ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE: Design and Implementation Group

March 6, 2003, 1:30pm
VH 2251

Those Present: Ruthie Dare-Halma, Sue Pieper, Erika Woehlk, Heidi Templeton, David Hoffman, Sarah Mohler, Maria Di Stefano, Doug Davenport, Randy Smith, Vaughan Pultz, Garry Gordon, Marie Orton.

I. Analysis and Reporting Group Update

    A. The assessment grant guidelines are due to division offices March 17. The ARG is meeting directly after this meeting and will create a review rubric.

    B. The committee will begin to look at analysis projects. Two considerations so far are examining the CSEQ to inform us about retention or tying ACT scores into retention.

II. Subcommittee Reports

    A. Sarah Mohler, Writing Assessment

        1. The writing assessment committee plans to begin interviewing between 70 and 90 faculty who teach writing-enhanced and JINS courses and ask them how they teach writing and how they provide feedback to their students. The committee hopes to find practical information on how writing is taught and what expectations are in place.

        2. The new assessment will give feedback to faculty and package them to the students.

        3. Sarah might present the committee's progress at a Faculty Development Luncheon and an upcoming conference in Maryville. Ultimately, the committee will present the University community with several methods and everyone will decide together what the best method is.

        4. The committee is still examining the possibility of a portfolio or a course-embedded program. However, there might be some resistance to a course-embedded assessment, especially if it went to JINS courses where another assessment is already required.

    B. Doug Davenport, Computer Literacy

        1. The subcommittee looked at the original documents and outcome statements for computer literacy.

        2. The first thing to do is to find out the status of what we've already looked at, especially SmartForce. In some respects, SmartForce is quite cost efficient, but it does cost money to bring the modules here and implement the program. The subcommittee will talk to other institutions to see how SmartForce is working for them. How do we choose which modules to implement? Microsoft Word and Excel are institutional norms for Truman and they are also used nationally, so it would make sense to include those modules.

        3. The last outcome statement deals with copyright issues. How do we approach this?

        4. The subcommittee might consider Tek.Xam outcome statements regarding the Internet.

C. Marie Orton, Institutional Effectiveness Outcomes Development

   1. Michael McManis is working with division heads.

D. Heidi Templeton, Implementation of Motivation Committee Recommendations Regarding Communication to Students

   1. Stephen Hadwiger will join from HPP.

   2. The subcommittee would like to conduct focus groups of students about the junior test. The test cannot go away, so we need to get ideas on how to motivate students. We should make them understand why we need the results of the junior test and of the GSQ.

   3. The first thing to do is form a committee. Then we will identify students for the focus groups on the junior test and the GSQ. Find out what the negative feelings are and what to do to fix them. Students need to see the value in these instruments.

   4. Other ideas regarding motivation.

      a. Have 'nuggets' of information pop up on the assessment website.

      b. Make faculty use assessment to institute any curricular or program changes, i.e. for the N-1 proposal in Faculty Senate now.

      c. Have RCP advisors and Truman Week instructors tell students about the importance of assessment at Truman.

E. Sue Pieper, Student Opinion Survey

   1. The subcommittee is about halfway through collecting data.

   2. The students are not complaining about having to fill out the survey.

   3. Very preliminarily, students do not see why the senior test is important, but they are giving it a decent effort.

III. The DIG will move the Portfolio report to the next meeting.

IV. Alumni Survey

A. Nancy Asher will be sending the Alumni Survey out to alumni soon.

B. The Survey should be pared down considerably.

C. We should consider placing the Survey online.

D. Bring in the Career Center for advice.

E. The DIG recommends to Nancy to postpone sending the Survey out until it can be revised.

V. Remaining Meeting Times:

    Thursday, March 20, 1:30-3:00, VH 2251
    Tuesday, April 1, 3:00-4:30, VH 2251
    Thursday, April 17, 1:30-3:00, VH 2251
    Tuesday, May 6, 3:00-4:30, VH 2251

Meeting adjourned at 2:55pm.

ew