

ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE: Design and Implementation Group

April 17, 2003, 1:30pm
VH 2251

Those Present: Ruthie Dare-Halma, David Hoffman, Marie Orton, Maria Di Stefano, Sue Pieper, Marty Eisenberg, Erika Woehlk, John Bohac, Doug Davenport, Sarah Mohler, Nancy Asher, Randy Smith, Candy Young, Michael McManis, Garry Gordon, Vaughan Pultz, Stephen Hadwiger

I. Analysis and Reporting Group Progress Report

- A. The grant review committee will be making their recommendation to Garry Gordon soon.
- B. Of the seven grant applications, six will be funded and one applicant is being asked to revise and resubmit.

II. Subcommittee Reports

- A. Marty Eisenberg, Critical Thinking Assessment: nothing to report.
- B. Randy Smith, Erika Woehlk, Instruments/Outcomes Mapping
 - 1. Barbara Price finished the mapping of the CAAP. Erika passed around a handout with Barbara's work.
 - a. The writing skills section of the CAAP does not match our Writing as Critical Thinking outcomes well. Thus, she recommends not administering this portion of the CAAP.
 - b. The CAAP leaves several areas lacking appropriate assessments.
 - 2. Randy finished outcomes mapping of the NSSE and the CIRP.
 - 3. Erika is working on mapping the GSQ.
 - 4. As of now, the subcommittee is not prepared to make any large recommendations. It is still unclear where there might need to be less assessment of the LSP categories or more.
- C. Maria Di Stefano, Graduate Student Exit Questionnaire
 - 1. The subcommittee requested an extension at the last meeting.
 - 2. The graduate committee has made progress in developing and reviewing graduate outcome statements.
- D. John Bohac, GSQ Review
 - 1. The subcommittee is looking at the feasibility of putting the GSQ online.
 - 2. After that feasibility is determined, they will begin revising the actual survey.

E. Candy Young, Assessment in the Disciplines Workshops

1. Candy passed around a handout with a grid containing cells for various pieces of information each discipline would complete.
2. The grid is a proposal for an online databank that will allow users to click on any square and look up data, outcomes statements, etc. An “x” will be placed in the square where information exists. Click on the “x” and read the information.
3. Most of the information is already present in the five-year reviews each discipline completes. We will be able to extract from those.
4. HLC will be interested in the last section, “Proposed Changes and Improvements.”
5. Question: will the data be available externally? No.
6. How will it be available internally? We should get feedback from the larger faculty body before we make a decision like this. For now, assume that the website will be for the HLC visit. In the fall, we will be able to determine how the availability to the campus will occur.

F. David Hoffman, Vaughan Pultz, CSEQ and NSSE Role Review

1. David passed around a handout with the subcommittee’s recommendations. The two main recommendations are:
 - a. Continue using the NSSE, probably every other year
 - b. Continue using the CSEQ
2. There was some discussion on recommendation 2.5: “DIG should recommend that the VPAA appoint and empower a coordinator for this assessment project similar to portfolio and interview project to facilitate full implementation of junior CSEQ and SAR.” The DIG arrived at no conclusion.

G. Ruthie’s notes for the final meeting

1. All subcommittees should send a summary report of approximately 1 page to Ruthie for the May 6 meeting.
2. Make it clear what the DIG needs to recommend.

H. Nancy Asher, Motivation Subcommittee Recommendations (non-communication)

1. Will look at the “old” motivation recommendations from Heidi.

I. Ruthie for Heidi Templeton

1. Are interviewing the students who took the junior tests on a delayed timescale and the students who took the tests in a timely manner.

2. Plan to interview students in August and early September next semester before they take the junior tests.
- J. David Hoffman for Bryce Jones, Student Satisfaction Assessment
1. Costs for the Noel-Levits student satisfaction survey: \$1.75 / student / paper test or \$2.25 / student online. There is also a \$75 processing fee. Total cost would be between \$2200-2500 for 1200 students.
 2. Institutional priorities survey runs between \$1700 and \$3000.
- III. Doug Davenport, Electronic Portfolios
- A. Considering either a Web-based or digital portfolio.
1. Advantages
 - a. Electronic portfolios can enhance student engagement
 - b. Enhance relevance of the project to the student
 - c. Enhance understanding of technology and computer literacy
 - d. Provides alternate formats (to paper)
 - e. Revolutionizes how data are handled
 - f. Helps analysis
 - g. Can tie in with Blackboard or Banner
 2. Disadvantages
 - a. Cost, either commercially or off-the-shelf, is high: approximately \$20 / student / year
 - b. Loses something in the way it is presented to the faculty and the way faculty review the portfolios
 - c. Privacy issues
- B. Discussion
1. If we go this route, perhaps the best way to get started is to hold faculty workshops explaining about the electronic portfolios.
 2. In-house or external programs? Most would like to try developing an in-house program, but we must ask ITS about feasibility issues.
 3. Where is the advantage if the faculty readers have to print off the portfolios (assuming they don't want to read them off a computer screen)? Most of the time and energy saving will occur on data entry before and after the reading as well as aiding storage.

C. The DIG recommends that Doug pursue options of an electronic portfolio further.

IV. Remaining meeting time this semester.

Tuesday, May 6, 3:00-4:30pm, VH 2251. Final reports will be due.

Meeting adjourned at 3:11pm.

ew