

ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE: Design and Implementation Group

May 6, 2003, 3:00pm
VH 2251

Those Present: Ruthie Dare-Halma, Bryce Jones, Doug Davenport, Sue Pieper, Dave Rector, Garry Gordon, Maria Di Stefano, Nancy Asher, Erika Woehlk, David Hoffman, John Bohac

I. Subcommittee Final Reports

A. Erika Woehlk, Mapping Assessment Outcomes

1. Of the four surveys mapped, between 30 and 40 percent of the questions applied to the LSP Outcome Statements.
2. **The DIG endorses** the recommendation to ask the Analysis and Reporting Group to merge survey data and look at individual students to see how their responses may have changed to similar questions over time.
3. **The DIG endorses** the subcommittee's request to extend their work through August 2003.

B. Sue Pieper for Sarah Mohler, Develop a New Writing Assessment

1. No recommendations to the DIG. The subcommittee is still dealing with some issues.
2. **The DIG requests** that Sarah present the results of the writing assessment subcommittee's interviews to the committee.
3. The subcommittee requests the DIG's feedback on the following issues.
 - a. Whether the assessment should be formative or summative. **The DIG recommends** either; a tie vote of 6-6 occurred. If possible, the DIG would like to see a little of each.
 - b. Whether one sample of writing or a collection of student writings should be collected and assessed. **The DIG recommends** 7 to 5 that a sample of writings be collected.
 - c. Whether the assessment should be embedded in an existing class or assessment tool, or if it should be a stand-alone assessment. **The DIG recommends** unanimously that it be embedded.
 - d. Whether the assessment should emphasize interdisciplinary/cross-curricular writing skills or more disciplinary-focused writing skills. With 9 votes, **the DIG recommends** that it be up to the student. (2 votes for interdisciplinary, 0 for disciplinary, and 1 for both.)
 - e. What constituency should be the primary audience? **The DIG cannot make a recommendation at this time.** This is contingent upon what is decided on the first four points. If it's formative, most likely the students will be the primary audience. For summative, it is hard to judge because faculty could make revisions to the

curriculum and their course content based on the results, which in turn helps students, the administration and outside accrediting agencies.

C. Marty Eisenberg, Critical Thinking. No report

D. Doug Davenport, Computer Literacy

1. There are several options that would be viable; however, the ultimate decision depends upon availability of resources.
2. Tek.Xam is more of an assessment tool, while SmartForce is a development program.
3. Discussion
 - a. If we do opt for one of these commercially developed instruments, we probably shouldn't call it an "assessment." If we create a one-hour workshop over the interim, that would be a big incentive for students. Rather than calling it another assessment tool, which would just be perceived as another hoop they have to jump through, offering credit will 'reward' them.
 - b. **The DIG recommends to Doug** that he investigate the cost and possibility of obtaining SmartForce modules on a one-year trial basis.
 - c. **The DIG recommends** investigation into the creation of a one-hour interim workshop for computer literacy.

E. Candy Young, Discipline Assessment

1. **The DIG endorses** the pursuit of the development of a discipline-based assessment Website.
2. **The DIG endorses** offering workshops to faculty currently conducting their discipline's five-year review.

F. Maria Di Stefano, Graduate Student Exit Questionnaire

1. During the current semester, Graduate Council engaged in very meaningful conversations regarding assessment of graduate programs. After it is established what to assess, only then can we determine how to assess it.
2. **The DIG endorses** the subcommittee's request to extend their work through Spring 2004.

G. Garry Gordon for Michael McManis, Institutional Effectiveness Outcomes

1. Michael has spoken with division heads and is currently working with another group to develop the outcomes.

H. John Bohac and Dave Rector, Review of the GSQ

1. **The DIG endorses** the subcommittee's request to put the GSQ online.

2. **The DIG suggests** that the subcommittee look into cycling some questions; involving computer science and statistics students in the process of rewriting and putting the survey online; and consider having disciplines add their own questions during this summer's Master Plan Workshop.
- I. Bryce Jones, Satisfaction Instrument
 1. Will there be a benefit in getting an outside satisfaction survey with data that can be compared to other schools? It could be a good thing, except students might think they are being over-assessed.
 2. **The DIG endorses** the subcommittee's request to administer the Noel-Levitz satisfaction survey IF we can do it for a one-year trial period and if funding is available.
 - J. David Hoffman, CSEQ and NSSE Review
 1. **The DIG endorses** the subcommittee's recommendation to continue administering the CSEQ and the NSSE.
 - K. Sue Pieper, Post-Assessment Survey
 1. The subcommittee has administered the Post-Assessment Survey to approximately 645 students.
 2. **The DIG supports** the subcommittee's continued analysis of the data, to be completed Summer 2003.
 - L. Ruthie Dare-Halma for Heidi Templeton and Stephen Hadwiger, Recommendations on Motivation
 1. The Interviews are on-going. The subcommittee will send data to the DIG as soon as it is available.
 2. The goal is to find out what students have objections to/problems with and address those in public relations communications.
 - M. Nancy Asher, Review of Motivation Subcommittee's Strategy
 1. **The DIG endorses** the subcommittee's request to join the efforts of Heidi and Stephen.
- II. Other
 - A. Sue handed out a document outlining the activities of the Analysis and Reporting Group this year.
 - B. Sue handed out updated copies of Truman's Assessment Action Plan.

Meeting adjourned at 4:45pm.

ew