



Assessment Committee
Harry S Truman College
Chair – Jen Asimow
Vice-Chair – Maeve Massini
Secretary/Archivist - Madi Johnson

Minutes for September 26, 2024
Note* Meeting time change: 3:45-4:45PM

In attendance: Brandon Bumstead, Madi Johnson, Jen Asimow, Ana King, John Cooksey, Maeve Masini, Farzana Najam, Zeb Woods, Andrew Kerr, Rahm Almarza, Diego Baez

Visitor: Trinette Rogers (Jen's Erikson intern)

Apologies: Katie Ediger, Ritch Keitel,

Absent:

1) The meeting was called to order at 3:45.

2) Approval of Minutes from 9/12/2024. Brandon moved to approve the minutes. Ana seconded the motion. The minutes were approved.

3) Chair Updates

A. [Calendar](#). Madi motioned to approve the calendar until 2031. Brandon seconded the motion. The calendar is approved.

4) Department/Unit Level Assessment Updates/Report - Maeve

-Maeve wanted to discuss sharing the completed 4-phase studies on the Truman web page. We are going to hold off on that as most of our work is already available via the newsletter and the year-end report. We also have to now send documents to the district to have them uploaded or linked as the system has changed.

-If anyone needs to discuss their department 4-phase study, please reach out to Maeve.

-If you have made changes based on a completed study, is there follow-up information that you can provide?

5) Review initial data from the [Faculty Survey on Critical Thinking](#)

Discuss with your group and take notes on the documents (on paper or online) Answer the following questions:

1. What are your initial reactions?
2. Is there anything “popping out” (surprising) from the data that you think we should explore further?
3. Is there anything that isn’t surprising or confirms what you already believed to be true?
4. Should we look at each of these areas by full-time/part-time and department? Why or why not?

a. Group 1 – Perceptions

1. Overall, faculty feel that critical thinking is very important, should be a priority, should be encouraged, and essential for preparing students. However, they do feel that the institution is providing adequate resources and support for faculty to teach it.
2. Faculty overwhelmingly do not think students come to CCs with established critical thinking skills.
3. The group would like to see the data broken down by faculty status and department.

b. Group 2 – Practices

1. We all think/believe we are always implementing critical thinking practices.
2. Providing real world examples shows up as a “sore” point. It was a little more of a realistic response than the others.
3. Not particularly. It isn’t surprising that we all think we are doing this. The pressure of a self-report survey may have shaped the responses so they seemed more positive.
4. By department—more relevant based on the information we are looking at. Split FT and PT faculty is also something that we think we should look at.

c. Group 3 - Barriers pp. 5-6 (link above)

Barriers: class size- larger classes make it harder to teach critical thinking (smaller is better), the amount of time to teach critical thinking is a barrier, previous experiences have not prepared students to adequately think critically (we have students with emerging skills).

NOT a barrier- our colleagues are not resistant to teach critical thinking, not consistently reported that we have a problem with materials or resources.

It might be interesting to break this data out by discipline.

4. The group also recommends looking at the data by department and by FT/PT faculty.

***If we are going to split the data by department then we need to ensure that Katie is okay with that since she is a department of 1. If she is okay with that, we can split the data.

5) AOB

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 PM.