

ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE: Design and Implementation Group

April 1, 2003, 3:00pm
VH 2251

Those Present: Ruthie Dare-Halma, David Gillette, Sue Pieper, Nancy Asher, Heidi Templeton, Erika Woehlk, Candy Young, Maria Di Stefano, Michael McManis, Dave Rector, Shawn Doyle, Bryce Jones, John Bohac, Barbara Price

Meeting convened at 3:30pm

- I. Erika Woehlk distributed copies of the Fall 2002 *Assessment Almanac* to committee members.
- II. Analysis and Reporting Group update
 - A. The ARG reviewed the assessment grant applications and will be making recommendations to Vice President Gordon soon.
 - B. Discussion: Since there were a relatively small number of grants, what will happen to the excess money? It could be used to pay for publishing or for funding further assessment research. Rest assured, if a faculty or staff member were appointed to conduct assessment research, he/she would not receive more salary than what was allotted for the grant applicants.
- III. Subcommittee Reports
 - A. Bryce Jones, Student Satisfaction Assessment (Design and Implementation)
 1. This subcommittee is examining outside surveys at the moment, including Noel-Levitz, Astin, and ACT. However, there are three problems associated with outside surveys:
 - a. May lose comparability with whole data
 - b. We can add local questions, but chances are they cannot be as detailed as if we were to create our own survey
 - c. Cost
 2. The subcommittee will like to speak with David Hoffman next
 3. Suggestions: consider revising the GSQ or striking the NSSE or CSEQ. Consider a Web-based survey.
 - B. Sue Pieper (for Sarah Mohler), Writing Assessment
 1. The committee is interviewing writing-enhanced instructors and will be analyzing the data from the interviews on Friday.
 2. Sarah will be presenting the results at an upcoming conference in Maryville.
 - C. Ruthie Dare-Halma (for Doug Davenport), Computer Literacy

From an e-mail message from Doug: The Computing Literacy Assessment Group is examining assessment instruments used at other institutions. Thus far, it appears that Tek.Xam and SmartForce are used by numerous higher education institutions. Furthermore, the group is finding that definitions and terms used for this essential skill vary tremendously, which affects the methods used for assessment. We hope to provide a list of practical assessment strategies at the May 6th meeting, along with some information regarding the definitional concerns that should be addressed.

D. Michael McManis, Institutional Effectiveness Outcomes

1. This subcommittee began with indicators developed by the Division Heads
2. Should the subcommittee develop a list of “dashboard” indicators, *i.e.* a list of about 10-15 indicators that are easily quotable? Yes, but continue work on a larger grouping as well.

E. Sue Pieper, Post Assessment Survey

1. Approximately 200 students have now completed the survey, with an estimate of 600 by the time testing is through.
2. Very preliminarily, the mean for importance placed on the exams is lower than the mean associated with effort. Question #5 (This was an important test to me) received the lowest mean and #8 (I would like to know how well I did on this test) received the highest.

F. Heidi Templeton, Assessment-related Communications to Students

1. This subcommittee is looking at three groups of students: those who have taken the junior test already, those who have not signed up yet, and those who will be taking it during the next round. Hope to determine something about motivation.
2. Suggestion: also consider looking at last fall’s students who did not receive a letter from the President.
3. Suggestion: increase the spirit of competitiveness and reward the students somehow if they score the highest in the State.

IV. Electronic Portfolios: move to April 17th meeting

V. Staff Survey Status Report: will be distributed in late April or early May.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30pm

ew