

ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION GROUP

May 4, 2005, 4:30pm
Baldwin Hall 100

Those Present: David Gillette, Karon Speckman, Sue Pieper, Erika Woehlk, Marty Eisenberg, Nancy Asher, Candy Young, Heidi Templeton, David Hoffman, Brandon Large, Scott Thatcher, Dave Rector, Lou Ann Gilchrist, Michael McManis

Guest: John Ishiyama

- I. Analysis and Reporting Group (ARG) Student Engagement Project – John Ishiyama
 - A. J. Ishiyama has been merging data sets from the CIRP, CSEQ, and GSQ and tracking students over time. There are 8,000 records that include surveys from 1992-2003.
 - B. Recently, the analysis project has been centered on the CSEQ and what it can tell us about student experiences and whether or not they will return to Truman. There are 1402 individual CSEQ records of “juniors” (students enrolled in JINS courses) incorporated into the database. There were different categories involved:
 1. Students’ perceived interactions with faculty.
 - a. For all students and for First-Generation Low Income Students (FGLI), their perceived interactions with faculty have a positive correlation to their return to Truman.
 - b. For African-American students, this interaction has a negative correlation to their return to Truman.
 2. The Diverse Experiences Index, which includes:
 - a. Out-of-class interactions with faculty.
 - i. For all respondents and FGLI students, out-of-class interactions with faculty have a positive correlation to their return to Truman.
 - ii. The correlation for African-American students and out-of-class interactions with return is positive, but not significant.
 - b. Experience in clubs.
 - i. For all respondents and for FGLI students, their club/organization participation has a positive, significant correlation to their return to Truman.
 - ii. For African-American students, their participation in clubs/organizations has a negative correlation to their return to Truman.
- II. CSEQ Administration – David Gillette

- A. J. Ishiyama, D. Hoffman, and M. Eisenberg summarized their opinions on the CSEQ (see agenda).
- B. Discussion
 - 1. Keep the resource issue separate from the quality of the surveys when making this decision.
 - 2. The CIRP, NSSE, and CSXQ all play a part in deciding whether or not to administer the CSEQ to freshmen. Each of these data sets does different things.
 - a. The CIRP is good for background information on students and their pre-college experiences.
 - b. The NSSE is good for cross-institutional comparisons and for summarizing issues the State might be interested in.
 - c. The CSXQ (although we don't administer it at Truman) provides the same data as the CSEQ except for the Estimate of Gains.
 - 3. We should be interested in data that will help us as an institution.
 - 4. A course-embedded CSEQ has a much higher response rate than non-course-embedded. However, other offices have had success using other methods to obtain high response rates on surveys.
 - 5. **The DIG will meet during the summer to continue discussion on this issue.** Some additional things that might be considered at the meeting are:
 - a. Reviewing the Assessment Program as a whole when considering such significant issues as CSEQ administration.
 - b. Considering the good will of the students.
 - c. Focusing on performance and direct measures.

III. CLA Update – Sue Pieper

- A. S. Pieper distributed 2 handouts.
- B. The State has issued a directive to all state institutions: assessment programs must include value-added student learning.
 - 1. What do we anticipate our institution will be doing to measure value-added student learning in the 2005-2006 academic year?
 - 2. What information, if any, do we need from the Council for Aid to Education and/or MDHE to make an informed decision about the approach our institution will use during AY2005-2006 to measure value-added student learning?

- C. There were two options discussed: 1) continue with the CLA, or 2) re-institute the Growth as a Thinker component to the Portfolio Project.
- D. The DIG cannot make a decision now, considering that the senior score reports from the CLA have not been received.

IV. Interview Project Update – Jeffrey Vittengl (*in absentia*)

Since the last DIG meeting, the Interview Project team has been focused on coding the verbal interview responses. We have completed coding for 9 of the 10 interview questions, and the final question will be coded by the end of finals week. Each question has yielded approximately 10-12 response categories. After the coding is completed, I will analyze the data descriptively to characterize students' most common experiences with leadership and service learning, as well as inferentially to test the relations of interview responses to measured outcome variables (*e.g.*, satisfaction with Truman State University, perceived educational growth, grade point average).

V. Assessment Grant Update – Erika Woehlk

A. The ARG received 5 grant proposals.

1. "Sociological Inquiry Students' Achievements of Social Scientific Mode Outcomes" has been asked to revise and resubmit. No response yet from the grant writer.
2. "Assessment of JINS Outcomes: The 'JINS Effect' " was extended a grant agreement form and letter from the VPAA including the committee's comments for improvement. The agreement form has not yet been returned.
3. "Promoting Student Success: Development of an Effective Intervention System" was extended a grant agreement form. Four of the five grant recipients have returned their forms.
4. "Promoting Academic Success and Retention through Healthy and Balanced Living: Assessment and Strategies for Improving College Health at Truman State University" was not extended an offer.
5. "Truman Index for Leadership Development Experiences" was asked to revise and resubmit. The grant writer chose not to resubmit and has declined the grant.

- B. Next year, the ARG hopes to announce the grants in the fall and extended offers in December. This will allow for some research to be performed during the spring semester if necessary.

VI. UGC Computer Literacy Committee Update – Scott Thatcher

- A. The Committee is considering keeping outcomes #1, 3, and 5 because they can be assessed by the CSEQ.
- B. The Committee will likely recommend that the University not add any requirements of students: that the outcome will be checked "passively" through questions on the CSEQ.
- C. Discussion: Update the language on some of the out-of-date outcomes.

VII. Announcements

- A. Please watch for Fall 2005 schedule requests and return them quickly when they do come.
- B. Tell Sue Pieper if you have any input on the way the CLA Score Report is formatted.

Meeting adjourned at 5:33pm.

ew