

## ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION GROUP

March 25, 2004, 4:00pm  
VH 2251

**Those Present:** Lou Ann Gilchrist, Sue Pieper, Candy Young, Stephen Hadwiger, Erika Woehlk, Nancy Asher, Heidi Templeton, Doug Davenport, David Gillette, John Bohac, Steve Stepanek, Michael McManis

- I. Data Review Project Report – Junior Tests – Candy Young, Heidi Templeton, Mark Kirtland, Michael McManis
  - A. C. Young distributed a handout containing five years' worth of CAAP and AP data. The handout includes the percent of students scoring about the 50<sup>th</sup> and 80<sup>th</sup> percentiles.
  - B. Students taking the Academic Profile receive proficiency ratings from 1 to 3.
  - C. Cursory findings.
    1. Students performed better in the 2002-2003 academic year than in the previous four years. This is a result of the motivation initiatives put in place in Spring 2003.
    2. Students who completed the reading section first had higher scores in that section as well as higher motivation.
    3. Truman students are doing well on the mathematics section.
    4. The motivation initiatives are working. We might even consider doing more to increase motivation.
  - D. Consider only requiring two sections of the CAAP instead of three.
    1. Student suggestion: supply the student with a list of three tests to choose from and allow him/her to select the two he/she wants to take.
    2. If two CAAP tests do become required, consider giving the CSEQ immediately afterward. Pros: it will be a controlled environment and the purpose could be correctly and consistently explained. Cons: it's already embedded in the JINS courses.
    3. With only two tests, it may become difficult to advise students individually. One approach, though, could be to ask them why they chose the two they did.
  - E. With the CAAP and Academic Profile, the user norms include students from two states that require passing the test(s) for junior standing or graduation.
  - F. Suggestions for the future.
    1. Perhaps we should rethink which tests we use and determine what other tests are out there that may suit our purposes for assessing general education learning outcomes. What does the rest of the world consider important for a college student to know?

2. Ask faculty to proctor the tests during the University Conference.
- G. The Collegiate Learning Assessment – Questions
1. How will it be administered and what results will we get?
  2. If we take a sampling of each class, how will that compare to what other institutions are doing?
  3. It is important to note which institutions are public and which are private in comparing the data: unsure if the CLA makes this distinction.

## II. Ongoing Project Updates

- A. Update from division representatives regarding their division discussions about sharing discipline-specific data across the University
1. E. Woehlk read an absentee report from J. Gering, reporting that the Science Division is opposed to data sharing at this point.
  2. Other division representatives will query their divisions before the next DIG meeting.
  3. The discipline assessment website is available to anyone with a Truman IP. Does the value of the website outweigh the potential for misuse?  
<http://disciplineassessment.truman.edu>.
  4. Regarding senior tests, all disciplines need to have a local and an external means for evaluating the major. If the senior test does not “fit,” consider finding another options.
- B. Update Regarding the Writing Assessment – no report

## III. Remaining Meeting Times

April 13, 2004, 4:00pm  
April 29, 2004, 4:00pm

Meeting adjourned at 4:45pm.

ew