

ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION GROUP

April 29, 2004, 4:00pm
VH 2251

Those Present: Stephen Hadwiger, Nancy Asher, David Gillette, Doug Davenport, Sue Pieper, Erika Woehlk, Lou Ann Gilchrist, Garry Gordon, Dave Rector, Bryce Jones, Michael McManis, Candy Young

I. Announcement

- A. David Gillette will be the 2004-2005 Chair of the Vice President's Advisory Committee on Assessment. G. Gordon thanked him for his work on the Interview Project and for the work he will do as Chair.
- B. G. Gordon is in the process of finding a replacement for the Interview Project Director.

II. Data Review Project Report – CSEQ/NSSE – Marty Eisenberg, Lou Ann Gilchrist, Sarah Mohler, Stephen Hadwiger, David Gillette

A. L. Gilchrist reported

- 1. There are four quadrants of student affairs outcomes. L. Gilchrist distributed a handout with CSEQ and NSSE data concerning these outcomes.
 - a. Quadrant 1: Truman students report about the same level of connectedness as students from other institutions. Maybe our goal should be higher than this, though.
 - b. Quadrant 2: We're doing very well in general education, but not so well in reported preparation for job placement. Students report they're thinking critically, but reflective behavior indicators indicate the opposite when compared with the national norms.
 - c. Quadrant 3: Students spend a lot of time studying (significantly more than the national norm), but a more revealing comparison would come from a highly selective group.
 - d. Quadrant 4: Not very many indicators in this quadrant show significant differences from the national norms. We should be seeing higher numbers, however, in the developing responsible citizens category.
- 2. Are national norms the best comparison to make? Other highly selective institutions and/or COPLAC would be ideal, but even they are not exactly like Truman.

B. S. Hadwiger reported

- 1. S. Hadwiger distributed a handout with CSEQ and NSSE data pertaining to indicators of diversity on campus.
- 2. The handout made comparisons between male and female responses, Truman and COPLAC responses.
- 3. What are our benchmarks?

- C. D. Gillette reported and distributed a handout containing all items where Truman differed significantly from the COPLAC institutions on the NSSE.

III. Ongoing Project Updates

A. Sharing discipline-specific data across the University

1. DIG members shared their divisions' cursory opinions, which varied from unwilling to willing.
2. If data were to be shared, everyone must understand that different disciplines are under different circumstances (for example with FTE ratios), which makes direct comparison tricky. Disciplines should work toward *self*-improvement; other discipline's data are useful for examples of best practice.
3. Continue discussion in Fall 2004.

B. Update Regarding Writing Assessment (none)

IV. Continuation of Budget Funding Priorities

After some discussion, this agenda item will be continued for deliberation on the Fall 2004 Design and Implementation Group agenda.

V. Announcements

A. D. Gillette discussed ideas for the 2004-2005 Assessment Committee.

1. Plan to continue data reviews.
2. Create internship slots for students to perform data analyses and dissemination.
3. Create lines of communication between the Design and Implementation Group, the Analysis and Reporting Group, and the Undergraduate Council.

B. N. Asher asked for suggestions for revisions to the Alumni and Employer Surveys. DIG members should respond to her by Friday, May 7.

C. There will be some sampling of Portfolio data this summer.

Meeting adjourned at 5:23pm.

ew