

Chapter XVII: MASTER PLAN AND ASSESSMENT WORKSHOP

This chapter includes a summary of the workshop and updated Selected Measures from the University Master Plan.

There is another summary and a paper presented at the workshop in Volume III.

1999 Annual Master Plan and Assessment Workshop July 19-20, 1999

Summary of the Summer Planning Workshop

Stuart Vorkink

President Jack Magruder's presentation

- Within the framework of our new mission, our institutional identity has been well established. Evidence of this progress includes:
 1. The curricular adjustments made,
 2. Student body demographics leading to selectivity,
 3. The changing nature of the faculty,
 4. Raised post-secondary aspirations of Truman students,
 5. An expanding academic reputation,
 6. Steps toward student learning outcomes,
 7. Governor Carnahan has maintained that our success has exceeded all expectations.

- Truman State University has a deep-rooted, clearly articulated agenda for the future, involving the
 1. Continuing development of an academically challenging, yet nurturing liberal arts culture,
 2. Confronting the on-going demands of recruiting and integrating meritorious students, faculty and staff into the university community.
 3. Improving unrelentingly within our teaching/learning undertakings,
 4. Raising student post-secondary aspirations in terms of graduate or professional schools,
 5. Facilitating increasing student mastery in their major area of study,
 6. Enhancing student performance within the value-added component of the liberal studies program,
 7. Refining of basic and advanced interdisciplinary thinking skills,
 8. Continuing to monitor student and institutional growth and development by means of a viable, evolving assessment program.

- In order to adequately support this agenda, Truman must put forth a tremendous effort in a number of areas such as
 1. Ensuring budgetary and fiscal viability,
 2. Maintaining and developing the physical facilities,
 3. Developing and maintaining a strong image within the general public and among key Players" within the university's external environment.

Vice-President Gordon's Presentation

- As an institution we have much to celebrate. We are doing good work, especially with respect to:
 1. The recruitment of good students,
 2. The recruitment of good faculty,
 3. Progress made in the Liberal Studies Program (i.e., “the core”)
 4. Progress in the Freshmen Experience, and
 5. The Mission Enhancement Program.

Two of the better measures of our good work are

- The level of mastery our students have attained in their major areas and
 - The number of students involved in undergraduate research.
- We have made progress. Yes! But there are still some challenges (i.e., “gaps to close”) left. Some of these gaps appear attitudinal. For example,

(1) Perhaps our ultimate concern should be to broaden a shared sense of responsibility permeating all the divisions, disciplines.

- Who has responsibility for the LSP?—The Faculty Senate?
Who is responsible for critical thinking?—Language & Literature?
Who is responsible for the residential colleges?—the professors of the colleges?
Who is responsible for the MAE program?—the education faculty?
Who has responsibility for the Mathematical Mode of Inquiry?—the mathematics faculty?
Who has responsibility for developing courses for the Communications mode?—
Language and Literature?
No! No! and No!—We all do!

- Too many of us seem to lose ourselves in our own majors or disciplines and seem to forget we are part of a larger university community.
- Less than one-half of the full time faculty teach in the Liberal Studies Program

(2) Acculturation of the new faculty into the university community becomes a major concern, particularly as we become aware that more than 60 percent of the faculty have been hired within the last ten years (since the mission change).

(3) Although the quality of entering students is very high, many are unprepared for the rigors of college study. Compared to students from private liberal arts colleges, fewer of our students come from wealthy families, they study less and they work to support themselves more; yet they share similar aspirations.

(4) The institution has begun to address the faculty work load issue—Realize that we may need to learn how to go about our business in different ways in order to remain viable fiscally and in terms of personnel levels.

- (5) With proper university-wide support the Freshmen Experience can make a major difference in integrating students into the University community.
- (6) A number of important matters need special institutional attention:
 - Senior Test Scores (Are we sliding?)
 - Student and Faculty enthusiasm for the Liberal Studies Program. Negative faculty attitudes impact student attitudes meaningfully.
 - The current distribution of grades (3.28 in 50th percentile)
 - Academic advising—As the residential colleges evolve, this challenge may be reduced.
 - Learning to connect students to the University

❖ Once Again, the key to a positive future is to continue to cultivate a university-wide sense of shared responsibility

The First 60 Hours: Candy Young, Vaughan Pultz, Ruthie Dare-Halma

- Assessment with its use of multiple measures has a long, productive legacy at Truman. However, the effectiveness and utility of those measures employed must be continually reevaluated and monitored to keep the system viable. Similarly, the assessment culture at Truman requires constant attention and maintenance.
- Student progress in their first 60 hours in the basic LSP skills (e.g., reading, writing, critical thinking, scientific reasoning, mathematics) has not been as strong as expected.
- With most students claiming to do their best, the data reveal that student experience in these areas could most accurately be characterized as value neutral or even value subtracted, rather than value added.
- Such findings could have a negative impact on the State’s FFR (Funding for Results) program as well as our overall budgetary position and standing “down state”.

Reading and Challenge: John Halski, Jennifer Neighbors, Julia Kitsmiller

- “Deep” reading by the students is a function of the use to which faculty members put the reading and the quality of the texts per se. For example, if the lecture simply replicates the reading, students see no point in doing the reading assignments.
- Perhaps one of the better strategies for encouraging good reading involves writing assignments drawn from the readings.
- As students progress through their programs (both the major and the LSP), moving through the ranks of the freshmen, sophomores, juniors and seniors, they tend to read less, particularly for the core courses.

Critical Thinking; Stuart Vorkink, Ian Lindevald, Royce Kallerud, Sara Orel

- For all too many of us critical thinking remains undefined, even implicit within our courses and thus perhaps within the lives of our students. Tests indicate that student critical thinking skills decline (i.e., demonstrate value-subtracted) in the first two years.
- Without gaining foundational knowledge, concepts and skills in any specific area or topic, well-structured critical thinking is virtually impossible.
- However, portfolio analysis indicate that a large proportion of students nearing graduation demonstrate significant growth as thinkers, becoming adequate or better as critical thinkers.
- Students can learn much from faculty who are willing to model critical thinking for their students by identifying weaknesses in their own thinking thereby dislodging dogmatism. Such an approach allows critical thinking to become a mode of communication between student and faculty member.
- Students tend to believe most of what they read. One important aspect of critical thinking is to know something about the sources (i.e., authors). Such information tends to enhance critical thinking by checking the credibility of the sources of the idea in question.

Residential Colleges: Dean Mary Ramsbottom

- Although residential colleges received conceptual emphasis in the master plan, they are now being actualized as evidenced by
 - Progress in hiring staff
 - Current budgetary investment by the University
 - Courses scheduled
 - Data from pilot courses
- Despite the significant progress made, the University community must be patient, allowing the residential colleges to evolve and grow toward their potential.

The Master of Arts in Education (MAE) Program: (John Hoffmann, Donna Rhinesmith)

The MAE program has:

- Made great strides in coordinating its activities externally with NCATE and DESE visits and standards as well as with on-site training and a variety of outreach programs.

- Progressed similarly in the training of residential and academic advisors and in the orienting of divisional resource persons.
- The number and quality of MAE students are increasing as indicated by the impressive placement rates and by their dispersion to better schools throughout the nation and Missouri.
- Truman's MAE graduates are highly rated due to levels of confidence, base knowledge, maturity and mastery of up-to-date techniques.

Vice President Garry Gordon

Division Action Plans (DAPs) should take into consideration how the discipline will:

- Contribute to the critical shortage of JINS courses
- Meet the need for Communications Mode courses
- Provide interdisciplinary courses
- Supply their students with course experiences reinforcing the Mathematics mode.

Within the context of liberal arts education, the major should

- Share and model successes for other majors
- Provide students with meaningful experiences designed to further refine their basic liberal arts skills
- Identify and improve those more useful assessment measures
- Seek opportunities to recruit and hire minority faculty members.

(A.) Average freshman / sophomore gain scores on an appropriate assessment of the liberal studies program, currently the CAAP.

(Anticipated Result: To increase average freshman / sophomore gain scores on the CAAP for each subtest in order to achieve the 80th percentile.)

AVERAGE SCALED SCORE GAIN, AVERAGE PERCENTILE RANK CHANGE CORRESPONDING TO MEAN SCALED SCORES AND PERCENTILE S CORRESPONDING TO AVERAGE SCALED SCORES ON VALUE-ADDED TESTING											
	FY	Actual 1993	Actual 1994	Actual 1995	Actual 1996	Actual 1997	Actual 1998	Actual 1999	Projected 2000	Projected 2001	Projected 2002
UNIVERSITY TOTAL – CAAP											
Critical Thinking											
Scaled Score Change		1.34	0.26	-0.68	1.10	-0.26	-1.19	-0.94			
Percentile Rank Change		0.60	-6.50	-8.10	-2.70	-8.00	-9.60	-2.90			
Post test Percentile		71.00	62.96	58.40	63.50	59.10	57.70	55.10	76.00	78.00	80.00
Mathematics											
Scaled Score Change		0.84	0.06	0.00	0.54	-0.29	-0.08	0.64			
Percentile Rank Change		2.50	-4.60	7.00	8.20	2.80	4.50	13.70			
Post test Percentile		78.50	73.90	73.20	76.60	76.00	76.30	80.60	76.00	78.00	80.00
Reading											
Scaled Score Change		0.46	0.41	-0.87	0.38	-0.27	-0.50	-1.61			
Percentile Rank Change		-5.20	-4.00	-6.70	-2.60	-5.40	-5.20	-9.00			
Post test Percentile		70.10	67.10	58.20	65.60	62.00	59.30	48.80	73.00	76.00	80.00
Science Reasoning											
Scaled Score Change		1.48	0.95	-1.01	0.08	-0.59	-0.18	-1.31			
Percentile Rank Change		-9.05	0.12	10.44	-4.57	-4.11	0.87	-9.80			
Post test Percentile		51.95	59.08	51.50	63.88	62.60	62.27	54.90	75.00	78.00	80.00
Writing Skills											
Scaled Score Change		-0.05	1.05	-0.96	0.13	-0.31	0.56	-0.86			
Percentile Rank Change		-3.90	5.40	-5.70	-2.10	-2.70	11.6	0.50			
Post test Percentile		69.10	79.90	70.60	72.00	70.20	73.10	62.50	74.00	77.00	80.00

Percentiles are estimated using the closest fall user norms.

(B) Percentage of students reporting “Very Satisfied / Very Often, etc.” with selected measures of the liberal arts and sciences program on the Graduating Student Questionnaire.

(Anticipated Result: To attain an appropriate increase on each measure.)

SAMPLE QUESTIONS LIBERAL STUDIES COURSES - GSQ											
How often were your core courses challenging?											
	FY	Actual 1993	Actual 1994	Actual 1995	Actual 1996	Actual 1997	Actual 1998	Actual 1999	Projected 2000	Projected 2001	Projected 2002
UNIVERSITY TOTAL											
Very Often		N/C	N/C	21.2%	12.9%	11.1%	12.4%	13.6%	30.0%	35.0%	40.0%
Mean		N/C	N/C	3.00	2.74	2.672	2.738	2.742	3.10	3.20	3.30
How adequate do you feel your education and experiences at Truman have been in learning on your own?											
	FY	Actual 1993	Actual 1994	Actual 1995	Actual 1996	Actual 1997	Actual 1998	Actual 1999	Projected 2000	Projected 2001	Projected 2002
UNIVERSITY TOTAL											
Very Adequate		N/C	51.9%	N/C	52.7%	51.1%	54.2%	55.0%	59.0%	61.0%	63.0%
Mean		3.40	3.43	N/C	3.46	3.469	3.480	3.488	3.65	3.70	3.75

How adequate do you feel your education and experiences at Truman have been in understanding different philosophies and cultures?											
	FY	Actual 1993	Actual 1994	Actual 1995	Actual 1996	Actual 1997	Actual 1998	Actual 1999	Projected 2000	Projected 2001	Projected 2002
UNIVERSITY TOTAL											
Very Adequate		N/C	21.6%	24.3%	24.1%	24.4%	25.0%	22.8%	30.0%	32.0%	34.0%
Mean		2.94	2.88	2.68	2.95	2.977	2.979	2.943	3.14	3.22	3.30
How adequate do you feel your education and experiences have been in recognizing assumptions, making logical inferences and reaching correct conclusions?											
	FY	Actual 1993	Actual 1994	Actual 1995	Actual 1996	Actual 1997	Actual 1998	Actual 1999	Projected 2000	Projected 2001	Projected 2002
UNIVERSITY TOTAL											
Very Adequate		N/C	32.6%	26.8%	31.6%	32.4%	31.9%	32.2%	37.0%	39.0%	41.0%
Mean		3.21	3.21	3.03	3.22	3.242	3.231	3.212	3.38	3.44	3.50
How satisfied were you with the faculty enthusiasm for classes in the core?											
	FY	Actual 1993	Actual 1994	Actual 1995	Actual 1996	Actual 1997	Actual 1998	Actual 1999	Projected 2000	Projected 2001	Projected 2002
UNIVERSITY TOTAL											
Very Satisfied		N/C	N/C	25.3%	19.1%	16.8%	15.8%	16.2%	33.0%	37.0%	40.0%
Mean		N/C	N/C	3.03	2.83	2.812	2.768	2.778	3.16	3.23	3.30
How satisfied were you with the overall impression of the liberal arts and sciences courses?											
	FY	Actual 1993	Actual 1994	Actual 1995	Actual 1996	Actual 1997	Actual 1998	Actual 1999	Projected 2000	Projected 2001	Projected 2002
UNIVERSITY TOTAL											
Very Satisfied		N/C	N/C	18.8%	19.0%	17.3%	17.6%	18.3%	29.0%	32.0%	35.0%
Mean		N/C	N/C	2.98	2.88	2.850	2.874	2.855	3.18	3.24	3.30

(E.) Percentage of nationally competitive undergraduates who score at high levels on national assessments of achievement in the major.

(Anticipated Result: To increase the percentage of graduates scoring above the 50th percentile on senior tests such as the Major Field Achievement Test (MFAT) to a university-wide average of approximately 80 percent.)

PERCENT SCORING ABOVE THE 50TH PERCENTILE ON SENIOR TESTS											
	FY	Actual 1993	Actual 1994	Actual 1995	Actual 1996	Actual 1997	Actual 1998	Actual 1999	Projected 2000	Projected 2001	Projected 2002
UNIVERSITY		72.5	66.9	65.5	66.5	60.3	65.8	67.5	77.2	78.2	79.8

(F.) Percentage of nationally competitive undergraduates who have high rates of employment and entry into graduate or professional programs appropriate to the discipline.

(Anticipated Result: To ensure that more than 95 percent of all graduates obtain either relevant employment or continue their studies at a graduate institution, including the achievement of an average rate of at least 46.8 percent of all bachelor's degree recipients entering full-time graduate or professional school.)

PERCENT OF BACCALAUREATE RECIPIENTS EMPLOYED FULL TIME											
		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
	FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY		48.7	56.4	58.1	58.5	60.4	57.6	55.4	53.4	51.9	50.6

PERCENT OF BACCALAUREATE RECIPIENTS ENROLLED IN GRADUATE OR PROFESSIONAL SCHOOL FULL TIME											
		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
	FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY		36.2	38.5	36.9	35.7	36.5	37.5	41.8	43.9	45.4	46.8

- (G) Percentage of nationally competitive graduate students who score at high levels on national assessments of achievement in the major.
 (Anticipated Result: (a) To ensure that all Master of Arts in Education (MAE) graduates score above the mean on the National Teachers' Examination (NTE) as described on the following data table; and (b) as other measures of assessment for graduate programs are developed, to ensure that student performance is nationally competitive.)

PERCENT OF MAE DEGREE CANDIDATES SCORING ABOVE THE MEDIAN ON THE NTE											
<small>(Note--for fiscal years 1993 - 1995, the scale used was percent of degree recipients scoring above the 50th percentile on the NTE.)</small>											
		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
	FY	1993	1994	1995	1996*	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY		90.9	90.5	94.7	92.1	97.3	86.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
<small>*" = FY 1996 is defined as Summer 95, Fall 95, and Spring 96 graduates.</small>											

PERCENT OF MAE DEGREE RECIPIENTS SCORING AT OR ABOVE THE AVERAGE PERFORMANCE RANGE UPPER LIMIT ON THE NTE (ABOUT 75 %ile)											
<small>Note—for fiscal years 1993 - 1995, the scale used was percent of degree recipients scoring above the 80th percentile on the NTE.</small>											
		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
	FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY		48.5	60.8	65.8	69.8	54.8	56.1	67.0	71.0	73.0	75.0

- (H.) Percentage of nationally competitive graduate students who have high rates of employment and entry into doctoral degree programs as appropriate to the discipline.
 (Anticipated Result: To ensure that all graduates obtain either relevant employment or continue their studies at a graduate institution.)

PERCENT OF GRADUATE DEGREE RECIPIENTS EMPLOYED FULL TIME											
		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
	FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY		81.2	87.0	84.5	84.5	91.5	97.1	86.8	86.7	86.2	86.9

PERCENT OF GRADUATE DEGREE RECIPIENTS ENROLLED IN DOCTORAL OR PROFESSIONAL PROGRAMS FULL TIME											
		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
	FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY		14.5	9.4	8.7	11.2	5.1	1.0	12.2	12.5	13.5	13.1

- (I.) Percentage of graduates who are “Highly Satisfied” with their majors.
 (Anticipated Result: To attain an appropriate increase in the percentage of students at both the undergraduate and graduate levels reporting “Very Satisfied/Very Adequate, etc.” with selected measures of the discipline majors as reported on the Graduating Student Questionnaire.)

SAMPLE QUESTIONS MAJOR COURSES - GSQ											
How often were your major courses challenging?											
	FY	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected
		1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY TOTAL											
Very Often		N/C	N/C	62.4%	46.7%	43.0%	45.3%	46.3%	74.7%	76.5%	77.8%
Mean		N/C	N/C	3.58	3.38	3.208	3.360	3.374	3.67	3.69	3.71
How adequately has your major prepared you to apply knowledge in defining problems and solving them?											
	FY	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected
		1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY TOTAL											
Very Adequate		N/C	42.1%	N/C	48.7%	46.5%	44.1%	49.0%	53.8%	55.8%	57.8%
Mean		3.37	3.25	N/C	3.41	3.396	3.348	3.407	3.43	3.46	3.50
How adequately has your major prepared you to think critically?											
	FY	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected
		1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY TOTAL											
Very Adequate		N/C	N/C	N/C	54.8%	56.5%	58.8%	58.3%	61.0%	63.0%	65.0%
Mean		N/C	N/C	N/C	3.46	3.509	3.532	3.513	3.56	3.58	3.60
How adequately has your major prepared you to believe that learning is a life-long process?											
	FY	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected
		1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY TOTAL											
Very Adequate		N/C	N/C	N/C	69.3%	67.3%	67.2%	66.0%	73.0%	74.0%	75.0%
Mean		3.52	N/C	N/C	3.63	3.625	3.626	3.604	3.69	3.72	3.75
How adequately has your major prepared you to understand multiple perspectives?											
	FY	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected
		1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY TOTAL											
Very Adequate		N/C	N/C	N/C	56.2%	57.4%	60.3%	55.5%	61.0%	63.0%	65.0%
Mean		N/C	N/C	N/C	3.49	3.509	3.548	3.484	3.35	3.36	3.38
How satisfied were you with faculty enthusiasm for classes in the major?											
	FY	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected
		1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY TOTAL											
Very Satisfied		N/C	N/C	54.0%	54.4%	54.3%	49.3	52.4%	63.5%	65.9%	68.2%
Mean		N/C	N/C	3.46	3.45	3.458	3.410	3.428	3.52	3.55	3.59

How satisfied are you with this major?										
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected
FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY TOTAL										
Very Satisfied	N/C	N/C	N/C	43.9%	34.3%	38.7	41.5%	56.2%	58.6%	60.4%
Mean	N/C	N/C	N/C	3.33	3.005	3.177	3.219	3.51	3.55	3.57
How adequately has your major prepared you to find information; interpret and apply the finding?										
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected
FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY TOTAL										
Very Adequate	N/C	44.8%	N/C	54.0%	53.0%	53.0	53.6%	55.8%	57.1%	60.0%
Mean	3.39	3.30	N/C	3.48	3.466	3.466	3.466	3.46	3.49	3.51
How satisfied were you with the accessibility of instructors in your major?										
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected
FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY TOTAL										
Very Satisfied	N/C	N/C	51.9%	40.4%	41.8%	39.8	42.6%	60.0%	62.0%	64.0%
Mean	3.31	N/C	3.37	3.23	3.251	3.225	3.275	3.47	3.51	3.53
How satisfied were you with academic advising?										
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected
FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY TOTAL										
Very Satisfied	N/C	20.8%	N/C	20.1%	20.4%	18.9	21.5%	27.0%	29.0%	31.0%
Mean	2.74	2.63	N/C	2.66	2.645	2.636	2.662	2.75	2.77	2.80
How satisfied were you with the overall quality of instruction in your major?										
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected
FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY TOTAL										
Very Satisfied	N/C	39.6%	39.3%	43.2%	41.3%	39.8	43.6%	48.8%	50.9%	53.1%
Mean	3.28	3.15	3.25	3.28	3.237	3.252	3.285	3.37	3.41	3.47

(J.) Percentage of students reporting “Very Satisfied/Very Adequate, *etc.*” with selected measures of the co-curricular program on the Graduating Student Questionnaire.
 (Anticipated Result: To attain an appropriate increase on each measure averaging approximately ten percentage points.)

SAMPLE QUESTIONS CO-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES – GSQ										
How adequate do you feel your education and experiences at Truman have been in growing intellectually from co-curricular experiences?										
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected
FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY TOTAL										
Very Adequate	N/C	N/C	N/C	28.1%	29.9%	27.8%	28.5%	35.0%	37.0%	39.0%
Mean	N/C	N/C	N/C	3.03	3.041	3.037	3.013	3.20	3.25	3.30
How adequate do you feel your education and experiences at Truman have been in growing socially and personally from co-curricular experiences?										
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected
FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY TOTAL										
Very Adequate	N/C	N/C	N/C	33.0%	35.4%	34.5%	36.4%	40.0%	42.0%	44.0%
Mean	N/C	N/C	N/C	3.13	3.130	3.149	3.136	3.33	3.39	3.45

How adequate do you feel your education and experiences at Truman have been in growing socially and personally through on-campus residential experiences?										
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected
FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY TOTAL										
Very Adequate	N/C	N/C	N/C	26.5%	25.7%	27.5%	27.8%	33.0%	35.0%	37.0%
Mean	N/C	N/C	N/C	2.87	2.832	2.885	2.840	3.05	3.10	3.15
How satisfied were you with the opportunities to be involved in student life and co-curricular activities?										
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected
FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY TOTAL										
Very Satisfied	N/C	N/C	N/C	31.6%	33.8%	30.2%	33.8%	38.0%	40.0%	42.0%
Mean	N/C	N/C	N/C	3.13	3.136	3.119	3.139	3.33	3.39	3.45

(K.) Percentage of students reporting “Very Satisfied / Very Adequate, etc.” with selected measures of the total liberal arts culture on the Graduating Student Questionnaire.
 (Anticipated Result: To attain an appropriate increase on each measure averaging approximately ten percentage points.)

SAMPLE QUESTIONS											
OVERALL LIBERAL ARTS CULTURE - GSQ											
How often did you discuss issues of social, cultural or academic significance with others outside of class during the course of the school year?											
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected
FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	
UNIVERSITY TOTAL											
Very Often	N/C	N/C	N/C	33.6%	32.7%	31.1%	28.6%	40.0%	42.0%	44.0%	
Mean	N/C	N/C	N/C	3.08	3.071	3.050	3.020	3.30	3.35	3.40	
How satisfied were you with the opportunities to interact with faculty outside of class?											
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected
FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	
UNIVERSITY TOTAL											
Very Satisfied	N/C	N/C	N/C	34.8%	33.7%	33.6%	34.5%	44.0%	47.0%	50.0%	
Mean	N/C	N/C	N/C	3.13	3.110	3.077	3.092	3.38	3.44	3.50	
How often do you apply the knowledge and skills gained in one discipline to learning in other disciplines during the course of the school year?											
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected
FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	
UNIVERSITY TOTAL											
Very Often	N/C	N/C	N/C	26.1%	23.7%	26.4%	25.1%	34.0%	35.1%	36.2%	
Mean	N/C	N/C	N/C	3.04	3.019	3.042	3.027	3.25	3.30	3.35	
How adequate do you feel your education and experiences at Truman have been in respecting the uniqueness and worth of each individual?											
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected
FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	
UNIVERSITY TOTAL											
Very Adequate	N/C	37.7%	N/C	38.3%	38.4%	38.4%	38.3%	45.0%	47.0%	50.0%	
Mean	N/C	3.17	N/C	3.22	3.205	3.219	3.204	3.44	3.49	3.55	
How often do you attend cultural events during the course of the school year (e.g., art exhibits, Lyceum events, campus lectures)?											
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected
FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	
UNIVERSITY TOTAL											
Very Often	N/C	8.5%	6.7%	16.8%	20.2%	19.3%	18.1%	22.0%	24.0%	25.0%	
Mean	N/C	2.13	2.19	1.68	2.61	2.629	2.648	2.611	2.75	2.80	2.85

Approximately how many hours per week do you spend out of class on course-related work?											
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected
FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	
UNIVERSITY TOTAL											
0-5 Hours	6.6%	8.9%	10.4%	6.3%	4.8%	6.7%	5.7%	2.5%	1.5%	0.0%	
6-10 Hours	23.6%	24.6%	25.5%	18.3%	19.2%	20.3%	21.2%	12.1%	10.5%	10.0%	
11-15 Hours	28.0%	21.8%	20.3%	22.5%	20.4%	23.0%	22.4%	16.0%	15.5%	15.0%	
16-20 Hours	21.5%	18.8%	18.2%	23.3%	23.7%	20.6%	21.0%	24.5%	25.0%	25.0%	
21-25 Hours	10.8%	12.3%	9.0%	13.3%	16.1%	15.6%	15.2%	18.4%	19.0%	20.0%	
26-30 Hours	9.5%	7.4%	8.1%	9.9%	9.6%	7.8%	8.9%	14.5%	15.0%	15.0%	
31 or More Hours	N/C	6.2%	8.4%	6.6%	6.2%	6.0%	5.6%	12.0%	13.5%	15.0%	
Approximately how many hours per week do you spend reading beyond course assignments?											
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected
FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	
UNIVERSITY TOTAL											
None	N/C	N/C	N/C	21.3%	22.3%	21.5%	20.8%	11.0%	8.0%	5.0%	
1-2 Hours	N/C	N/C	N/C	43.1%	40.7%	42.3%	42.8%	22.0%	16.0%	10.0%	
3-5 Hours	N/C	N/C	N/C	22.2%	23.0%	21.5%	23.2%	40.0%	45.0%	50.0%	
6-10 Hours	N/C	N/C	N/C	8.2%	9.4%	9.4%	8.8%	18.0%	21.0%	25.0%	
11-15 Hours	N/C	N/C	N/C	2.9%	2.5%	2.9%	2.6%	4.5%	5.0%	5.0%	
16 or More Hours	N/C	N/C	N/C	2.3%	2.1%	2.3%	2.0%	4.5%	5.0%	5.0%	

- (L.) Percentage of students reporting “Strongly Agree” with selected measures of the assessment program on the Graduating Student Questionnaire. (Anticipated Result: To attain an appropriate increase on each measure averaging ten percentage points.)

SAMPLE QUESTIONS ASSESSMENT PROGRAM – GSQ											
The assessment program fosters curriculum improvement.											
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected
FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	
UNIVERSITY TOTAL											
Strongly Agree	N/C	N/C	N/C	8.3%	7.6%	9.0%	10.2%	16.0%	18.0%	20.0%	
Mean	2.59	N/C	N/C	2.62	2.575	2.634	2.644	2.78	2.83	2.88	
The assessment program helps me to better understand my strengths and weaknesses.											
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected
FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	
UNIVERSITY TOTAL											
Strongly Agree	N/C	N/C	N/C	3.2%	2.4%	2.7%	3.1%	11.0%	13.0%	15.0%	
Mean	N/C	N/C	N/C	2.08	1.996	2.049	2.040	2.23	2.27	2.30	
The assessment program helps the university demonstrate the quality of its programs.											
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected
FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	
UNIVERSITY TOTAL											
Strongly Agree	N/C	N/C	N/C	14.3%	12.6%	12.8%	14.2%	22.0%	24.0%	25.0%	
Mean	2.26	N/C	N/C	2.65	2.618	2.632	2.611	2.83	2.88	2.92	

II. Recruiting and Supporting Outstanding Students, Faculty, and Staff

Measures of Success:

- (M.) Number of incoming freshmen and their academic preparation as measured by average ACT score.
(Anticipated Result: To recruit approximately 1500 first-time freshmen who have an average score of 27.0 on the ACT.)

NUMBER OF FIRST-TIME FRESHMAN ENROLLED											
		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected
	FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY*		1,400	1,617	1,545	1,504	1,482	1,663	1,484	1,525	1,525	1,525
“*” = Number of Pre-MAE Freshmen in											
Totals		332	330	293	311	290	316				

AVERAGE ACT SCORE FOR FIRST-TIME FRESHMEN											
		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected
	FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY		25.3	25.6	26.0	26.0	26.4	27.0	27.2	26.7	26.9	27.0

N.) Number of minority students.

(Anticipated Result: To ensure a diverse student body by increasing the number of minority students (*i.e.*, students of color who identify themselves as African-American, Hispanic-American, Native-American, or Asian-American) to 10 percent of the total undergraduate enrollment.)

PERCENT OF FIRST-TIME FRESHMAN WHO ARE MINORITY STUDENTS											
		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected
	FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY		7.6	8.5	7.2	8.4	8.1	7.16	7.6	9.7	10.0	10.1

(O.) Undergraduate retention rates and graduation rates.

(Anticipated Result: To achieve a freshman-to-sophomore retention rate of 90 percent and to attain underlying student progression rates that will produce a six-year graduation rate of 75 percent; an actual graduation rate of 64 percent is anticipated by 2002 for students who matriculate and graduate from Truman. A graduation rate of 75 percent is anticipated for students who matriculate at Truman and graduate from either Truman or another public four-year institution.)

FRESHMEN-TO-SOPHOMORE RETENTION RATES											
		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected
	FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
	Fall	91 to 92	92 to 93	93 to 94	94 to 95	95 to 96	96 to 97	97 to 98	98 to 99	99 to 00	00 to 01
UNIVERSITY											
Percentage		83.1	83.2	84.1	83.6	83.7	84.0	87.0	88.0	89.0	90.0

SIX-YEAR GRADUATION RATE											
		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
	FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
	Fall	F-87	F-88	F-89	F-90	F-91	F-92	F-93	F-94	F-95	F-96
From Truman Only		53.2	54.6	58.0	59.2	59.8	64.0	61.6	62.4	63.2	64.0
From Truman or Any Mo. Public			63.0	67.0	69.0	66.0	71.0	72.0	73.0	74.0	75.0

(P.) Number, demographic characteristics, and academic preparation of new graduate students.

(Anticipated Result: To recruit approximately 195 new graduate students annually whose average admissions test scores are above the 50th percentile when calculated by discipline.)

NEWLY ENROLLED GRADUATE STUDENTS (FISCAL YEAR TOTAL)											
UNIVERSITY		148	135	141	110	132	118	125	171	185	195

GMAT PERCENTILE RANKING CORRESPONDING TO MEAN SCALED SCORE NEWLY ENROLLED GRADUATE STUDENTS – ACCOUNTANCY											
		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	*Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected
	FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
Verbal		69.4	82.0	65.8	83.5	60.1	64.0	77.0	80.0	80.0	80.0
Quantitative		76.8	86.2	74.2	80.0	81.7	67.0	71.7	80.0	80.0	80.0
Total		79.3	90.0	75.2	86.0	77.7	69.0	82.0	82.0	82.0	82.0

* Percentile ranges are taken from the Graduate Management Admission Council "Examinee Score Interpretation Guide 1996-97."

VERBAL GRE PERCENTILE RANKING CORRESPONDING TO MEAN SCALED SCORE NEWLY ENROLLED GRADUATE STUDENTS											
		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected
	FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY		56.7	60.4	54.5	51.0	53.8	52.0	52.25	58.7	61.6	64.0

QUANTITATIVE GRE PERCENTILE RANKING CORRESPONDING TO MEAN SCALED SCORE NEWLY ENROLLED GRADUATE STUDENTS											
		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected
	FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY		51.7	50.6	40.5	43.3	47.8	48.0	49.4	52.9	54.6	55.8

ANALYTICAL GRE PERCENTILE RANKING CORRESPONDING TO MEAN SCALED SCORE NEWLY ENROLLED GRADUATE STUDENTS											
		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected
	FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY		65.4	59.6	58.6	62.1	63.4	66.0	62.4	66.6	68.4	69.9

PERCENT OF NEWLY ENROLLED GRADUATE STUDENTS WITH BACHELOR DEGREE NOT FROM TRUMAN											
		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected
	FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY		19.6	26.7	29.8	17.0	22.1	16.1	15.2	24.8	24.9	25.0

PERCENT OF NEWLY ENROLLED GRADUATE STUDENTS WHO ARE MINORITY STUDENTS											
		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected
	FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY		1.4	0.7	2.1	2.8	7.4	6.5	4.8	8.6		

(Q.) Distribution of student/faculty ratios among disciplines across the university.

(Anticipated Result: Conditional on the final provisions of the liberal studies program and on an annual review of actual changes in student enrollment patterns, to attain a projected full-time equivalent faculty of approximately 391 and a full-time equivalent student / faculty ratio of approximately 15.83.)

NUMBER OF FULL-TIME-EQUIVALENT FACULTY											
		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected
	FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY		350.52	353.86	366.80	371.55	368.49	365.27	375.42	384.23	389.81	391.06

ANNUALIZED RATIO OF FTE STUDENTS TO FTE FACULTY											
		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected
	FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY		14.83	15.29	16.09	15.30	15.55	15.74	15.37	15.51	15.63	15.83

(R.) Diversity of the faculty.

(Anticipated Result: To increase the proportion of minority faculty (that is, faculty of color who identify themselves as African-American, Hispanic-American, Native-American, or Asian-American) to 14.3 percent and the proportion of female faculty to 36.4 percent.)

PERCENT OF FULL-TIME FACULTY WHO ARE MINORITY											
		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected
	FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY		8.2	9.0	9.1	9.6	9.0	10.1	10.1	13.2	14.1	14.3

PERCENT OF FULL-TIME FACULTY WHO ARE FEMALE											
		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Projected	Projected	Projected
	FY	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
UNIVERSITY		31.6	29.9	32.0	32.5	32.9	33.9	34.4	35.0	35.4	36.4

Selected Measures of Success
Truman State University Master Plan 1997-2007

	FY	Actual 1999	Projected 2002
DEEPENING AN ENHANCED, SELF-REFLECTIVE LIBERAL ARTS CULTURE			
Proportion of "Highly Satisfied" Students As Measured by the GSQ: LAS Program, Major, etc.		Various	<i>Average Increase of 10 Percentage Points</i>
Percentage of Graduating Seniors Who Demonstrate At Least a Basic Level of Interdisciplinary Thinking Skills in Portfolio		21	90
Number of Interdisciplinary LAS Program Courses		Data Base Under Development	
Percent of On-campus Students in Residential Colleges		41	100
Proportion of Students in Residential Colleges Achieving Improved Learning Outcomes As Measured by GSQ and ISS		Various	<i>Average Increase of 10 Percentage Points</i>
LAS Program: CAAP Subscore Percentiles		62.5/80.6	80
Major: Senior Test Score Percentages Above 50%ile		67.5	79.8
Percent Graduates Entering Graduate Or Professional School Full-time		37.6(FY98)	46.8
Freshman/Sophomore Retention Rate		87	90
Six-year Graduation Rate			
Truman Freshmen from Truman		64(FY98)	64
Truman Freshmen from Any Four-year Missouri Public		71(FY98)	75
Number of Students Participating Annually in Student/Faculty Scholarly Projects		691	1,100
Number of Students Involved in Annual Research Symposium		274	450
SUPPORTING OUTSTANDING STUDENTS, FACULTY, & STAFF			
Total Undergraduate Enrollment		6,083	6,180
Total Graduate Enrollment		270	322
Average Freshman ACT Score		27.2	27
Percent Freshmen Minority		7.6	10.1
Full-time MAE Students		103	120
Percent of New, Full-time, Tenure-track Faculty with Academic Honors		Data Base Under Development	
Percent of New, Full-time, Tenure-track Faculty with Broad Undergraduate Educations		Data Base Under Development	
Percent Full-time Faculty Minority		10	14.3
University-wide FTE Student/FTE Faculty Ratio(annualized)		15.37	15.83
University-wide FTE Faculty/FTE Staff Ratio		0.94	1.00
Relative Competitiveness of Faculty and Staff Compensation		Data Base Under Development	
Percentage of Faculty Engaged in Scholarly Activity with Students		Data Base Under Development	
Number of Scholarly Publications and Presentations by Faculty		232 (FY97)	350
PROVIDING EXCELLENT SUPPORT TO THE TEACHING/LEARNING PROCESS			
Relative Competitiveness of Library Support & Service		Various	<i>Average Increase of 10 Percentage Points</i>
Percentage of Faculty with Direct Internet Access		100%	100
Percentage of Students with Direct Internet Access		95	100
Percentage of Students with Direct Computer Access		48.5	100
Percentage of Classes with a Significant Instructional Technology Component		Data Base Under Development	
NURTURING APPROPRIATE RELATIONSHIPS WITH EXTERNAL CONSTITUENCIES			
Number of Donors to Foundation		7,242	8,200
Total Gifts, Excluding Planned Gifts		\$1,180,558	\$850,000
Percent of E&G Budget Supported by State		59	62
Citizens Served Through External Partnerships and Related Programs		1850 (est.)	2360

From Appendix E: Measures of Success

Detailed Data Projections (pages 70-89)

I. Deepening an Enhanced, Self-reflective Liberal Arts Culture