

ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION GROUP

November 6, 2003, 4:00pm
VH 2251

Those Present: Ruthie Dare-Halma, Sarah Mohler, Doug Davenport, Jon Gering, Steve Stepanek, Candy Young, Maria Di Stefano, David Gillette, John Bohac, Dave Rector, Garry Gordon, Lou Ann Gilchrist, Nancy Asher, Erika Woehlk, Sue Pieper, Stephen Hadwiger, Bryce Jones

Guests: Natalie Alexander, Debra Cartwright

I. *Assessment Almanac* Changes – Erika Woehlk and Sue Pieper

A. Proposed changes to Volume III

1. There are four options:
 - a. Keep it as is and publish it in paper form and online.
 - b. Keep it as is and publish it only online.
 - c. Move some information to Volume II from Volume III and do not publish Volume III.
 - d. Eliminate Volume III.
2. The DIG endorses option “b.” Keep Volume III’s formatting and publish it online.

B. Proposed changes to Volume II

1. Point readers to “resource people” who will be able to provide aggregate data, frequencies, and in some cases, raw data. The DIG endorses this change and says the general resource people should be Erika Woehlk and Nancy Asher.
2. Re-do the Capstone Experiences chapter so that it includes either excerpts from the most recent round of 5-Year Reviews or examples of best practice on campus. The chapter should answer the question, “How does the capstone experience assess discipline learning outcomes?” The DIG makes no recommendation at this time and will re-visit this question next meeting.
3. Include a chapter on the Scholarship of Assessment Grants. The DIG endorses this change.
4. Include a chapter on the Staff Survey. The DIG endorses this change.
5. Preface every chapter with a short executive summary that gives important findings, results, or questions raised from data analysis. There are a few chapters now without narration. The DIG makes no recommendation at this time and will re-visit this question next meeting.

C. Proposed changes to Volume I

1. Volume I will be revised and updated as appropriate by Erika Woehlk and Sue Pieper.

2. Eliminate Chapter V, the Master Plan and Assessment Workshop summary. There is a longer chapter in Volume II concerning the Workshop. The DIG endorses this change.
- D. Proposed change to all volumes
1. Include a byline for each chapter, granting credit where it is earned. The DIG does not endorse this change. The opening pages for each volume list contributors and that suffices.
- II. Motivation Study Findings Progress Report – Candy Young and Deb Cartwright
- A. Several motivation initiatives regarding the junior tests were implemented in Spring 2003
1. Students may register for two additional timeslots (morning and late afternoon) during the January Conference. Students who chose to complete the assessment on this day received a coupon for a Godfather’s personal-size pizza from Sodexo.
 2. Students who were assigned the CAAP were required to complete only three sections out of the five. In the past, students completed four sections.
 3. Students who performed well receive a specific acknowledgement on their transcript: “distinction” for scoring above the 50th percentile and “high distinction” for scoring above the 80th percentile.
- B. Initial findings
1. The self-reported effort score on the exams is the best predictor of the resultant score. ACT Score is also a very important predictor.
 2. The motivation strategies in general led to greater effort and higher test scores as statistically significant levels. It was beneficial to include more options to take the exams during the day as taking the exam during the day correlated with higher test scores and was statistically significant.
 3. Faculty proctors were beneficial and having a faculty proctor present was correlated with higher self-reported effort and higher test scores and was statistically significant.
- C. Implications
1. Need to offer more daytime test-taking options, encourage faculty proctoring, and continue the letter to students from the president.
 2. Need to educate the faculty about the benefits of the junior test for the university and the students, how to access and use the data for advising and letters of recommendation, about the success of the motivation plan, and about the potential for application to senior exams in the major.
- III. Continuation of General Education Critical Thinking Instrument Discussion – Candy Young
- A. Truman State University and 15 other Missouri institutions are participating.

B. We have to justify the 100-student sample. How do we pick the students?

IV. Action Plan Progress Reports (3 reports were given)

A. Graduate Program Assessment & Graduate Student Exit Questionnaire – Maria Di Stefano

1. The Graduate Council has been working on developing outcomes for each graduate program.
2. After outcomes and matrices are finalized, the Council will develop the Graduate Student Exit Questionnaire so that it is best suited to assessing the outcomes. The final versions of the Graduate Program Frameworks are on the April 21, 2004 Graduate Council agenda.

B. Writing Assessment – Sarah Mohler

1. The proposed assessments are using the writing-enhanced outcomes.
2. The proposed new assessment will be three-prong:
 - a. Evaluate pieces of writing students have previously produced in order to alleviate the burden of assessment on students and faculty and motivate participation.
 - b. Utilize existing assessment tools to streamline the assessment procedure, promote cost effectiveness and eliminate redundancy.
 - c. Assess the reliability of the writing assessment tools and the accuracy of the data by utilizing multiple measures (data from nationally normed measures like the NSSE, GSQ, CSEQ, as well as data from in-house measures such as the LSP Senior Portfolio and Interview Project).
3. Sarah will present the proposal to Undergraduate Council on November 13. The DIG endorses the proposal.

C. GSQ Review – Nancy Asher for Rector & Bohac

1. The Graduating Student Questionnaire has been developed as an online product and December 2003 graduates will have the option of completing the survey online.
2. The survey has been revised and updated. The new question #11 is written expressly in terms of the LSP, for instance. See handout for complete changes.

V. Next meeting: Monday, November 17, 4:30-5:30pm, Violette Hall 2251.

Meeting adjourned at 5:25pm.

ew