

ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION GROUP

November 17, 2003, 4:30pm
VH 2251

Those Present: Ruthie Dare-Halma, Sue Pieper, Erika Woehlk, Maria Di Stefano, Lou Ann Gilchrist, Barbara Price, Mark Kirtland, Marty Eisenberg, Dave Rector, Bryce Jones, Stephen Hadwiger, Nancy Asher, Steve Stepanek, Candy Young, Doug Davenport, Jon Gering, Sarah Mohler

I. *Assessment Almanac* Changes Follow-up – Erika Woehlk

- A. There are two options for the Capstone Experiences chapter: keep the existing format, or include excerpts from current 5-Year Reviews concerning capstone experiences. The DIG recommends maintaining the current format.
- B. It was proposed last meeting to preface chapters currently without any narration with a summary of findings, questions raised, trends, etc. The DIG endorses this proposal. There were volunteers for the five chapters needing narration.

II. Future Projects

- A. The DIG should begin looking at each of our assessment instruments, particularly the surveys, and look for any alarming trends or data points. The ultimate goal will be, once a trend or data points are identified, to find out why the data is the way it is and then suggest ways to improve conditions tied to that question. Members of the DIG will begin this project in Spring 2004. Stephen Hadwiger volunteered to begin with the GSQ.
- B. Another possibility for projects next spring is to look at a current aspect of campus life, student learning, satisfaction, retention, etc. and use multiple measures to assess that issue. Lou Ann Gilchrist volunteered to look at the co-curriculum by using multiple survey instruments, the Portfolio, and the Interview Project.

III. Action Plan Progress Reports

- A. Mapping Current Assessments to University LSP Learning Outcomes – Erika Woehlk and Barbara Price
 - 1. The subcommittee has met twice this semester and has one instrument left to map. At that point, the subcommittee will write up a report with their findings, to be completed by the end of the Fall 2003 semester.
 - 2. The Undergraduate Council is interested in the mapping and has already begun to assess the Historical Mode of Inquiry by looking at survey data relevant to that mode and Portfolio data from the Historical Analysis prompt.
- B. Critical Thinking Assessment – Marty Eisenberg

Candy Young suggested that the new critical thinking instrument from RAND that will be piloted this year to 100 students is an adequate beginning to assessing critical thinking at Truman. The DIG concurred.

C. Computing Literacy Assessment – Doug Davenport

1. SkillSoft will offer Truman a ninety-day pilot. Twenty-five students and 25 faculty and staff can participate in the pilot. If we choose to adopt SkillSoft as our computer literacy assessment program, SkillSoft will be ready within 10 days to go campus-wide.
2. One hundred modules will cost \$17,470 per year for a three-year contract. Availability of funds is being addressed.
3. The modules will offer computer literacy assessment, certification, and faculty/staff development opportunities; they include tests and tutorials.
4. Undergraduate Council will have to determine which modules will be required for students, at what point the students must pass the modules, etc.
5. The DIG agrees to go forward with SkillSoft, assuming available funds.

D. Assessment in the Disciplines – Candy Young

1. The subcommittee has developed knowledge, skills, and attitudes matrices to be included in the previously-developed discipline assessment website.
2. Each discipline will be asked to fill out the matrices themselves. Disciplines will be provided with generic matrices as well as examples of ones filled out by a discipline.

E. Institutional Effectiveness – Michael McManis

Dave Rector distributed two handouts from Michael McManis: one with “dashboard” indicators, the other a complete list of performance indicators.

F. Assessment of Student Satisfaction – Bryce Jones

In the spring, this subcommittee had begun looking at the Noel-Levitz satisfaction survey as a possibility for assessing student satisfaction at Truman. However, given current resource constraints and the amount of data that Truman already has on student satisfaction, the subcommittee recommends that the DIG utilize what data are already available rather than going to an outside instrument.

G. GSQ Review – Dave Rector and John Bohac

Nancy Asher spoke for this subcommittee at the last meeting. There is no update.

H. Review/Implement Past Communication-Related Recommendations by Previous Motivation Subcommittee – Heidi Templeton and Stephen Hadwiger

In the spring, this subcommittee conducted interviews of students who had delayed taking the junior test. Further work will be completed this semester and next semester. The subcommittee will also begin examining the previous motivation committee’s recommendations.

I. Review/Implement Non-Communication-Related Recommendations of Past Motivation Subcommittee – Nancy Asher

This subcommittee report is moved to the December 4 meeting.

IV. Next meeting: Thursday, December 4, 2003, 4:00-5:00pm, Violette Hall 2251.

Meeting adjourned at 5:47pm.

ew