

ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION GROUP

March 7, 2006, 1:30pm
SUB Alumni Room

Those Present: David Gillette, Erika Woehlk, Sue Pieper, Glenn Wehner, John O'Brien, Karen Smith, Brandon Large, Lou Ann Gilchrist, Nancy Asher, Candy Young, Michael McManis, John Bohac, Barbara Price, Scott Thatcher, Jeremy Houser (for Jennifer Eldridge-Houser)

- I. Interview Project – Jeffrey Vittengl (*in absentia*)
 - A. In February, 38 faculty and staff and 38 student interviewers interviewed 116 students.
 - B. The Project data have been entered and cleaned up.
- II. Portfolio Project – Karen Smith
 - A. The plea for readers went out last week. So far there have been 30 responses, and K. Smith needs 30 more. The deadline for responses is March 20.
 - B. K. Smith will research whether or not staff can be Portfolio readers.
- III. Student Interview Project Topic Search – Barbara Price for Bryce Jones
 - A. B. Price distributed a handout with the committee's recommendations. The two topics they propose are:
 1. Interview juniors and seniors and ask them what do you know now that you didn't know in your first year that would have helped you in your first year. This might also include: What services could the University have provided that would have helped? What was useful and what was not?
 2. Ask questions relating to student engagement (or lack thereof) with faculty. This might include advising (for which we are seeing some low scores).
 - B. The committee spoke with members of the First-Year Experience Task Force, who recommended choosing topic #1, which will complement their work.
 - C. D. Gillette will pass these recommendations to J. Vittengl.
- IV. Student Engagement Survey – David Gillette
 - A. There are two student assessment interns this semester working on a follow-up to the Interview Project on student engagement. They have conducted interviews of selected faculty so far, but will administer an online survey to all faculty and students shortly. The survey will solicit opinions and experiences regarding student engagement.
 - B. Discussion with DIG:

1. What will the survey look like compared to the NSSE? The NSSE is very general; our survey will have specific questions generated from the responses from the Interview Project.
2. In the Interview Project, faculty saw class-based interaction as very important; students reported out-of-class interactions as important.
3. B. Price will e-mail D. Gillette the specific NSSE questions that pertain to student engagement.

V. CLA Update – Sue Pieper

- A. March 30 is the first session for the seniors. S. Pieper distributed a sign-up sheet for faculty proctors – some times already have one student proctor assigned from Assessment and Testing.
- B. S. Pieper will give L.A. Gilchrist information on what the students are required to do on the CLA.
- C. There will be a web conference on March 21 at 3:00 in McClain Hall 215 to train the proctors.
- D. Discussion with DIG:
 1. Are seniors who take the CLA exempt from taking their senior exam? No.
 2. There were two too few freshmen in the performance exam of the CLA last semester, so we will not be able to get scores back on that section. Thus, should the seniors do the other section only? No, because even though we won't get comparative data between the seniors and freshmen for the performance exam, we can still get results back for the individual datasets.
 3. S. Pieper will ask CLA if we can add two freshmen to the pool this semester.

VI. GRE – Nancy Asher

The change to specific testing dates will now occur in Fall 2007, not October 2006.

VII. Senior Tests Update – David Gillette

- A. The Vice President agreed with our recommendations.
- B. Faculty whose disciplines currently use the GRE will likely have one year to pick a replacement exam or assessment.

VIII. Junior Test Discussion – David Gillette

- A. N. Asher distributed a chart with Truman's general education assessment scores compared to other institutions'.
- B. Discussion with DIG:

1. What would we do instead of the CAAP and Academic Profile? The CLA? Whatever it is, we need something that we can show to the public that is easy to understand.
2. The CLA might be preferred by the CBHE.
3. Reservations regarding the CAAP: We teach beyond what the CAAP tests. It doesn't discriminate well with high performing students.
4. E. Woehlk will send "The Matrix" to the DIG, which shows the results of a comprehensive review of assessment instruments and their correlations to LSP outcomes.
5. For next time, the DIG should review the CAAP and Academic Profile portions of The Matrix. Also, S. Thatcher, C. Young, J. O'Brien, G. Wehner, and B. Large will go to Assessment and Testing to look at sample copies of the CAAP.
6. For next time, think about the effects sampling will have on the assessment program for general education.

The meeting adjourned at 2:27pm.

ew