

## ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION GROUP

February 20, 2003, 1:30pm  
VH 2251

**Those Present:** Ruthie Dare-Halma, Sue Pieper, Erika Woehlk, Nancy Asher, Dave Rector, Vaughan Pultz, Candy Young, Marie Orton, David Hoffman, Sarah Mohler, Randy Smith, Michael McManis.

### I. Analysis and Reporting Group Report

- A. The assessment grant guidelines are finished and are posted at <http://assessment.truman.edu/grants2003.pdf>.
- B. The Group will now try to concentrate on analysis of data.

### II. Subcommittee Reports

- A. Candy Young, assessment in the discipline workshops
  - 1. Recruited Sara Orel (FA), Sandy Weber (BU), and John Ishiyama (SS)
  - 2. Work began at the January Conference where the panel asked participants 5 questions.
  - 3. Findings:
    - a. There needs to be a more systematic way to prepare for HLC. The things we ask the disciplines to report should dovetail nicely with the HLC criteria.
    - b. How are the reports written? Most disciplines appoint one person to write the report. It is viewed as a task and not a learning opportunity for the discipline to look at its progress and at areas that may need improvement. The outcome should be change in the discipline, not just a report that is done because it has to be done.
    - c. If the VPAA office would attach more of a sense of importance to the five-year reviews, then perhaps the disciplines will be more inclined to look at them as a learning opportunity.
    - d. Disciplines with few faculty have an easier time writing the review.
    - e. How do we communicate to students what the discipline objectives are? This is an HLC question and one that needs to be answered soon.
  - 4. The next steps are to look at capstones and to read the five-year reviews and see how assessment data were used.
- B. Erika Woehlk, Randy Smith, and Barbara Price, mapping assessments to learning outcomes
  - 1. The group put together a list of all the assessment instruments/programs at Truman and assigned three to each group member.

2. The plan is to match each assessment instrument, question by question if applicable, to the LSP outcomes. The group created a scale of zero to four where zero is “not at all,” one is “minimally” and three is “thoroughly.”
  3. The group chose not to tackle the senior tests and capstone courses yet because of the great variety involved and because they most likely assess major learning outcomes rather than LSP outcomes.
  4. Once the matching is complete, the group will identify areas that need assessing and areas that are possibly over assessed.
  5. The DIG recommended that this group recruit more members of the faculty to aid them.
- C. Sue Pieper for Maria Di Stefano, review the graduate student exit questionnaire
1. Maria formed the committee and they have chosen the data to be analyzed.
- D. Dave Rector and John Bohac, review the GSQ
1. John is working on recruiting faculty help.
  2. The plan is to trim the GSQ down.
- E. David Hoffman and Vaughan Pultz, CSEQ and NSSE
1. Recruited Paul Parker (SS), Scott Thatcher (MT), Dan Doman (LL), Debra Kling (RCP), and Matt Walczewski (Student)
  2. The CSEQ is a formative assessment.
- F. Heidi Templeton, implementation of motivation committee recommendations regarding communication to students
1. The HPP Division is meeting this week and will recommend a new representative to serve on the DIG and on Heidi’s subcommittee
  2. Work has not yet begun.
- G. Nancy Asher and Shawn Doyle, implementation of motivation committee recommendations
1. Nancy is looking for a faculty member to recruit for help.
  2. The Post-Assessment Survey is now being given to students taking their senior test.
- H. Sue Pieper, update on Post-Assessment Survey
1. The Survey is now implemented at all senior test sessions.
  2. The Biology discipline already had their own motivation instrument, but Sue and Ian spoke to the discipline, who subsequently agreed to use the new Post-Assessment Survey as well. The Post assesses motivation and effort, while the Biology instrument asks

different questions. Biology can now compare their results with the rest of the University.

3. Can we get a correlation of motivation and effort to performance? This is one topic someone applying for an assessment grant might want to consider. At some point we might also want to look at the effect faculty proctors have on performance.

### III. Assessment Data Procurement Procedures

- A. There is a new form that one needs to fill out to request assessment data. The form asks for the data you need and the reason you need it. The form also required that ITS approve the data request.
- B. if someone is requesting survey data that is in Assessment and Testing, then there is no reason ITS should have to approve it.
- C. The form was probably developed in anticipation for data requests from Banner, which is why ITS signature is required.
- D. Someone needs to let the VPAA office know that, depending on the data requested, ITS will not have to approve all data requests.

### IV. Remaining Spring meetings:

Tuesday, March 4, 3:00-4:30, VH 2251  
Thursday, March 20, 1:30-3:00, VH 2251  
Tuesday, April 1, 3:00-4:30, VH 2251  
Thursday, April 17, 1:30-3:00, VH 2251  
Tuesday, May 6, 3:00-4:30, VH 2251

### V. Other

- A. Interview Project: 135 interviews have been conducted so far, with 27 more today and 35 more before Midterm Break. David is looking for 2 faculty to conduct interviews on March 1.
- B. Both Assessment Committee groups will meet with presidential candidate Dr. Barbara Dixon at 3:00 in VH 1300, February 25.

Meeting adjourned at 2:40pm.

ew