

ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

February 5, 2002, 2:30pm
VH 2251

Those Present: John Bohac, Vaughan Pultz, David Gillette, Doug Davenport, Ruthie Dare-Halma, Marty Eisenberg, David Hoffman, Heidi Templeton, Marie Orton, Steve Hadwiger, Shirley Morahan, Patricia Miller, Sarah Mohler, Erika Woehlk

- I. Review of November 15 minutes
- II. January Conference
 - The presentations were clear and informative.
 - The Assessment Committee got no recognition for the changes and advances that have been made.
 - NCA is coming in Fall 2004 - Spring 2005. We need to be ready.
 - Results of one breakout group indicated they would like one full-time person working on assessment who is trained in statistical analysis.
 - Students and faculty mentioned that there is little public reporting of the results of assessment. Perhaps we should begin to utilize the *Index* more as a medium for the dissemination of such information.
 - Re-examine incentives for students to take the assessment tests and surveys. Business prints senior test scores on transcripts. Should the rest of the University adopt a similar procedure? The junior test is a bigger problem, though. Perhaps we should begin to offer small scholarships as motivation or report these scores, too, on the transcript.
 - Some positive student comments from the Conference said that the Sophomore Writing Experience conferences are a strength and the Portfolio project helps them prepare for graduate school. Weaknesses of the assessment program were that students weren't motivated to take the tests. As a result, they didn't perform well. Also, they don't like the SWE or the junior test. They suggested assessment implementation should be examined because right now it is based on credit hours and not *Truman* experience or Truman credit hours. Those students who transfer in after their sophomore year, for example, end up taking a lot of tests right away. Another weakness students cited was that they believe teacher evaluations aren't acted upon.
 - Anything we tell students during Freshman Week about assessment doesn't stick. We will revisit this issue next meeting.
 - The CSEQ results are being mailed to the students next week.
- III. Analysis Group

- Preliminary organization: there will still be one Vice President's Advisory Committee on Assessment. However, it will be split into two parts, "operational" and "analysis." The two groups will overlap some personnel and will have the same chair.
- The analysis group will have a significant staff presence and a separate charge from the operational group. Yet, there will be no hierarchy between the two groups. Members will be appointed, not elected. The charge might be to advise the Vice President about a project or two and solve a particular problem or concern by looking at already collected data. Eventually, they will develop grant proposals to compete for money for scholarship on assessment.
- The operational group will function largely the same way the Assessment Committee does now, with a focus on improving the quality of the institution.
- The Committee mentioned at this point that there is still a communication gap between the Committee and the rest of the University. We need a newsletter or something similar to inform everyone of the changes the Committee has effected. Sarah Mohler and Heidi Templeton will begin looking at putting together a newsletter.
- The Committee recommends the creation of an analysis group.

IV. Computing Literacy Assessment Task Force

- There are three candidates: SmartForce, Cisco, and Knowledge Net. SmartForce seems the most promising.
- The Task Force is meeting tomorrow.

V. Susan Hatfield visit

- Susan Hatfield is booked until April 6. Both the Vice President and President would very much like her to visit Truman.

VI. Staff Survey

- Michael McManis sent out a draft on e-mail. Please read it after the meeting.

VII. Junior Test Subcommittee

- Will report next time.

VIII. Tek.Xam Subcommittee

- Tek.Xam II has been developed and is being piloted. This one will take a shorter time for students to complete and become certified for computer literacy. It can be used campus-wide.

IX. Assessment website update

- Nothing to report.

X. Interview Project

- 37 interviews have been completed.

XI. Sophomore Writing Experience modification

- The SWE might be shifting toward a portfolio format. This shift will help students prepare for their senior portfolio and will introduce them to interdisciplinary thinking.
- The change eliminates the on-demand writing sessions and the ranking sessions, which streamlines the system for students and makes the assessment more cost-effective for the University.
- It encourages students to gather writing from a variety of disciplines and put together a portfolio that they feel accurately represents themselves as writers, something students did not feel their SWE essay accomplished.
- It initiates student reflection on their writing process, their strengths and weaknesses, and writing in different modes *before* coming to the conference.
- It provides a basis to discuss the way writing differs from discipline to discipline and urges them to begin thinking about ways in which different modes of thinking and writing can be integrated, especially in regard to the JINS seminar students will be taking.
- The proposal will go to the Composition Committee on Thursday.
- Please read the handout Sarah Mohler passed around and e-mail her your feedback.

XII. Assessment reports for the SIS

- The ad hoc consultant will be meeting the third week of February to discuss assessment and how that will work with the new SIS.

XIII. The 2001 *Assessment Almanac* is finished

XIV. Other

- David Hoffman and John Bohac will work together on forming a subcommittee to look at re-writing the GSQ.

Meeting adjourned at 4:25pm.