

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT STEERING COMMITTEE

Summary Notes for Meeting, 2:00 – 4:00 p.m., May 14, 2002

Present: Linda Delene (Committee Chair, Academic Planning and Assessment), Eileen Evans (The Graduate College), Katharine Cummings (Teaching, Learning and Leadership/COGE), Ariel Anderson (Teaching, Learning and Leadership/USC), Gus Breyman (DCE Lansing Campus), Beth denHartigh (Disabled Student Services), George Fierro (College of Aviation/Academic Advisors), Damodar Golhar (Haworth College of Business), Joyce Kubiski (Art), Linda LeBlanc (Psychology), Lynn Lee (Trio Programs), Stephen Malcolm (Biological Sciences), Bettina Meyer (University Libraries/TOC), Donald Meyer (Economics), Hossein Mousavinezhad (Electrical and Computer Engineering/GSC), Peter Saunders (Center for Teaching and Learning), Daniel Stauffer (Health, Physical Education and Recreation/GSAC), Diane Swartz (Division of Student Affairs), Edmund Tsang (College of Engineering and Applied Sciences), Martha Warfield (Division of Multicultural Affairs) and Robert Wertkin (Social Work); also present Trudy Stauffer (Academic Planning and Assessment). **Absent:** Mozhdeh Bruss (Family and Consumer Services/International Programs and Area Studies) Galen Rike (Waldo Library/AAUP) Raymond E. Cain, Jr. (Aviation Sciences), Elton Weintz (History/GSAC). The summary of the meeting of April 9 was accepted.

Historic WMU Assessment Plan Overview: Evans presented a brief history of the work of the Office of University of Assessment from its establishment in 1988 to its disassembly in 1994. The office was responsible for carrying out three types of activities: annual, cyclical and other. *Annually*, the office-administered measures of achievement of the aims of general education as well as achievement in the major required of all graduating seniors (the “senior comp”). Reports were made available to the provost, the faculty senate, the colleges, and those concerning the senior comp, to the respective departments. *Cyclically*, the office conducted yearly non-longitudinal studies on selected variable topics. The office also carried out *other* studies, e.g., faculty morale and ACT student needs assessment. The upshot of this report and the ensuing discussion was a reaffirmation of the recognition that assessment must now involve all academic programs and needs to be institutionalized so deeply that should any part of it be flawed, it would have institutional ramifications. This would be a new understanding of assessment for the University community.

Lost Student Analysis Project: Swartz reported that a group lead by Jim Gilchrist in the College of Arts of Sciences will assist in developing questions for phone interviews to be conducted this summer among a sample of first- and second-year students who left the University without graduating. The aim will be to pinpoint the reasons why these students left and to identify measures needed to decrease student attrition.

General Education Program Assessment: Cummings reported on discussions occurring in the Committee to Oversee General Education (COGE) to provide direction to its assessment subcommittee. Some disagreements about the nature of assessment remain to be resolved; however, COGE is mindful of its mandate to conduct the first assessment of the current general education program in AY 2004.

Review of Draft 4 of the University Assessment Plan: Some editorial changes were suggested, but no substantive changes were recommended. Saunders will develop a list of appropriate names and offices to be added to Appendix III (WMU Sources of Assessment Assistance). Delene was given latitude to draft an appropriate timeline for the assessment initiative to be included with Appendix V (Calendar of WMU Accreditation Visits). Cummings moved, supported by Evans, acceptance of the University Assessment Plan with today’s suggested changes and its release for public comment. Motion carried.

General Plan for Soliciting Public Review and Comments: Delene explained that copies of the University Assessment Plan would be distributed widely; that committee members should be prepared to respond to questions from their respective constituencies, and that all public comments would be due by the middle of October. She also distributed three sample illustrative graphics to accompany the assessment plan document, and the committee expressed its preference for the table showing “contributors” and “domains.” The meeting was adjourned at 4:00PM.