

**ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION GROUP**  
**January 23, 2007, 10:30am**  
**SUB Alumni Room**

**Those Present:** Glenn Wehner, Marty Eisenberg, Erika Woehlk, Jeffrey Vittengl, Maria Di Stefano, Nancy Asher, Bryce Jones, Karen Smith, Barbara Price, Vaughan Pultz, and Steve Stepanek

I. Summer 2007 Assessment Internships – Erika Woehlk

A. Synopsis of the Internship Program

1. The Assessment Internships started in Spring 2005 with 3 projects. The next spring, we had 2 projects, but 3 students. The projects have ranged from website development to data analysis. For an example of a project, please attend the January 30 Assessment Colloquium, which will be presented by one of the Spring 2006 Interns.
2. The Internship is four credit hours (3 pass/fail, 1 graded) and there must be a faculty supervisor.
3. This year, since the Assessment Committee got off to a late start, we've decided to offer summer internship opportunities instead. The internships will occur during the eight-week undergraduate session.

B. E. Woehlk asked DIG members for possible internship projects.

1. Analysis of Writing Assessment data – with Barbara Price.
2. Analysis of Portfolio data – with Karen Smith.
3. Improving the Portfolio website – with Karen Smith.
4. Revamping the Graduate Student Exit Questionnaire (GSEQ) – with Maria Di Stefano.
5. DIG members are encouraged to ask their colleagues for other potential projects. Please respond to E. Woehlk by February 14 with your ideas.

II. The CAAP & MAPP (aka “junior tests”) – Nancy Asher

A. Synopsis of the CAAP & MAPP and their results: N. Asher distributed a packet of information.

1. The Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP) has several modules that provide subscores on areas such as mathematics, writing, reading, and critical thinking. Last year the Assessment Committee and Vice President chose to administer just one module per year, and that was critical thinking. Thus, the CAAP takes students 40 minutes to complete, plus an extra 10-15 minutes at the beginning to go over the rules. See the handout for complete information.
2. The Measure of Academic Proficiency and Progress (MAPP) has a long two-hour version and a short 40-minute version. The two-hour version provides students with

proficiencies on areas such as mathematics, natural sciences, social sciences, and critical thinking. Last year the Assessment Committee and Vice President chose to administer the two-hour version. See the handout for complete information.

3. Both the CAAP and MAPP are given to students with 75 credit hours or more. Essentially, these students are juniors, but we do catch some students who've been here for two years (instead of three) because of the amount of transfer credit they bring in. The students are randomly assigned a test (half take the CAAP and CSEQ and the other half take the MAPP).
  4. Truman students' highest scores are in the mathematics subsections on both tests (the CAAP results from previous years contain math subscores). The lowest scores are in reading comprehension.
  5. In the packet of information, there are also sample score reports for the CAAP and MAPP. Students get to know, on the CAAP, what percentile they achieve and how that compares to other Truman students and to all students who took the exam. The MAPP report shows students their scores by letting them know if they are proficient, marginal, or not proficient. A copy of each student's score report is sent to the student's advisor.
- B. What are the issues?
1. Time equity. The CAAP takes students roughly 50 minutes. Then they are given the College Student Experience Questionnaire (CSEQ), which takes 30 minutes to complete. The MAPP, on the other hand, takes about 130 minutes to complete. There is a disparity of 50 minutes.
  2. Loss of cohorts for the CSEQ. Previously, the CSEQ has been administered to all students enrolled in all JINS courses every year. With the change implemented this year of offering the CSEQ only every other year to students taking the CAAP, we have lost a great deal of information on many students. It will be very difficult to get a good number of matches between the CSXQ (administered the freshman year) and the CSEQ.
  3. Module rotation. Now that we administer just one module of the CAAP per year, do we want to switch which ones are offered to create a rotational schedule?
  4. Applicability of exams. The primary use of the CAAP is for junior colleges or community colleges to assess their general education and to place their students in appropriate math and science levels.
- C. How can we solve the issues?
1. Time equity. This issue ties in with advising. How do advisors use the score reports? If it turns out that advisors on the whole are not discussing the results of the junior tests with their advisees, then that might be motivation enough to move to the 40-minute MAPP, which will solve the time equity issue. Then the CSEQ could be given to all "juniors" once again.
  2. Loss of cohorts for the CSEQ. See #1 above.

3. Module rotation. N. Asher asked DIG members to think about a rotation schedule. She will not need to order more tests until August, so this will be an agenda item for the DIG later this semester.
  4. Applicability of exams. N. Asher will send DIG members a list of other institutions that use the CAAP and MAPP. During the 2003 assessment mapping project, it was determined that the junior tests had very little correlation, if any at all, with our Liberal Studies Program. Perhaps it is time for Truman to explore other assessments more appropriate for our students and our academic program.
- D. Another suggestion for a Summer 2007 Assessment Internship is for a student to research Truman's results on the CAAP and MAPP reading subscores. Why are they so low?
- E. N. Asher passed around a sign-up sheet for faculty proctors for the junior tests on University Conference Day, February 7.

### III. GSQ Working Group – Marty Eisenberg

#### A. Synopsis of the Graduating Student Questionnaire (GSQ).

1. This survey is required of all graduating seniors before they can be cleared for graduation.
2. The survey contains one lengthy section asking for students' satisfaction with offices on campus. With the development of the Continuous Improvement Plans being required of all academic offices on campus, the GSQ could prove to be a useful tool for those offices to assess their success rates.

#### B. Formation of a Working Group.

1. The Group will make this particular section of the GSQ more useful for offices by asking them what they would like to be able to find out.
2. Perhaps we could use the random probe technique where students randomly answer two or so open-ended questions such as a simple, "Why [are you satisfied/dissatisfied with \_\_\_\_\_ office]?" This will certainly be more meaningful than what is currently asked for.
3. M. Eisenberg will lead the Working Group. E. Woehlk, S. Stepanek, and N. Asher volunteered to serve. The DIG will also ask for a Library and a Registrar's representative.
4. Divisional DIG representatives should query their colleagues as to what indicators they would like to see on the GSQ for academic programs.

### IV. Other – Perhaps it is time to hold a joint DIG/ARG meeting to talk about shared research interests.

### V. Announcements

- A. The first Spring 2007 Assessment Colloquium will be January 30, 4:00pm, PML 302A. Rebecca Maddox, a former assessment intern, will speak on, "Student Engagement and Liberal Arts Education: Faculty and Student Perceptions."
- B. The next DIG meeting will be February 20.

The meeting adjourned at 11:30am.

ew