

ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION GROUP

January 16, 2003, 1:30pm
Governors' Room

Those Present: Dave Rector, Maria Di Stefano, Ruthie Dare-Halma, Sue Pieper, Doug Davenport, Sarah Mohler, Garry Gordon, Erika Woehlk, Nancy Asher, John Bohac, David Gillette, Candy Young, Stephanie Nigus (for Shawn Doyle), Randy Smith, Marie Orton, Michael McManis, Heidi Templeton, Marty Eisenberg, David Hoffman.

- I. FSSE: Faculty Survey of Student Engagement, a survey designed as a follow-up to the Higher Education Research Institute's Faculty Survey. We must reply to Indiana by February 1 or 2 if we are going to participate. The Survey requires the faculty member to choose one course and answer the Survey based on that one course. There will be no cost to Truman. The FSSE will require a random sample of faculty. It might be worthwhile, whereas the proposed CIRP follow-up survey might be overkill for the students. (After the meeting the FSSE website indicated enrollment had closed for FSSE and that they are now wait-listing institutions.)
- II. At the next meeting (February 4), half of the subcommittees will make their reports.
- III. Analysis and Reporting Group report: The Group is meeting to develop guidelines for assessment grants. One question that will be addressed at their next meeting is whether or not the money should be distributed to the divisions as was done with the faculty research/scholarship and curriculum development grants. If the money is not redistributed, should it go to one or two faculty members who will be devoted to doing a thorough investigation into the retention problem? Or should there be an application process and several grants of varying amounts awarded? The ARG will meet on January 23 to discuss these questions.
- IV. Motivation issues with the CAAP and AP.
 - A. Registration bump. Won't work with Banner until at least 2004 and then, there will have to be a data field developed for the CAAP and AP. At this point, it is probably not a wise thing to do.
 - B. The benefit should be reasonably available to everyone.
 - C. Raffle. It's not really an incentive because the odds are too large. Moreover, it's a game of chance. Is it even legal?
 - D. Transcripts.
 1. Make a notation on students' transcripts who score above the 50th percentile as having performed distinctively on the CAAP or AP. Do the same for the 80th percentile, but note them as having performed with high distinction.
 2. We must make sure that other people who read the transcript know the difference between a percentile and a percent. We don't want them to think a student got a 50% on the CAAP, for instance.

3. As long as we provide a key, the transcript notation is a good idea. It has worked for the business division for their senior test and there is no reason to think it would not be acceptable for the CAAP and AP.
- E. January Conference as a testing day.
1. Will provide students with additional opportunities to take the tests. They might be more prone to take advantage of this day than of using a weekday evening or a Saturday.
 2. Could take students away from the events of the January Conference.
 3. We will need enough students and faculty to proctor the exams. We will also need to find classrooms for the tests.
 4. We should provide pizza from Mainstreet or coupons for their pizza after the tests on the January Conference Day.
 5. As long as we can provide the proctors and the classrooms, we should do it. These data are being used against us and we should use this opportunity to help improve our scores by increasing motivation.
- F. Committee's recommendations concerning student motivation as itemized on the handout.
1. Structural Changes
 - a. Reduce the sections of the CAAP from 4 to 3. **Yes.**
 - b. Use January Conference Day as the primary day to offer the exams. **Yes.**
 - c. Use Assessment Committee members and other faculty volunteers to start the exams and help proctor. **Yes. Three committee members volunteered.**
 - d. Create an explanatory letter and have it sent by the President. **Yes.**
 2. Incentive Ideas
 - a. Registration advantage. **No.**
 - b. Raffle idea. **No.**
 - c. Pizza for students who take the exam on January Conference Day. **Yes.**
 - d. Recognize students who score well with a notation on their transcript. **Yes, but the language needs to be worked out.**
 - e. Additional incentive: good scores are favorable for scholarship renewal. **Yes.**

- V. Interview Project update. There has been a greater response rate from faculty willing to give interviews this semester than in semesters past. However, since we are interviewing twice as many students, we still need more faculty and student interviewers.
- VI. Summary
 - A. Committee **does recommend** administering the FSSE.
 - B. Committee **does not recommend** administering the HERI follow-up to the CIRP. Nancy Asher, however, will look into obtaining a copy of the survey and e-mail it to the committee. At that point, the committee will re-evaluate the survey and if it asks questions we are interested in having answers to, the committee *will* recommend administering it.
 - C. Half of the subcommittees will report on their progress at the February 4 DIG meeting. Please let Ruthie know if you are willing to report.

Meeting adjourned at 2:47pm.

ew