	11.2	5.1	11.1	12.2	12.5	13.5	13.1

- (I.) Percentage of graduates who are “Highly Satisfied” with their majors.
 (Anticipated Result: To attain an appropriate increase in the percentage of students at both the undergraduate and graduate levels reporting “Very Satisfied/Very Adequate, etc.” with selected measures of the discipline majors as reported on the Graduating Student Questionnaire.)

SAMPLE QUESTIONS MAJOR COURSES - GSQ											
How often were your major courses challenging?											
	FY	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
		1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY TOTAL											
Very Often		N/C	N/C	62.4%	46.7%	43.0%	45.3%	72.6%	74.7%	76.5%	77.8%
Mean		N/C	N/C	3.58	3.38	3.208	3.360	3.63	3.67	3.69	3.71
How adequately has your major prepared you to apply knowledge in defining problems and solving them?											
	FY	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
		1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY TOTAL											
Very Adequate		N/C	42.1%	N/C	48.7%	46.5%	44.1%	51.8%	53.8%	55.8%	57.8%
Mean		3.37	3.25	N/C	3.41	3.396	3.348	3.40	3.43	3.46	3.50
How adequately has your major prepared you to think critically?											
	FY	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
		1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY TOTAL											
Very Adequate		N/C	N/C	N/C	54.8%	56.5%	58.8%	59.0%	61.0%	63.0%	65.0%
Mean		N/C	N/C	N/C	3.46	3.509	3.532	3.54	3.56	3.58	3.60
How adequately has your major prepared you to believe that learning is a life-long process?											
	FY	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
		1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY TOTAL											
Very Adequate		N/C	N/C	N/C	69.3%	67.3%	67.2%	72.0%	73.0%	74.0%	75.0%
Mean		3.52	N/C	N/C	3.63	3.625	3.626	3.66	3.69	3.72	3.75
How adequately has your major prepared you to understand multiple perspectives?											
	FY	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
		1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY TOTAL											
Very Adequate		N/C	N/C	N/C	56.2%	57.4%	60.3%	59.0%	61.0%	63.0%	65.0%
Mean		N/C	N/C	N/C	3.49	3.509	3.548	3.32	3.35	3.36	3.38

How satisfied were you with faculty enthusiasm for classes in the major?										
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY TOTAL										
Very Satisfied	N/C	N/C	54.0%	54.4%	54.3%	49.3	60.9%	63.5%	65.9%	68.2%
Mean	N/C	N/C	3.46	3.45	3.458	3.410	3.49	3.52	3.55	3.59
How satisfied are you with this major?										
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY TOTAL										
Very Satisfied	N/C	N/C	N/C	43.9%	34.3%	38.7	53.2%	56.2%	58.6%	60.4%
Mean	N/C	N/C	N/C	3.33	3.005	3.177	3.46	3.51	3.55	3.57
How adequately has your major prepared you to find information; interpret and apply the finding?										
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY TOTAL										
Very Adequate	N/C	44.8%	N/C	54.0%	53.0%	53.0	54.4%	55.8%	57.1%	60.0%
Mean	3.39	3.30	N/C	3.48	3.466	3.466	3.43	3.46	3.49	3.51
How satisfied were you with the accessibility of instructors in your major?										
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY TOTAL										
Very Satisfied	N/C	N/C	51.9%	40.4%	41.8%	39.8	58.0%	60.0%	62.0%	64.0%
Mean	3.31	N/C	3.37	3.23	3.251	3.225	3.43	3.47	3.51	3.53
How satisfied were you with academic advising?										
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY TOTAL										
Very Satisfied	N/C	20.8%	N/C	20.1%	20.4%	18.9	25.0%	27.0%	29.0%	31.0%
Mean	2.74	2.63	N/C	2.66	2.645	2.636	2.72	2.75	2.77	2.80
How satisfied were you with the overall quality of instruction in your major?										
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY TOTAL										
Very Satisfied	N/C	39.6%	39.3%	43.2%	41.3%	39.8	46.8%	48.8%	50.9%	53.1%
Mean	3.28	3.15	3.25	3.28	3.237	3.252	3.33	3.37	3.41	3.47

- (J.) Percentage of students reporting “Very Satisfied/Very Adequate, etc.” with selected measures of the co-curricular program on the Graduating Student Questionnaire.
 (Anticipated Result: To attain an appropriate increase on each measure averaging approximately ten percentage points.)

SAMPLE QUESTIONS CO-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES – GSQ										
How adequate do you feel your education and experiences at Truman have been in growing intellectually from co-curricular experiences?										
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY TOTAL										
Very Adequate	N/C	N/C	N/C	28.1%	29.9%	27.8%	33.0%	35.0%	37.0%	39.0%
Mean	N/C	N/C	N/C	3.03	3.041	3.037	3.15	3.20	3.25	3.30

How adequate do you feel your education and experiences at Truman have been in growing socially and personally from co-curricular experiences?										
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY TOTAL										
Very Adequate	N/C	N/C	N/C	33.0%	35.4%	34.5%	38.0%	40.0%	42.0%	44.0%
Mean	N/C	N/C	N/C	3.13	3.130	3.149	3.27	3.33	3.39	3.45
How adequate do you feel your education and experiences at Truman have been in growing socially and personally through on-campus residential experiences?										
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY TOTAL										
Very Adequate	N/C	N/C	N/C	26.5%	25.7%	27.5%	31.0%	33.0%	35.0%	37.0%
Mean	N/C	N/C	N/C	2.87	2.832	2.885	3.00	3.05	3.10	3.15
How satisfied were you with the opportunities to be involved in student life and co-curricular activities?										
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY TOTAL										
Very Satisfied	N/C	N/C	N/C	31.6%	33.8%	30.2%	36.0%	38.0%	40.0%	42.0%
Mean	N/C	N/C	N/C	3.13	3.136	3.119	3.27	3.33	3.39	3.45

(K.) Percentage of students reporting “Very Satisfied / Very Adequate, etc.” with selected measures of the total liberal arts culture on the Graduating Student Questionnaire.
 (Anticipated Result: To attain an appropriate increase on each measure averaging approximately ten percentage points.)

SAMPLE QUESTIONS											
OVERALL LIBERAL ARTS CULTURE - GSQ											
How often did you discuss issues of social, cultural or academic significance with others outside of class during the course of the school year?											
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected	
FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	
UNIVERSITY TOTAL											
Very Often		N/C	N/C	N/C	33.6%	32.7%	31.1%	38.0%	40.0%	42.0%	44.0%
Mean		N/C	N/C	N/C	3.08	3.071	3.050	3.24	3.30	3.35	3.40
How satisfied were you with the opportunities to interact with faculty outside of class?											
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected	
FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	
UNIVERSITY TOTAL											
Very Satisfied		N/C	N/C	N/C	34.8%	33.7%	33.6%	41.0%	44.0%	47.0%	50.0%
Mean		N/C	N/C	N/C	3.13	3.110	3.077	3.32	3.38	3.44	3.50
How often do you apply the knowledge and skills gained in one discipline to learning in other disciplines during the course of the school year?											
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected	
FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	
UNIVERSITY TOTAL											
Very Often		N/C	N/C	N/C	26.1%	23.7%	26.4%	32.0%	34.0%	35.1%	36.2%
Mean		N/C	N/C	N/C	3.04	3.019	3.042	3.20	3.25	3.30	3.35
How adequate do you feel your education and experiences at Truman have been in respecting the uniqueness and worth of each individual?											
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected	
FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	
UNIVERSITY TOTAL											
Very Adequate		N/C	37.7%	N/C	38.3%	38.4%	38.4%	43.0%	45.0%	47.0%	50.0%
Mean		N/C	3.17	N/C	3.22	3.205	3.219	3.37	3.44	3.49	3.55

How often do you attend cultural events during the course of the school year (e.g., art exhibits, Lyceum events, campus lectures)?										
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY TOTAL										
Very Often	N/C	8.5%	6.7%	16.8%	20.2%	19.3%	21.0%	22.0%	24.0%	25.0%
Mean	2.13	2.19	1.68	2.61	2.629	2.648	2.70	2.75	2.80	2.85
Approximately how many hours per week do you spend out of class on course-related work?										
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY TOTAL										
0-5 Hours	6.6%	8.9%	10.4%	6.3%	4.8%	6.7%	4.0%	2.5%	1.5%	0.0%
6-10 Hours	23.6%	24.6%	25.5%	18.3%	19.2%	20.3%	14.0%	12.1%	10.5%	10.0%
11-15 Hours	28.0%	21.8%	20.3%	22.5%	20.4%	23.0%	16.3%	16.0%	15.5%	15.0%
16-20 Hours	21.5%	18.8%	18.2%	23.3%	23.7%	20.6%	24.0%	24.5%	25.0%	25.0%
21-25 Hours	10.8%	12.3%	9.0%	13.3%	16.1%	15.6%	16.7%	18.4%	19.0%	20.0%
26-30 Hours	9.5%	7.4%	8.1%	9.9%	9.6%	7.8%	14.0%	14.5%	15.0%	15.0%
31 or More Hours	N/C	6.2%	8.4%	6.6%	6.2%	6.0%	11.0%	12.0%	13.5%	15.0%
Approximately how many hours per week do you spend reading beyond course assignments?										
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected
FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY TOTAL										
None	N/C	N/C	N/C	21.3%	22.3%	21.5%	14.0%	11.0%	8.0%	5.0%
1-2 Hours	N/C	N/C	N/C	43.1%	40.7%	42.3%	28.0%	22.0%	16.0%	10.0%
3-5 Hours	N/C	N/C	N/C	22.2%	23.0%	21.5%	35.0%	40.0%	45.0%	50.0%
6-10 Hours	N/C	N/C	N/C	8.2%	9.4%	9.4%	15.0%	18.0%	21.0%	25.0%
11-15 Hours	N/C	N/C	N/C	2.9%	2.5%	2.9%	4.0%	4.5%	5.0%	5.0%
16 or More Hours	N/C	N/C	N/C	2.3%	2.1%	2.3%	4.0%	4.5%	5.0%	5.0%

(L.) Percentage of students reporting “Strongly Agree” with selected measures of the assessment program on the Graduating Student Questionnaire. (Anticipated Result: To attain an appropriate increase on each measure averaging ten percentage points.)

SAMPLE QUESTIONS ASSESSMENT PROGRAM - GSQ											
The assessment program fosters curriculum improvement.											
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY TOTAL											
Strongly Agree	N/C	N/C	N/C	8.3%	7.6%	9.0%	9.0%	14.0%	16.0%	18.0%	20.0%
Mean	2.59	N/C	N/C	2.62	2.575	2.634	2.634	2.74	2.78	2.83	2.88
The assessment program helps me to better understand my strengths and weaknesses.											
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY TOTAL											
Strongly Agree	N/C	N/C	N/C	3.2%	2.4%	2.7%	2.7%	9.0%	11.0%	13.0%	15.0%
Mean	N/C	N/C	N/C	2.08	1.996	2.049	2.049	2.20	2.23	2.27	2.30
The assessment program helps the university demonstrate the quality of its programs.											
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY TOTAL											
Strongly Agree	N/C	N/C	N/C	14.3%	12.6%	12.8%	12.8%	20.0%	22.0%	24.0%	25.0%
Mean	2.26	N/C	N/C	2.65	2.618	2.632	2.632	2.78	2.83	2.88	2.92

II. Recruiting and Supporting Outstanding Students, Faculty, and Staff

Measures of Success:

(M.) Number of incoming freshmen and their academic preparation as measured by average ACT score.

(Anticipated Result: To recruit approximately 1500 first-time freshmen who have an average score of 27.0 on the ACT.)

NUMBER OF FIRST-TIME FRESHMAN ENROLLED											
		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
	FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY*		1,400	1,617	1,545	1,504	1,482	1,663	1,520	1,525	1,525	1,525
“*” = Number of Pre-MAE Freshmen in											
Totals		332	330	293	311	290	316				

AVERAGE ACT SCORE FOR FIRST-TIME FRESHMEN											
		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected
	FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY		25.3	25.6	26.0	26.0	26.4	27.0	27.2	26.7	26.9	27.0

(N.) Number of minority students.

(Anticipated Result: To ensure a diverse student body by increasing the number of minority students (*i.e.*, students of color who identify themselves as African-American, Hispanic-American, Native-American, or Asian-American) to 10 percent of the total undergraduate enrollment.)

PERCENT OF FIRST-TIME FRESHMAN WHO ARE MINORITY STUDENTS											
		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
	FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY		7.6	8.5	7.2	8.4	8.1	7.16	9.4	9.7	10.0	10.1

(O.) Undergraduate retention rates and graduation rates.

(Anticipated Result: To achieve a freshman-to-sophomore retention rate of 90 percent and to attain underlying student progression rates that will produce a six-year graduation rate of 75 percent; an actual graduation rate of 64 percent is anticipated by 2002 for students who matriculate and graduate from Truman. A graduation rate of 75 percent is anticipated for students who matriculate at Truman and graduate from either Truman or another public four-year institution.)

FRESHMEN-TO-SOPHOMORE RETENTION RATES											
		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected
	FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
	Fall	91 to 92	92 to 93	93 to 94	94 to 95	95 to 96	96 to 97	97 to 98	98 to 99	99 to 00	00 to 01
UNIVERSITY											
Percentage		83.1	83.2	84.1	83.6	83.7	84.0	87.0	88.0	89.0	90.0

SIX-YEAR GRADUATION RATE											
		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
	FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
	Fall	F-87	F-88	F-89	F-90	F-91	F-92	F-93	F-94	F-95	F-96
From Truman Only		53.2	54.6	58.0	59.2	59.8	64.0	61.6	62.4	63.2	64.0
From Truman or Any Mo. Public			63.0	67.0	69.0	66.0	65.7	72.0	73.0	74.0	75.0

(P.) Number, demographic characteristics, and academic preparation of new graduate students.

(Anticipated Result: To recruit approximately 195 new graduate students annually whose average admissions test scores are above the 50th percentile when calculated by discipline.)

NEWLY ENROLLED GRADUATE STUDENTS (FISCAL YEAR TOTAL)											
UNIVERSITY		148	135	141	106	122	169	157	171	185	195

GMAT PERCENTILE RANKING CORRESPONDING TO MEAN SCALED SCORE NEWLY ENROLLED GRADUATE STUDENTS – ACCOUNTANCY											
		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	*Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
	FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
Verbal		69.4	82.0	65.8	83.5	60.1	71.3	80.0	80.0	80.0	80.0
Quantitative		76.8	86.2	74.2	80.0	81.7	54.3	80.0	80.0	80.0	80.0
Total		79.3	90.0	75.2	86.0	77.7	67.6	82.0	82.0	82.0	82.0

* Percentile ranges are taken from the Graduate Management Admission Council "Examinee Score Interpretation Guide 1996-97."

VERBAL GRE PERCENTILE RANKING CORRESPONDING TO MEAN SCALED SCORE NEWLY ENROLLED GRADUATE STUDENTS											
		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
	FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY		56.7	60.4	54.5	51.0	53.8	51.9	55.1	58.7	61.6	64.0

QUANTITATIVE GRE PERCENTILE RANKING CORRESPONDING TO MEAN SCALED SCORE NEWLY ENROLLED GRADUATE STUDENTS											
		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
	FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY		51.7	50.6	40.5	43.3	47.8	49.4	50.5	52.9	54.6	55.8

ANALYTICAL GRE PERCENTILE RANKING CORRESPONDING TO MEAN SCALED SCORE NEWLY ENROLLED GRADUATE STUDENTS											
		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
	FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY		65.4	59.6	58.6	62.1	63.4	63.8	64.9	66.6	68.4	69.9

PERCENT OF NEWLY ENROLLED GRADUATE STUDENTS WITH BACHELOR DEGREE NOT FROM TRUMAN											
		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
	FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY		19.6	26.7	29.8	17.0	22.1	18.3	24.8	24.8	24.9	25.0

PERCENT OF NEWLY ENROLLED GRADUATE STUDENTS WHO ARE MINORITY STUDENTS											
		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
	FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY		1.4	0.7	2.1	2.8	7.4	6.5	7.6	8.6		

(Q.) Distribution of student/faculty ratios among disciplines across the university.

(Anticipated Result: Conditional on the final provisions of the liberal studies program and on an annual review of actual changes in student enrollment patterns, to attain a projected full-time equivalent faculty of approximately 391 and a full-time equivalent student / faculty ratio of approximately 15.83.)

NUMBER OF FULL-TIME-EQUIVALENT FACULTY											
		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
	FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY		350.52	353.86	366.80	371.55	368.49	364.27	378.73	384.23	389.81	391.06

ANNUALIZED RATIO OF FTE STUDENTS TO FTE FACULTY											
		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
	FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY		14.83	15.29	16.09	15.30	15.55	15.40	15.40	15.51	15.63	15.83

(R.) Diversity of the faculty.

(Anticipated Result: To increase the proportion of minority faculty (that is, faculty of color who identify themselves as African-American, Hispanic-American, Native-American, or Asian-American) to 14.3 percent and the proportion of female faculty to 36.4 percent.)

PERCENT OF FULL-TIME FACULTY WHO ARE MINORITY											
		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
	FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY		8.2	9.0	9.1	9.6	9.0	10.0	12.6	13.2	14.1	14.3

PERCENT OF FULL-TIME FACULTY WHO ARE FEMALE

		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	<i>Projected</i>	<i>Projected</i>	<i>Projected</i>	<i>Projected</i>
	FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	<i>1999</i>	<i>2000</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2002</i>
UNIVERSITY		31.6	29.9	32.0	32.5	32.9	33.9	34.5	35.0	35.4	36.4

Selected Measures of Success
Truman State University Master Plan 1997-2007

	FY	Actual 1998	Projected 2002
DEEPENING AN ENHANCED, SELF-REFLECTIVE LIBERAL ARTS CULTURE			
Proportion of "Highly Satisfied" Students As Measured by the GSQ: LAS Program, Major, etc.		Various	<i>Average Increase of 10 Percentage Points</i>
Percentage of Graduating Seniors Who Demonstrate At Least a Basic Level of Interdisciplinary Thinking Skills in Portfolio		17.4	90
Number of Interdisciplinary LAS Program Courses		Data Base Under Development	
Percent of On-campus Students in Residential Colleges		40	100
Proportion of Students in Residential Colleges Achieving Improved Learning Outcomes As Measured by GSQ and ISS		Various	<i>Average Increase of 10 Percentage Points</i>
LAS Program: CAAP Subscore Percentiles		73.1/76.3	80
Major: Senior Test Score Percentages Above 50%ile		65.8	79.8
Percent Graduates Entering Graduate Or Professional School Full-time		36.5 (FY97)	46.8
Freshman/Sophomore Retention Rate		86.7	90
Six-year Graduation Rate			
Truman Freshmen from Truman		64	64
Truman Freshmen from Any Four-year Missouri Public		65.7	75
Number of Students Participating Annually in Student/Faculty Scholarly Projects		691	1,100
Number of Students Involved in Annual Research Symposium		277	450
SUPPORTING OUTSTANDING STUDENTS, FACULTY, & STAFF			
Total Undergraduate Enrollment		6,046	6,180
Total Graduate Enrollment		243	322
Average Freshman ACT Score		27	27
Percent Freshmen Minority		7.16	10.1
Full-time MAE Students		77	120
Percent of New, Full-time, Tenure-track Faculty with Academic Honors		Data Base Under Development	
Percent of New, Full-time, Tenure-track Faculty with Broad Undergraduate Educations		Data Base Under Development	
Percent Full-time Faculty Minority		10	14.3
University-wide FTE Student/FTE Faculty Ratio		15.40	15.83
University-wide FTE Faculty/FTE Staff Ratio		0.96	1.00
Relative Competitiveness of Faculty and Staff Compensation		Data Base Under Development	
Percentage of Faculty Engaged in Scholarly Activity with Students		Data Base Under Development	
Number of Scholarly Publications and Presentations by Faculty		232 (FY97)	350
PROVIDING EXCELLENT SUPPORT TO THE TEACHING/LEARNING PROCESS			
Relative Competitiveness of Library Support & Service		Various	<i>Average Increase of 10 Percentage Points</i>
Percentage of Faculty with Direct Internet Access		100%	100
Percentage of Students with Direct Internet Access		22	100
Percentage of Students with Direct Computer Access		48	100
Percentage of Classes with a Significant Instructional Technology Component		Data Base Under Development	
NURTURING APPROPRIATE RELATIONSHIPS WITH EXTERNAL CONSTITUENCIES			
Number of Donors to Foundation		7,748	8,200
Total Gifts, Excluding Planned Gifts		\$856,832	\$850,000
Percent of E&G Budget Supported by State		58	62
Citizens Served Through External Partnerships and Related Programs		1850 (est.)	2360

From Appendix E: Measures of Success

Detailed Data Projections (pages 70-89)

I. Deepening an Enhanced, Self-reflective Liberal Arts Culture