

University Assessment Steering Committee  
Summary Note # 42  
November 20, 2006

Attending: Patrick Benton, chair (Aviation), Judah Ari-Gur (CEAS), Sue Brodasky (Institutional Effectiveness), Maira Bundza (Libraries), Kathy Cummings (EDUC), Marianne DiPierro (Grad College), Meg Dupuis (A&S), Eileen Evans (Institutional Effectiveness), Bruce Ferrin (HCOB), Linda Ickes (DOSA), Hossein Mousavinezhad (AAUP), Suzie Nagel (DOSA), Deb Newson (EUP), Carie Robertson (Sindecuse), Karen Stokes (ex-officio, TracDat), Gwen Tarbox (GSC), Yvonne Unrau (CHHS),

Absent: Cockrell, Dennis, Foulk, Parker, Snyder, Vann  
Guest: Natasha Jankowski (Grad Student)

The meeting was called to order and Summary Note #41 was approved (Dupuis/Nagel). Benton reported on efforts to include assessment information in the curriculum change process. He indicated that both Mary Lagerway and Jim Gilchrist supported the idea. Ari-Gur suggested that the current form provides a place for assessment information as part of the “rationale” section. Tarbox indicated that assessment should be the focus of the discussion, but Unrau suggested that the curriculum change may not be driven by assessment results. Ferrin commented that the back of the current form may provide an area for additional comments.

Evans reported on the Spellings Commission report related to accreditation. The report called for possible changes to regional accreditation processes and a greater emphasis on “transparency” of assessment data. “Closing the loop” with assessment and accreditation is becoming more important. Evans also reported on the results from the National Study of Student Engagement (NSSE). She distributed the executive summary from WMU NSSE results and indicated that she will convene a group to discuss the impact of those results. DiPierro asked whether a similar study is being conducted with graduate students. Evans indicated that IUPUI (the source of the NSSE study) was not currently addressing graduate students.

Benton shared information from Snyder concerning the plan from the math department. It was recommended that Evans meet with Dean Kent to follow up and perhaps apply some pressure to the department. It was also noted that the provost’s response to the annual assessment report from the college should express concerns about the lack of a plan from math.

Ari-Gur recommended approval of the plan from Manufacturing Engineering and distributed the rubric summary. The plan was approved (Ari-Gur, Benton).

Cummings reported on the assessment panels and speakers. She suggested a speaker focused on “assessment for learning” as a possibility for Spring. Ferrin pointed out that WMU is probably not ready to expand into a new definition of assessment yet. We have additional work to bring the campus to a common understanding of “assessment of learning.”

The meeting continued with discussion of each college assessment report. A summary of the committee’s comments on each report will be shared with the provost for inclusion in her responses to the college deans.