

## ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION GROUP

December 4, 2003, 4:00pm  
VH 2251

**Those Present:** Sue Pieper, Bryce Jones, Maria Di Stefano, Steve Stepanek, Doug Davenport, Marty Eisenberg, Lou Ann Gilchrist, Mark Kirtland, Stephen Hadwiger, Nancy Asher, Erika Woehlk, David Gillette, John Bohac

**Guest:** Debra Kerby

- I. Higher Learning Commission (HLC) and Assessment Committee Expectations – Deb Kerby
  - A. This year is the self-study “picture” year. The HLC committee members will be writing a draft self-study in summer 2004 and will submit the report in December 2004. The HLC team visit will occur on January 31 to February 2, 2005. The team will consist of six or seven people, including an assessment specialist.
  - B. There are five HLC criteria. Criteria 3 and 4 are relevant for the Assessment Committee. Core Component #3A is especially pertinent: “The organization’s goals for student learning outcomes are clearly stated for each educational program and make effective assessment possible.”
    1. The DIG should be familiar with innovate practice and assessment in the disciplines.
    2. Disciplines should:
      - a. have clearly-defined goals and objectives
      - b. demonstrate student work toward the goals
      - c. assess the goals
      - d. use the feedback gained from assessments to improve student learning
  - C. The DIG needs to know why we use the assessment instruments we use and what they are used for.
  - D. Criterion #4 addresses the LSP. The University should be able to demonstrate assessment of the LSP.
  - E. John Appleson visited campus in November. He recommended we include or link the Master Plan to the Self-Study Report.
  - F. The HLC might also request information on students’ non-academic experiences. We should be prepared to show outcomes and perhaps even assessment of the non-academic outcomes.
  - G. Michael McManis and Dave Rector are working on establishing a list of Truman’s peer institutions. This is important for benchmarking purposes.
  - H. The Self-Study writers hope to have an executive summary posted on the Web after the Report is finished.
- II. December 15<sup>th</sup> DIG Meeting Time – moved to 4:00pm.

### III. Action Plan Progress Reports

- A. Writing Assessment Update – Sarah Mohler. No report.
- B. Assessment in the Disciplines Update – Candy Young. No report.
- C. Institutional Effectiveness – Michael McManis. No report.
- D. Review/Implement Past Communication-Related Recommendations by Previous Motivation Subcommittee – Heidi Templeton and Stephen Hadwiger. No report.
- E. Review/Implement Past Non-Communication-Related Recommendations by Previous Motivation Subcommittee – Nancy Asher
  - 1. N. Asher sent out her report by e-mail earlier this week.
  - 2. Please contact her if you have suggestions, changes, or comments.

### IV. Update on Interview Project – David Gillette

- A. There have been three articles in the “Truman Today” featuring the Interview Project. D. Gillette requests the DIG’s feedback on the articles. Also, he would like to know if someone has been tracking the number of readers the “Today” receives now that it’s online as compared to 1) the readership when it was solely in paper format and 2) the readership when the entire contents of the “Today” were on one page online (as opposed to the format now where each section is on a separate page). D. Davenport suggested this can be done by tracking the number of hits the pages receive.
- B. D. Gillette requests that the DIG begin thinking about the content and goals of the 2005 Interview Project.

### V. Spring 2004 DIG “Action Plan” Proposal

- A. The five groups were reorganized to be: CSEQ/NSSE, Alumni & Employer Survey, GSQ, Junior Test, and Senior Tests.
- B. DIG members are encouraged to sign up for their first and second choices. The sign-up sheet will be distributed again at the December 15 DIG meeting.

### VI. Next meeting: Monday, December 15, 4:00-5:00pm in VH 2251.

Meeting adjourned at 4:55pm.

ew