COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCE
CAS Assessment Committee's Report on Assessment of Student Learning for 2012-13
W. Douglas Baker, Kate Mehuron and Members of CASAC
(Submitted June 27, 2013)

Report Criteria
The University Assessment Committee agreed that by June 30, 2013, each unit (i.e., 5 colleges, General Education program, Library, Student Support Group) will submit:

- A draft of unit-wide process-level planning for assessment (NOTE: the next stage of planning is how each program will do the exact) (page limit: 2-4 pages)
- Summary of highlights of achievements in assessment (page limit: 2-4 pages)
- Examples of assessment plans and reports

College of Arts and Sciences Assessment Committee (CASAC) (2012-2013)

- Doug Baker (Chair), Faculty – English
- John Dunn, Faculty – English & First-Year Writing
- Suzanne Gray, Department Head – Women's and Gender Studies
- Jenny Kindred, Faculty – Communication, Media & Theater Arts
- Beth Kubitskey, Faculty – Physics & Astronomy
- Victor Okafor, DH – Africology & African American Studies
- Steve Pernecky, DH – Chemistry
- Kate Mehuron, Associate Dean & Ex-Officio

CAS PROCESS-LEVEL PLANNING FOR ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING

Initiation and Objectives of CASAC. In September 2012, Dean Tom Venner and Associate Dean Kate Mehuron initiated a faculty-led committee, College of Arts and Sciences' Assessment Committee (CASAC), to create a system for evaluating student learning from programmatic perspectives across the college. CASAC is charged with meeting three main objectives: (1) design an assessment system to demonstrate that programs are evaluating student learning from programmatic perspectives and 'closing the loop' (i.e., making improvements based on data); (2) contribute to the university accreditation process and to the report for the Higher Learning Commission (HLC); (3) assist in coordinated, perpetual efforts of evaluating student learning across the college and university (e.g., assessment of student learning as part of criteria for CAS program review and General Education courses and specialized accredited programs—e.g., those housed in the College of Education).

The 2012-13 school year represented the inaugural year for colleges at EMU to construct their own systems for assessing student learning from programmatic perspectives (the Office of Instructional Effectiveness and Accountability (OIEA) previously coordinated these efforts). After Venner and Mehuron selected three department heads (Gray, Pernecky, and Okafor) and a faculty member (Baker) to chair the committee, CAS faculty nominated and elected on September 27 (through the College Advisory Committee) three more faculty members (Dunn, Kindred and Kubitskey). The first official meeting of the CASAC was October 4, 2012, and the committee met each Thursday throughout the school year.

Coordination of Assessment Efforts. Dean Venner and Associate Dean Mehuron, who are striving to create and enhance productive relationships with departments, faculty, staff and students, drafted a document outlining criteria of program review (February 2013) for CAS departments. One criterion includes assessment of student learning; therefore, departments under review will demonstrate how its programs have created plans to evaluate student learning, how programs have collected and analyzed data, and how they have described and presented examples of programmatic changes based on the data collected. Therefore, Venner and Mehuron, in coordination with CASAC, are working to avoid duplication of assessment efforts. Furthermore, Venner, Mehuron and CAS administrators and faculty will contribute to assessment of student learning of General Education courses and of programs with specialized accreditation, particularly ones associated with the College of Education.

Finally, CAS's plans and practices of evaluating student learning have been, and will continue to be, organized in conjunction with the University Assessment Committee, the office of Institutional Research and Information Management (and Director Bin Ning), General Education assessment planning committee (and Chris Foreman), and with the support of the Faculty Development Center (and Director Peggy Liggit).

Overview of Achievements. CASAC compiled an ambitious list of goals for the school year. By December 2012, CASAC had outlined goals and composed documents to guide its efforts, and it had contacted all 18 CAS department heads and faculty with instructions for describing and submitting assessment plans, which were due January 18 – Feb. 18, 2013. By April, CASAC had responded to all submitted assessment plans (102 of 130 degree programs, or 80%) to support programmatic efforts in preparing final assessment reports (due September 27, 2013). CASAC also constructed a data management system through EMU Online, posting all meeting agendas and minutes and program plans and responses to the site.

In consultation with the CAS Dean's office and the University Assessment Committee, CASAC drafted a four-year plan that will guide CAS in designing multiple efforts of assessing student learning (e.g., degree programs, General Education courses, and programs with specialized accreditation) and in contributing to university accreditation and the on-site visits of the HLC in 2017-18 and Council of Assessment of Education Programs (CAEP) in 2017. CASAC plans to submit the draft to the Dean's office and to CAC in Fall 2013 for approval. The draft includes, for example, the information below: a mission statement, assessment of student learning goals for programs, premises of evaluating student learning, a timeline and a description of necessary resources.

Members of CASAC (Baker & Kindred) also contributed to the Assessment Workshop in May 2013, soliciting faculty participants and coordinating and presenting at the two-day seminar EMU faculty. One of the keys to this effort was engaging other CAS faculty who are still learning about assessment processes and who are coordinating programs (e.g., Steve Krause, Written Communications, and Derek Mueller, First-Year Writing), and early-career faculty (e.g., Gina Luttrell). These types of workshops and observations of assessment plans are guiding the selection of training for faculty in 2013-14. In other words, CASAC is in the process of making informed decisions about faculty training based on data gathered from interactions with faculty and administrators, faculty workshops, and observations and analyses of submitted assessment plans.

Draft of CASAC's Four-Year Plan to Assess Student Learning

Mission Statement
In collaboration with the University Assessment Committee, CAS Dean's office and CAC, CASAC is faculty-led and focused on assisting administrators, faculty and programs in building systems to evaluate student learning from programmatic perspectives.

Goals (by 2017-2018 HLC accreditation visit)
CAS will be able to demonstrate that:

- All department heads and faculty will be knowledgeable, informed and supportive of evaluating student learning from programmatic perspectives.
- All programs will have a list of student-learning outcomes (SLOs) that reflect the values and goals of the program, department and university.
- All programs will have constructed curriculum maps, based on discussions with program faculty, that will display where and when SLOs have been *introduced to students, reinforced, and demonstrated* (programs will have constructed a chart or matrix that demonstrates where learning toward outcomes occurs).
- All student-learning outcomes will have been assessed, or re-evaluated, to match the program goals with outcomes.
- All programs will be able to demonstrate how assessment of student learning informs programmatic decisions regarding curriculum.
- All programs will have a list of SLOs that have been identified and measured with the appropriate evidence.
- A sustained assessment process will inform curricular decisions for each program.

Premises of Assessing Student Learning

- Purposes of assessing student learning include the following:
    - Enhance opportunities for students to learn across fields and disciplines.
    - Create recursive and iterative assessments that guide programs to use data to inform curricular and programmatic decisions, particularly to influence what students have access to for learning.
    - Assessment systems can contribute to public relations, providing information about how and what students are learning—demonstrating the efficacy of programs and the opportunities provided to students.
- Faculty "buy in" is critical to the effectiveness of any assessment program. Part of faculty commitment is evident in the CASAC and in departments that have created an assessment liaison.
- Faculty and programs can strengthen learning opportunities through evaluating how and how well students are learning, and by making decisions about curricula and plans based on data—at least as one contributing factor.
- Administrative support is critical for any assessment program, including local and institutional support. The support might appear through financing of faculty participation in conferences, providing course release, and encouraging participation—including with the Provost office, among other on-campus offices.
- Communication among all stakeholders (including with students, faculty, administration, and trustees, and accrediting bodies) is paramount.

Suggestions to Support Process

- Emphasize the value of assessment work in faculty teaching, service, and scholarship, and reflect that value in workload considerations.
- The goals are intricately linked to institutional goals and resources. Evaluating student learning includes links to classroom instruction (General Education courses and degree programs, etc.), retention, university values, etc.
- A retreat to help answer key questions. For example: What are institutional or program decisions that need to be made? What kinds of assessment data would help make the decisions? How do we help faculty learn how to effectively use SLO data for programmatic change and how can the institution support the process? For example the role of assessment in every practice and faculty work?

Proposed Timeline

YEAR ONE - 2012-2013

Planning and coordinating programmatic assessment of student learning and reporting system, including humane and doable timelines

- CASAC formed (September 2012)
- Constructed list of CASAC's responsibilities (Fall 2012)
- Solicited (Dec-Jan) and responded to assessment plans (Feb-March)
- Align with program review schedule (in process)
- List areas that need to be strengthened (in process)

Communicating

- Contacted all DHs and faculty about first-year plans (Fall 2012)
- Solicited assessment plans (Dec-Jan 2013)
- Create Web presence (in process)
- Articulate with Gen Ed and University Assessment committee (Summer-Fall 2013)
- Continue to work with CAC (continuous)

Building Capacity

- CASAC met weekly to discuss, plan and learn
- Assigned committee members to specific departments
- Decided on and ask for resources for 2013-14
- Observed and listened for faculty suggestions, concerns, etc.

Supporting Programs, Administrators and Faculty

- List areas that need to be considered and strengthened (in process)
- Identify programs and what stage they are in, what is their knowledge level, who the coordinators are, etc.
- Consider focusing on programs up for review next year (in process)

YEAR TWO - 2013-2014

Summer 2013

- Increase number of programmatic plans to evaluate student learning (80% participation in 2012-13)
- Finish draft of four-year plan and seek input from the Dean's office, Gen Ed Committee, University Assessment Committee, CAC, among other stakeholders

- Prepare draft of calendar for next year
- Encourage faculty participation in assessment seminar in May
- Turned in a committee approved request for resources (Dean's approval in May)
- Analyze assessment plans and compile list strengths/weaknesses
- Based on data (similar to what we are asking programs to do), make decisions about next steps toward creating a productive evaluation system
- Write report for Dean's office (Due end of June)
- Prepare report and data for University Research (Bin Ning's) office (Due end of June)
- Note: Assessment Seminar – May 16-17, 2013
- Begin drafting plans for faculty training through FDC

August/September 2013
- Four-year plan to CAC
- Dean's response to CASAC and degree programs
- Encourage more department heads to participate
- Final assessment reports due Sept. 27: Analyze reports and compile list strengths/weaknesses
- Final draft of training plans for faculty through FDC
- Contact programs with program review and prepare to support them in drafting information about student learning, including relevant items from criteria 3, 4, 5
- Training for analyzing and reporting (FDC)
- Training for trainers (Doug will talk with Peggy and organize)
- Coordinate with COE and accredited programs, including potential participation in CAEP conference (see COE Associate Dean)
- Coordinate with Gen Ed (we need a systematic approach)
- Encourage programs to submit grants for linking evaluation of student learning with program or disciplinary values, etc. (internal and external)

October 2013
- Assessment conference in Indianapolis (see Faculty Development Center (FDC))
- Training (FDC): Creating perpetual assessment systems, beginning with program outcomes (distinguishing between goals and outcomes); preparing for program review; learning to use assessment for retention, among other program/college/university goals
- Build faculty groups around Gen Ed (coordinating with Chris Foreman)

December 2013
- Response to programs
- KEY: programs must demonstrate perpetual system

January – April 2014
- Supporting programs under review to present final reports: Programs in these departments should submit a plan and demonstrate links between 2012-13 plans and ones for 2013-14—and through 2014-15
- Initial plans for departments under review for 2014-15
- Training (FDC) – Connections between Gen Ed and degree programs & accreditation programs—we have to move on this!

YEARS THREE & FOUR (2014-15 & 2015-16) in progress
One of the key goals will be to demonstrate to, and guide, faculty to learn how to build on evaluation of student learning for multiple purposes, including strengthening programs, articulating within and across programs and departments, and providing talking points for public relations among stakeholders. A second key goal will be to continue to provide opportunities for faculty to learn more about assessing student learning and leading them to value the process as part of scholarly activities. Finally, CASAC will coordinate with the CAS Dean's office, University Assessment Committee and Bin Ning to construct a webpage that will provide resources for CAS administrators, faculty and students on evaluating student learning.

SUMMARY OF HIGHLIGHTS OF CASAC'S ACHIEVEMENTS IN ASSESSMENT

Overview of CASAC Achievements

During 2012-13, the first year that EMU decentralized assessment of student learning, CASAC achieved the following:

- Constructed a faculty-driven, College Advisory Council-approved, committee to coordinate efforts toward assessing student learning across CAS
- Established a review process with the Dean's office and CAC—in other words, all CASAC initiated documents were reviewed and subjected to approval by the Dean's office and CAC
- Composed a mission statement, goals, a list of responsibilities, and a list of premises for evaluating student learning
- Communicated with all 18 department heads, CAS faculty, and 130 degree programs the process and timeline of evaluation efforts for the year
- Created documents to assist in assessment of student learning, including a template for programs to report plans to evaluate student learning and to report analysis, findings and plans to use data collection for programmatic changes
- Constructed a data management system through EMU Online. Data include the following: CASAC meeting agendas and minutes; programs' assessment plans; CASAC's responses to all plans; final reports from 3-5 programs (that turned in the plans in April/May 2013).
- Received and responded to assessment plans of 102 degree programs (80%)*
- Drafted a four-year plan in coordination with the Dean's office

*Note: There are programs (e.g., Linguistics) that have drafted plans and are in the process of completing them. There are also programs that appear to have not turned in plans; however, some of these programs are linked by SLOs to programs that have turned in plans. CASAC is working to recognize which programs' SLOs are linked (e.g., in Chemistry).

Other Documents Constructed by CASAC

As mentioned above, CASAC crafted a mission statement, a list of goals, premises of assessing student learning, and a draft of a four-year plan. Below are other documents, including CASAC Responsibilities, CASAC Template for Planning and Reporting (see Appendix A), CASAC Template for Response to Programs (see Appendix A), and CASAC List of Programs, Plans & Reviewed Plans (see attached).

CAS Assessment Committee (CASAC):
Responsibilities – 2012-2013
(Rev. November 20, 2012)

Planning and coordinating programmatic assessment of student learning and reporting system, including humane and doable timelines

- Encouraging faculty to develop student learning outcomes, particularly as part of a system that enhances their program and students' learning opportunities—i.e., the assessment systems should be recursive and lead faculty to use findings to inform programmatic/curricular changes, especially in order to improve opportunities for student learning.
- Evaluating how we know EMU students are learning
- Developing evidence and warrants that demonstrate claims of student learning
- Reporting findings and using the information to enhance efficacy of programs and opportunities for students to learn

Communicating

- Communicating with stakeholders, including EMU's University Assessment Committee and other EMU colleges; CAS Dean's office; CAS-CAC; CAS departments and programs—and working to change the culture of assessment!
- Creating links with institutions that inform assessment policies and practices – for example, Higher Learning Commission; Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP, soon to replace NCATE); Specialized Professional Associations (e.g., ACTFL, NAEA, NAME, NCSS, NCTE, NCTM, NSTA), Michigan Department of Education, etc.
- Constructing and delivering messages, talking points, and anecdotes that reflect progress and provide examples for programs.
- Focusing messages on selected audiences: public and policy figures; department heads; program coordinators; faculty; students, etc.

Building Capacity

- Building on the assessment system initiated by EMU's Office of Instructional Effectiveness and Accountability (coordinated by Peggy Liggit)
- Strengthening CASAC's understanding of assessment (contexts and processes) and training others, including coordinating opportunities through the Faculty Development Center (FDC)
- Encouraging and collaborating with coordinators and other department and program leaders involved with assessment – 'keep it simple' (KIS) in order to negotiate and collaborate on processes and practices
- Encouraging instructors to incorporate principles of assessment in their courses

Supporting Programs, Administrators and Faculty

- Supporting programs by consulting or meeting with administrators or faculty, individually or as a group
- Coordinating with CAS Dean, among others, to help provide necessary resources
- Encouraging and guiding others to value the process and system, particularly in ways that benefit programs and students' opportunities to learn
- Guiding programs to use findings for public relations

Example Documents

- CASAC Template for Planning and Reporting (see Appendix A)
- CASAC Template for Response to Programs (see Appendix A)
- CASAC List of Programs, Plans & Reviewed Plans (see attached)

EXAMPLES OF ASSESSMENT PLANS AND REPORTS

In supporting programs' efforts in constructing plans to assess student learning, CASAC sought to create a *humane* and *doable* approach and to generate confidence in faculty and administrators in the process and in the committee. Therefore, the template for describing assessment plans included four main areas: (1) list of programmatic SLOs; (2) a list of SLOs the program would focus on for the year; (3) a description of where assessments would take place; and, (4) how data would be analyzed. The next main step, turning in a final report on the analysis and how the program 'closed the loop', will be due September 27, 2013.

Training of faculty will be based on the observed needs and in conjunction with the FDC. Further training of faculty continued with Assessment Workshop (May 16-17, 2012), designed to provide faculty across EMU with resources and opportunities to enhance plans to assess student learning. Peggy Liggit (FDC) and Doug Baker (CASAC) coordinated the workshop and were assisted by Wendy Burke (COE) and Jenny Kindred (CASAC).

Four representative assessment plans were chosen to present an overview of the range of disciplines and efforts to evaluate student learning. The following strengths and weaknesses are reflected in these examples. All assessment plans submitted by CAS programs were reviewed and responded by at least two members of CASAC. Program coordinators (or whoever submitted the plans) were encouraged to respond to CASAC, and faculty responses were noted on assessment documents and posted to the EMU Online site.

Representative Strengths of the Assessment Plans

Overall, the strengths of the assessment plans composed by CAS programs and responded to by CASAC include the following:

- Awareness of distinctions between goals and student learning outcomes—however, this strength was most apparent in programs that have consistently evaluated student learning (e.g., French)
- Descriptions of where and when the assessments would occur
- Some description of how faculty would analyze samples of student work

Representative Weaknesses of Assessment Plans

The following represent areas that CASAC views as needing more support:

- Some programs did not appear to have a comprehensive list of programmatic SLOs, which is important in order to gain better insights into how the selected SLOs fit with the overall.
- A curriculum map was not required this year; however, it was unclear how some of the assessments represented an over time approach to examining how well students are learning in the particular areas.
- Although it appears that 20% of the programs did not turn in plans, some of the programs combined programs—which CASAC agreed was a choice—but the intended links between or among programs were not always clear.

Four Examples (see Appendix B)
Below are four representative programs (two undergraduate and two graduate) from a range of content areas that demonstrated the CASAC expectations for creating an assessment system for observing and analyzing student learning.

Art: Bachelor's in Studio Art (program code: ART STAR)
The program demonstrates that it has selected three student learning outcomes, how it plans to assess students, and where and how the evaluations will take place. CASAC's response signals to the program that it is on the right track, although it should consider clarifying selected phrases (e.g., "thorough knowledge").

Children's Literature: Master's in Children's Literature (program code: ENGL CLT)
The program demonstrates that it has selected two of four main student-learning outcomes to focus on this year, and it provides a rationale for them and the process. CASAC's response suggests that the program should continue to examine the plan rubric.

Philosophy: Bachelor's in Philosophy (program code: HIST&PHIL PHIL)
The program demonstrates that it has constructed a system of assessing student learning and that it continues to evaluate students on seven learning outcomes. The CASAC response acknowledged the program's efforts, and the program reflects a more mature program in terms of assessing student learning.

Physics and Astronomy: Master's in Physics and Astronomy (program code: P&A PHY)
The program demonstrates how it plans to assess students on two main learning outcomes. The CASAC response provides a couple of suggestions that would support the program's efforts in compiling more reliable data.

APPENDIX A:
CAS Template for Planning and Reporting

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCE ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING

Degree Program	
Department	
Academic Year	
Report Submitted by	
Phone/email	
Date Submitted to Department Head	

Each program submitted a list of student learning outcomes (approved by an appropriate faculty input committee). Each program identified *at least two* specific outcomes (from the approved list) to assess for 2012-13. CASAC responded to the plans in March.

PLANNING: SECTIONS I – IV **DUE between JANUARY 14 and FEBRUARY 18, 2013**
I. What are your program's Student Learning Outcomes? Please list the program's Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs).
II. What Student Learning Outcomes will your program focus on for 2012-13? (Select *at least two* outcomes from approved list in section I.) Students will be able to…
III. What student activities or performances does the program plan in order to assess each Student Learning Outcome listed in section II? Describe the activity(s) or student performance(s) faculty in the program plan to observe for purposes of determining how well students met the learning outcomes.
IV. What methods will the program use for collecting and analyzing information about student achievement of the selected Student Learning Outcomes? Describe how the program plans to collect and analyze student performance samples (e.g., essays, projects, other artifacts, etc.) for purposes of assessing each selected learning outcome. Also, consider how the program will distinguish levels of performance.

CASAC Response and Support Members of CASAC will offer a written response to each program that submits plans for assessing students' learning on selected learning outcomes. The purpose of the response is to support your efforts and to help you shape an approach to assessing student performance toward meeting the outcomes that your program chose to focus on this year.
ANALYZING AND PLANNING: SECTIONS V – VII **DUE APRIL 30 *or* SEPTEMBER 27, 2013**
V. What were the results? Describe the results of analyzing student performances on the selected learning outcomes.
VI. What do the results mean or suggest for the program (the 'so what')? Describe what the results mean or suggest for the program in terms of student learning.
VII. What action does the program plan for purposes of enhancing opportunities for student learning? Based on findings of the above process, describe actions the program plans to implement.
CASAC Response and Support The purpose of CASAC's response to your program's report on programmatic assessment of student learning will be to observe how well your program collected and analyzed examples of student work toward meeting the outcomes your program chose to focus on this year. CASAC will write a report describing how degree programs across CAS are evaluating student learning and submit the report to the Dean's office.

Rev. March 22, 2013

NOTES

The main purposes for constructing programmatic assessments of student learning are the following:

- To enhance opportunities for students to learn
- To elicit information that can help improve programs
- To contribute to EMU's efforts to retain accreditation from the Higher Learning Commission

All degree programs (undergraduate and graduate) must submit a report.
CASAC functions to coordinate and support department heads and faculty efforts toward creating a system of programmatic assessment of student learning on selected outcomes.

Programs with outside accreditation, mainly ones that must address student learning (e.g., education programs with specialized professional associations that coordinate with NCATE—soon to be CAEP) should use the template to present representative plans.

APPENDIX A:
CAS Template for Response to Programs

College of Arts and Sciences
Programmatic Assessment of Student Learning
CASAC Response to Degree Programs: Plans for 2012-13
Winter 2013
(Rev. January 22, 2013)

Each CAS degree program was asked to construct an assessment plan for evaluating how it knows students are meeting representative learning outcomes. A criterion for a well-designed plan is alignment among the parts. That is, for example, do the planned activities or performances address the listed student learning outcomes, and do the planned methods of collecting and analyzing artifacts make sense based on the activities/performances?

In order for programs to successfully construct plans that will provide data that will potentially inform programmatic decisions, the initial plans should be aligned and address what the program is focused on for this school year. Below is a basic rubric with response from members of CASAC in support of your program's efforts toward these goals.

DEPARTMENT/PROGRAM: (Name of program and code)

(Note: The following two paragraphs were included in all responses.)
Overview to Response from CASAC to Program's Assessment Plans
As a program, you were asked to do the following: (1) List approved program Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), which are more specific than goals; (2) select at least two SLOs to focus on this term; (3) choose student performances to observe for purposes of assessing how well SLOs are met or achieved; (4) and analyze data collected from these observations and discuss with colleagues the 'so what,' the implications for what the program observed and decisions it might make based on the analysis of representative student performance.

Purposes of CASAC's Responses to Program's Assessment Plans
CASAC's goal in responding to your program's plans to assess students learning includes two main purposes: (1) to continue supporting and guiding your efforts by offering instructive feedback; and, (2) to help you in preparing to analyze data and write a final report (due at the end of April).

PLANNING SECTIONS I – IV
1. Program's Student Learning Outcomes
____ Program has a list of programmatic SLOs.
____ Program needs to include a list of programmatic SLOs.

Suggestions:

2. Student Learning Outcomes of Focus for 2012-13

____ Program has selected ____ of the SLOs to focus on for the year.
____ Program has not selected SLOs to focus on for the year.

Suggestions:

3. Planned Activities and Performances for Purposes of Assessing Student Learning

____ Planned activities or performances *are aligned* with focal SLOs in #2.
____ Planned activities or performances are *partially* aligned with focal SLOs in #2.
____ Planned activities or performances do not appear aligned with focal SLOs in #2.

Suggestions:

4. Planned Methods of Collection and Analysis

____ Planned methods of collection and analysis *are aligned* with SLOs and activities or performances, and appear to have potential to yield useful results.
____ Planned methods of collection and analysis are *partially* aligned with SLOs and activities or performances, and appear to have potential to yield useful results.
____ Planned methods of collection and analysis do not appear to be aligned with SLOs and activities or performances, or appear to need rephrasing to help yield useful results.

Suggestions: **(Note: The following paragraph was included in all responses.)**
Crucial for the effectiveness of the student learning assessment plans is the capacity for program faculty to meet, analyze and discuss the data from the assessments. Each program will select the most productive approach for achieving this goal. Keys to remember: although assessments might initially be done in individual classrooms by one or two faculty, the goal is to meet as a program to discuss findings, make observations and offer suggestions for next year, especially for purposes of enhancing students' opportunities for learning.

CASAC Peer Reviewers: (At least two members reviewed each program.)

Voluntary Response to CASAC
(Note: The following paragraph was included in all responses.)
If you would like to respond, comment or raise questions about the response to your program's plans to evaluate student learning, please do so below, and email the form to Doug Baker (douglas.baker@emich.edu). Our goal is to support all CAS programs through this process. If you have suggestions, also feel free to email Doug, or another member of the committee.

APPENDIX B:
Studio Art, Bachelor's

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCE
ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING

Degree Program	BS Studio Art
Department	ART STAR
Academic Year	2012-13
Report Submitted by	Colin Blakely
Phone/email	7-1268/cblakely@emich.edu
Date Submitted to Department Head	NA

Each program should have a list of student learning outcomes (approved by an appropriate faculty input committee). For 2012-13, each program should identify *at least two* specific outcomes (from the approved list) to assess for this year.

PLANNING: SECTIONS I – IV **DUE between JANUARY 14 and FEBRUARY 18, 2013**
I. What are your program's Student Learning Outcomes? 1. Students will demonstrate a thorough understanding of the formal elements and principals of design. 2. Students will demonstrate solid production skills when crafting both hand-made and digital work. 3. Students will begin to utilize the visual language as a vehicle towards the creation of meaning in art.
II. What Student Learning Outcomes will your program focus on for 2012-13? 1 and 2
III. What student activities or performances does the program plan in order to assess each Student Learning Outcome listed in section II? Students in all foundations courses are required to document work completed in those classes. All instructors teaching these courses are made aware of the requirement, and there is common language in all syllabi for these courses.

IV. What methods will the program use for collecting and analyzing information about student achievement of the selected Student Learning Outcomes?
All students enrolled in ARTS390W Studio Concepts (required for major) must undergo Foundations Review. At the end of the semester, students submit a portfolio of 10 work samples via the department's online assessment system. This portfolio is evaluated by 3 faculty members and assessed for SLO's 1 and 2. We just completed our third semester of Foundations Review.

APPENDIX B:
Children's Literature, Master's

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCE
ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING

Degree Program	Masters in Children's Literature (ENGL CLT)
Department	Department of English Language and Literature
Academic Year	2012-13
Report Submitted by	Annette Wannamaker
Phone/email	7-0148/awannamak@emich.edu
Date Submitted to Department Head	January 10, 2013

Each program should have a list of student learning outcomes (approved by an appropriate faculty input committee). For 2012-13, each program should identify *at least two* specific outcomes (from the approved list) to assess for this year.

PLANNING: SECTIONS I – IV
DUE between JANUARY 14 and FEBRUARY 18, 2013

I. What are your program's Student Learning Outcomes?
SLO 1
Students will demonstrate a breadth and depth of knowledge from within the field of children's and young adult literature.
SLO 2
Students will develop original arguments, drawing from scholarship in the field of children's and young adult literature.
SLO 3
Students will craft thoroughly researched written projects about topics in the discipline of literature for younger readers.
SLO 4
Students will prepare critically astute, well-researched presentations about topics in the discipline of literature for younger readers.

II. What Student Learning Outcomes will your program focus on for 2012-13?
(Select *at least two* outcomes from approved list in section I.)
Students will be able to…

SLO 1
Students will demonstrate a breadth and depth of knowledge from within the field of children's and young adult literature.

SLO 2
Students will develop original arguments, drawing from scholarship in the field of children's and young adult literature.

III. What student activities or performances does the program plan in order to assess each Student Learning Outcome listed in section II?
Describe the activity(s) or student performance(s) faculty in the program plan to observe for purposes of determining how well students met the learning outcomes.
Students taking the winter section of CHL583: Illustrated Texts will be asked to write a reflective essay near the end of the semester. We chose this specific course because almost every student in the program enrolled in it for the winter term. The essay will ask students to discuss how their knowledge of the field has changed and expanded, both through this course and through the program (or as much of the program as they have completed thus far). Students will also reflect on their own research experiences, discussing their reasons for selecting this course and program, their papers and presentations, and their future plans, as well as how effective they think that the course and program have been in helping them to accomplish their academic goals.

IV. What methods will the program use for collecting and analyzing information about student achievement of the selected Student Learning Outcomes?
The Children's Literature faculty will read and evaluate the reflective essays. In doing so, faculty members will assess how well the student work meets the criteria of the student learning outcomes. Based on our discussions about these essays, we will determine whether we eventually want all of our graduating students to complete a reflective essay about their experience here, or whether we want to continue to use our current capstone experiences of completing a thesis or final exams.

APPENDIX B:
Philosophy, Bachelor's

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCE
ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING

Degree Program	Philosophy (HIST&PHIL PHIL) (UG)
Department	History and Philosophy
Academic Year	2012-2013
Report Submitted by	Jill Dieterle
Phone/email	7-3393

	jdieterle@emich.edu
Date Submitted to Department Head	1/21/2013

Each program should have a list of student learning outcomes (approved by an appropriate faculty input committee). For 2012-13, each program should identify *at least two* specific outcomes (from the approved list) to assess for this year.

PLANNING: SECTIONS I – IV
DUE between JANUARY 14 and FEBRUARY 18, 2013

I. What are your program's Student Learning Outcomes?
Please list the program's Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs).

- Produce a reasonable interpretation of the text
- Describe a major philosophical problem and one of the most significant approaches to its solution
- Critically compare concepts, methods, and presuppositions across philosophical theories and traditions
- Explain the work of an historical philosophical thinker
- Construct a cogent argument for a position
- Question assumptions
- Defend original positions

II. What Student Learning Outcomes will your program focus on for 2012-13?
(Select *at least two* outcomes from approved list in section I.)
We will assess all seven SLOs.

III. What student activities or performances does the program plan in order to assess each Student Learning Outcome listed in section II?
Describe the activity(s) or student performance(s) faculty in the program plan to observe for purposes of determining how well students met the learning outcomes.
We assess papers written by students in our Writing Intensive courses.

IV. What methods will the program use for collecting and analyzing information about student achievement of the selected Student Learning Outcomes?
Describe how the program plans to collect and analyze student performance samples (e.g., essays, projects, other artifacts, etc.) for purposes of assessing each selected learning outcome. Also, consider how the program will distinguish levels of performance.
Each semester, we identify Philosophy Majors with 100 or more CH. We then compare that list of students with the class rosters in our Writing Intensive courses. The appropriate student papers are collected at the end of the term.

Our Curricular Map specifies which goals and corresponding student learning outcomes should be met by each Writing Intensive course. Using this curricular map, a grid is created that matches up student learning outcomes and student papers. Each space in the grid indicates a particular paper and the SLO that is to be assessed. Each faculty member in the Philosophy Program is randomly assigned grid spaces. We then read the papers, assessing for the appropriate outcome. Papers are scored 0 – 5 for each SLO the course from which the paper is taken is supposed to meet.

We now have four years of data. For each of the seven SLOs, we can report the degree to which the program meets them. Although the data set is still very small, our goal for this semester is to look at the data we have to see what conclusions can be drawn.

APPENDIX B:
Physics & Astronomy, Master's

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCE
ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING

Degree Program	MS Physics (P&A PHY) (G)
Department	Physics and Astronomy
Academic Year	2012/2013
Report Submitted by	M. Thomsen
Phone/email	734-487-8794, jthomsen@emich.edu
Date Submitted to Department Head	January 28, 2013

Each program should have a list of student learning outcomes (approved by an appropriate faculty input committee). For 2012-13, each program should identify *at least two* specific outcomes (from the approved list) to assess for this year.

PLANNING: SECTIONS I – IV
DUE between JANUARY 14 and FEBRUARY 18, 2013

I. What are your program's Student Learning Outcomes?
Please list the program's Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs).

SLO1. Student will be able to conduct advanced research in physics by
a. Using advanced techniques
b. Devising and modifying procedures as appropriate to accomplish a given task
c. Analyzing data at a level consistent with analyses found in professional publications

SLO2. Student will be proficient in professional communication.
a. Student will have the ability to write papers with a clarity and precision associated with professional publications
b. Student will have the ability to make well organized and clear oral presentations

SLO3. Student will have the ability to learn advanced concepts in physics.

SLO4. Student will have the ability to learn new concepts in physics independently.

II. What Student Learning Outcomes will your program focus on for 2012-13?
(Select *at least two* outcomes from approved list in section I.)
SLO2. Student will be proficient in professional communication.
SLO3. Student will have the ability to learn advanced concepts in physics.

III. What student activities or performances does the program plan in order to assess each Student Learning Outcome listed in section II?
Describe the activity(s) or student performance(s) faculty in the program plan to observe for purposes of determining how well students met the learning outcomes.

SLO2. We will collect final reports or theses from student research projects completed during this time period. We will study the feasibility of using PHY 510 oral and written assignments to provide additional data.

SLO3. Each module in PHY 530/1 is scored and records maintained regarding at what stage a student mastered each problem in the module. All modules in the course require independent learning on the part of the student. We will investigate the extent to which independent learning is a required element in other required courses in the program.

IV. What methods will the program use for collecting and analyzing information about student achievement of the selected Student Learning Outcomes?
Describe how the program plans to collect and analyze student performance samples (e.g., essays, projects, other artifacts, etc.) for purposes of assessing each selected learning outcome. Also, consider how the program will distinguish levels of performance.

SLO2. Student will be proficient in professional communication.
Each faculty member supervising a final research project that is concluded during this academic year will be asked to write a paragraph describing the quality of the student's written report as it evolved through several drafts and their impression about the student's ability to communicate in writing from this point forward. Plans will be developed for accumulation of similar information from PHY 510 (when it is taught next) and from oral presentations students make on their final projects.

SLO3. Student will have the ability to learn advanced concepts in physics.
Our goal this term is to accumulate data from one course and investigate the possibility of acquiring additional data from other courses. Scores from the last several years on individual modules in PHY 530/1 will be analyzed to look for trends, both in terms of ultimate grade achieved on content and on timeliness of submissions. Next, we plan to determine if additional data is available from other courses. Specifically, faculty teaching other graduate level courses will be surveyed to determine the extent to which independent learning is a requirement of these courses and if so whether there is a means to assess that component of the course.