

**College or Unit Level Annual Assessment Report
Template and Guidelines**

College or Unit Name:
General Education Program

Report Year:
2014-15

Submitted:
June 25, 2015

General Education Subcommittee on Assessment (GESA)

Chris Foreman, Professor & Director of General Education Program

W. Douglas Baker (Chair), Professor – English (CAS)

Stephanie Casey, Assistant Professor – Mathematics (CAS)

Sun Hae Jang, Assistant Professor of Orthotics and Prosthetics (CHHS)

David Gore, Assistant Professor – Communication Technology (COT)

Matthew Hammond, M.B.A. – Data Analyst for Accreditation and Learning Assessment (COB)

Maria Milletti, Professor – Chemistry (CAS)

TBA (COE)

TBA (Library)

1. In addition to the primary goal of assessing student learning, list other 2014-15 unit goals that support assessment of student learning (these can be direct, indirect or operational).

The 2014-15 academic year proved to be a critical and pivotal year for the General Education Program and its efforts in assessing student learning, especially with the reconstitution of the General Education Subcommittee on Assessment (GESA). Under the leadership of the director of the program, Chris Foreman, and Doug Baker, the elected faculty chair of the subcommittee on assessment, GESA strived to create a humane, doable and sustainable system of assessing student learning based on the program's learning outcomes. The GESA accomplished its five goals:

- (1) Reconstitute the subcommittee on assessment;
- (2) Build capacity among the committee;
- (3) Build on preliminary work of the previous subcommittee on assessment and the ad hoc, transitional committee on assessment from last year (2013-14);
- (4) Organize and coordinate Phase One of the current system; and
- (5) Organize committee retreats to achieve the first four goals and to draft plans for Phase Two and Three.

2. Summarize the accomplishments your unit made during 2014-15 toward assessing student learning, as your primary goal.

- a. Explain the role that faculty, staff, and students play in this work.
- b. Next, summarize the activities your unit engaged in during 2014-15 toward meeting the other goals listed above.

Reconstituted the General Education Subcommittee on Assessment (GESA). Although the GESA was reconstituted, none of its members had contributed to previous efforts to assess student learning for the General Education Program (note: Maria Milletti, who contributed to previous General Education assessment efforts, was added to the committee in May). Therefore, after securing Faculty Senate approval of the selected members, the GESA focused on building capacity of the group for purposes of designing a humane, doable and sustainable system of assessing student learning. The GESA worked to coordinate an assessment system that would build on the efforts of the previous subcommittee—and the ad hoc committee from 2013-14, and to envision and implement the next phases of the assessment system. The ad hoc committee organized by director Chris Foreman served dual purposes of coordinating a transition between the previous subcommittee, whose efforts concluded in 2012 (for reasons described below) and the current subcommittee.

Solicited and Recognized History of the Subcommittee on Assessment, 2007-2012. Through a SWOT analysis of the General Education Program, the General Education Review Committee (GERC), which included Chris Foreman and Doug Baker, compiled a document that describes the current state of the program ("Report on the General Education Program: Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats," May 12, 2015). Criterion #4 of the document focuses on the assessment of student learning, representing the comprehensive efforts of the

previous subcommittee (see “Report on the General Education Program,” “Criterion #4”). Drawing on conversations with previous members of the subcommittee on assessment, GESA contributed to current efforts to describe how student learning was assessed for the revised General Education Program (2007).

The previous subcommittee achieved three main goals:

(1) construction of initial assessments and of a process for reporting results (2008-09);
(2) creation (in 2009) of a faculty-led General Education Multicourse Assessment Project (GEMAP), which included nine groups of *faculty working groups* (at least 64 faculty members and department heads contributed), which met regularly through 2011, for the assessment of outcomes in Area III (U.S. Diversity, Global Awareness) and Area IV (Arts, Humanities, Social Sciences, Natural Sciences); and,

(3) a final project, designed for the AQIP process in 2011-12, that sought to assess the “experiential” methods of satisfying Learning Beyond the Classroom outcomes. Overall, the subcommittee—and the many contributing faculty members and department heads—agreed that the processes were “conceptually sound,” according to former chair Michael Tew, yet unsustainable because of the excessive demand for long-term faculty commitments and accompanying resources.

GESA views this historical information as critical to the description of EMU’s overall objectives and actions toward demonstrating how it has assessed, and does assess, student learning from the General Education Program perspective. Furthermore, the perspectives of contributors of the GEMAP influence current efforts to build a sustainable system with the support of faculty and department heads.

Constructed and Completed Phase One of the Current Assessment System. Phase One (2014-15) consisted of soliciting, reviewing and responding to assessment reports from all programs in the General Education Effective Communication (GEEC) category and from selected math courses in the General Education Quantitative Reasoning (GEQR) category. GESA successfully solicited reports from the coordinators of programs under GEEC (ENGL 121, CTAC 124, and ESLN 412) and from the department head of Math, who secured contributions from instructors of eight sections of three different General Education mathematics courses (MATH 110, 110e, and 170). GESA reviewed and responded to the reports, which were returned to the coordinators or department head.

Participated in a Committee Retreat, the 2015 Assessment Institute, and the General Education Assessment Retreat. On March 13, 2015, the five members of GESA, with the support of Director Chris Foreman, met for an all-day retreat for three main purposes: (1) to build capacity among members—especially for the purpose of creating common knowledge among the committee, including historical perspectives of previous efforts and the role of programmatic assessment of student learning; (2) to review and respond to assessment reports from programs of GEEC and GEQR; and (3) to envision and discuss next phases of the system (in order to assess representative courses in all General Education Program categories). These goals were accomplished. The committee members also participated in the Assessment Institute (April 30-May 1) to clarify the next phases of the system and to discuss how to communicate assessment efforts to stakeholders. Finally, GESA invited selected faculty (John Koolage and Michael Tew), the directors of the University Writing Center (Ann Blakelsee) and the Faculty Development Center (Peggy Liggitt), and a department head (Chris Gardiner) to a retreat (June 17) to plan the next phases of the assessment system.

Drafted Plans for Phases Two and Three. GESA drafted plans for assessing representative courses in all categories of the General Education Program, and these were crafted with the support of selected past members of the subcommittee on assessment. The one-day retreat (June 17, 2015),

supported by Director Chris Foreman, led to a draft of the assessment plans for 2015-16 (see Appendix 3.4: “Assessment of Student Learning: Phases 2 & 3,” p. 20). A revision of that document will be presented to the General Education Advisory Committee for approval, among other input committees (e.g., Faculty Senate and the College of Arts and Sciences College Advisory Council) in Fall 2015.

3. **Provide 2-3 descriptive examples from your unit activities that highlight how you assessed student learning.**
 - a. **Although the examples might be ones that indirectly influence student learning (e.g., reorganizing assessment councils, revising templates, etc.),**
 - b. **At least one of the examples should describe a direct measure or approach to assessing student learning (e.g., an individual program’s example).**

Indirect Activities that Highlight Efforts to Assess Student Learning

GESA met monthly throughout the academic year. Meetings in Fall 2014 focused on building common knowledge among the committee of the General Education Program, clarifying the role and objectives of the committee, and soliciting and responding to reports for Phase 1.

GESA Retreats. As mentioned, the one-day retreats in March and in June provided committee members with opportunities to further explore historical efforts to assess student learning in the current General Education Program, to review assessment reports, and to plan next phases. (See Appendix 3.1: “GESA Minutes from Retreat on March 13,” p. 7.) The June retreat focused on (1) review of Phase One, particularly to examine the process in light of the mission of the General Education Program; (2) clarify and prepare plans for Phase Two and Three; (3) build support for resources, practices and procedures to complete the first “round” of assessment of all categories of the program.

Committee Members Participated in the University Assessment Institute. On April 30-May 1 the GESA committee members participated as a team in the institute for purposes of discussing further the plans for Phase Two and Three, and to generate a message and talking points about efforts to assess student learning. The committee also discussed resources needed for the next academic year, including increased released time for at least three faculty and support for training, especially for the purposes of continuing to reshape the culture of assessment, to refine the submission and review process, and to satisfy demands of stakeholders.

Direct Activities that Highlight Efforts to Assess Student Learning

As mentioned, GESA solicited assessment reports from the programs listed under GEEC (ENGL 121, CTAC 124, and ESLN 412) and representative courses from the main department (MATH) that contributes to GEQR (Quantitative Reasoning). Below, each report and GESA’s response is described, mainly for the purpose of demonstrating how these programs assess student learning indirectly and directly. Impressively, all four courses/programs benefited from contributions of a coordinator/department head and many instructors from their programs. The group efforts of each demonstrates a strength in striving for reliable and valid assessments, although the cyclical nature of assessing student learning proved to be the key to each program’s effectiveness.

ENGL 121. Led by program coordinators Derek Mueller and Kate Pantilides, the ENGL 121 program engaged in a four-part self-study and process for assessing student learning. The first three phases formed the basis for a report submitted to GESA in February 2015 (the final part of the report was completed and submitted at the end of April). The program prepared for programmatic assessment of student learning by first surveying instructors (23 Graduate Assistants, part and full-time lecturers participated) on their knowledge and perspectives of the learning outcomes and of distinctions between ENGL 120 (not part of the GEEC) and 121. The step led to representative instructors and the two coordinators reading and assessing a sample of students' portfolios. The third part focused on a rubric-based online platform (*MyReview*), which the program is considering for purposes of supporting instructors' efforts in assessing student performance. The program demonstrated critical practices of improving the program and enhancing opportunities for students to learn: program leaders and representative instructors committed to assessment of student learning and programmatic self-study; procedures and practices of assessing student performance were designed and developed; and findings informed planned program improvements.

CTAC 124. Led by program director Doris Fields, eleven instructors who teach this course gathered to review a representative number of student essays (94 were collected and 50 reviewed) for purposes of assessing how well students met two selected learning outcomes. Impressively, as the coordinators of ENGL 121 did, Fields prepared for the assessment of the student performances by guiding the instructors through a "norming" session (a rubric was used), including clarification of the assignment, the prompt, and criteria for successful completion. (See Appendix 3.2: "CTAC 124 Assessment Report," p. 11.) The program used the findings to suggest next steps for improving the course and the process of assessing student performance from a programmatic perspective.

ESLN 412. Led by program coordinator Kimberly Anderson, instructors in the program collected data on student performances from multiple angles (e.g., on a standardized test, in-class writings, etc.). Their report demonstrates the program's capacity to work as a group, to gather and analyze multiple sources of student data, and to *close the loop* by suggesting changes to the program from the findings. In particular, the group discovered that students need more support when preparing written assignments, and the program has made decisions about how to meet this need. As with the other programs in the GEEC category, GESA responded to the report with observations, commendations and recommendations (see Appendix 3.3: "GESA Response to ESLN 412 Assessment Report," p. 18).

MATH 110, 110e, and 170. The Math department, led by department head Chris Gardiner, has consistently contributed to the assessment efforts of the General Education Program. In the first years after program was revised (2007), the Math department examined the proposed learning outcomes and through analysis of them and student performances reshaped the learning outcomes for the GEQR category. In the current report, eight instructors from three courses contributed to the assessments and analysis of them. Gardiner invited instructors to volunteer and to select an assignment that could be used to assess students toward meeting the learning outcomes. This approach demonstrated flexibility necessary and the complexity involved with honoring the time commitment of graduate assistants and lecturers while creating a productive assessment system. The complexity of gathering multiple instructors across different courses also demonstrates a need for the General Education Program to further support these types of assessment efforts. (Stephanie Casey, an assistant professor in the Math department and a member of GESA, will have one-quarter released time for both semesters next year to further support these efforts.)

4. Discuss what your unit learned from the 2014-15 efforts of assessing student learning and how it will use the findings to improvement the program(s), unit, and opportunities for students to learn.

There is Value of Consulting with Members of Previous Subcommittee on Assessment. The GESA focused on building capacity among committee members, coordinating programmatic assessment efforts among courses in the GEEC and GEQR categories, and creating plans for the next phases. Through these processes, the committee uncovered key findings. First, the efforts of the previous subcommittee on assessment should be included in reports in order to more accurately represent the General Education Program's work of assessing student learning. Talking with previous committee members also helped the current committee to build capacity across the university—a process that will continually need to be nurtured.

GESA Must Continue Building Capacity Among Committee Members, particularly for soliciting and responding to reports. Through committee meetings, the retreat in March, participation in the University Assessment Institute, and the retreat in June, members of GESA built common knowledge about the objectives of the committee and some methods for constructing a sustainable system. For example, the committee created a reporting system, one modeled from College of Arts and Sciences Assessment Committee's approach. GESA believes this type of parallel consistency is important for the General Education Program's assessment of student performances since most of the courses are based in CAS.

The Need for Further Resources is Critical. As the first year's work of the reconstituted committee has demonstrated, there are multiple and complex parts to creating a humane, doable and sustainable assessment system. GESA recognizes the need for increased released time for committee members to accomplish the huge task of assessing student learning across the program's categories. GESA has proposed for increased released time to support efforts in soliciting plans and reports from the Arts & Humanities (Doug Baker), Quantitative Reasoning (Stephanie Casey), and the Sciences (Maria Milletti).

Building Support for General Education Program Assessment is Critical. The next academic year will be pivotal in generating support for assessment processes and practices of and for the General Education Program. As IRIM Director Bin Ning has stated, the General Education Program must assess representative courses in all categories by Fall 2017. Part of meeting this goal—and doing it well—is dependent upon the support that GESA can garner and receive across campus. This will be a huge goal for next year.

5. As you turn toward next year (2015-16), what goals have emerged that your unit plans to focus on in the upcoming year?

- Build support for proposed Phase Two and Three of the assessment system for the General Education Program.
- Secure further resources necessary to implement assessment program.
- Continue to build capacity among members of the GESA, particularly clarifying roles and objectives for the academic year.
- Survey department heads to gather data on what departments are currently (not) doing—see Appendix 3.5, “Draft of Survey for Department Heads,” p. 22.
- Solicit assessment reports from the remaining categories.
- Respond to assessment reports.
- Enhance communication among colleges, programs and GESA.

Appendix

Contents

| | |
|--|-------|
| 3.1: GESA Minutes from Retreat on March 13 | p. 7 |
| 3.2: CTAC 124 Assessment Report | p. 11 |
| 3.3: GESA’s Response to ESLN 412 Assessment Report | p. 18 |
| 3.4: Assessment of Student Learning: Phases 2 & 3 | p. 20 |
| 3.5: Draft of Survey for Department Heads | p. 22 |

3.1: GESA Minutes from Retreat on March 13

**General Education
Sub-Committee on Assessment Retreat
Friday, March 13, 2015 – 9:00 am – 3:00 pm
Student Center 302
Minutes
(March 13)**

Attendance

David Gore, Matt Hammond, Stephanie Casey, Sun Hae Jung, Doug Baker

9:00-9:30

Discussed Goals for the Day (see binder for agenda and other materials)

- Become more familiar with the General Education program, including how the parts align (e.g., program, learning outcomes, five-year plan for assessment, and reports), and role of assessing student learning
- Review Phase One reports and develop rubric
- Explore and plan Phase Two (i.e., next steps and assessment plans)

Revisited Name of Committee

So, “General Education Subcommittee on Assessment” (GESA)

Discussed the Need to Clarify Goals and Timeline of the Assessment Committee

- Role of assessment in accreditation: Continue to create an assessment system that leads EMU instructors to assess student learning for General Education program.
- Expectations of accrediting body, Higher Learning Commission
- Matt encouraged us to create a reporting mechanism to provide evidence for assessment system, including evidence for how data is being used to improve programs—including the assessment system.

9:30-9:50

Bin Ning, Director of IRIM discussed the role of Gen Ed assessment in university accreditation. He provided *three perspectives* (the university’s and a reviewer’s) that we must consider.

- Students’ – “Why do we spend two years on Gen Ed? What are the outcomes? What am I supposed to learn?”
- University’s – The university invests resources into Gen Ed, so we want to prove that the program is worth it, especially in our reporting to the public, to the students and their parents.
- HLC’s – Bin serves as reviewer. Typically, the HLC team will have two-three people who will examine assessment. They do not check student coursework but want to know what kind of assessment program we have, the evidence, etc. For example, he will be visiting Emporia University soon and will ask three main questions about its Gen Ed program:
 - What are the clear outcomes you established and convey to the students in terms of Gen Ed?
 - How do you assess the learning outcomes? How do you know students learn those types of skills, etc.?
 - What evidence do you have that you assessed and that you improved your program?

Notes

- For the next few years, we need to continue building a sustainable system (Spring 2018 will be HLC visit). We have to show, for example, that we have addressed all of the parts of the Gen Ed program (i.e., all of the categories and learning outcomes). We still have time, but need to start right away.
- *It’s up to this group to design a system, one that faculty do not see it as a burden.* Typically, there is a small group for each category to start the work and small teams for each category. There is no “threshold” of faculty involvement, but we want to be able to say that there is “broad” buy in from faculty.
- Need alignment of the parts – e.g., on Gen Ed webpage and University Assessment Committee.
- Matt: How many assessments should we look at for each area? Bin: For first cycle, one outcome per year, so talking five-year cycle. But when get into second cycle we can combine writing and quantitative reasoning into one year. Need to address systematically all of the categories that we have (some may assess one or two a year, for example).
- Stephanie: Need to really think about continuity as we design the system. Bin: Maybe have a primary and secondary foci. Maintain the momentum—and continuous improvement. Doug: need overlap in order to maintain overlap.
- *EMU will have a mock visit, or something similar, during early 2017.*
- *If this group sees a person who can help us, let Bin know. We can invite people.*

9:50-10:30

**Discussed Alignment of the Parts – The “Groundwork” of Assessment of Student Learning
(see handout in binder of the following):**

- General Education Program: Education for Participation in the Global Community (updated version from Chris Foreman—will be online soon)
- General Education Learning Outcomes (<https://www.emich.edu/gened/learningoutcomes.php>)
- General Education Program: “Overview Five-Year Plan” – Assessment (<http://www.emich.edu/assessment/unitsaessment.php>)
- General Education Annual Assessment Report, 2013-14. Discussed main critique and needs for this year.

We examined the updated list of Gen Ed requirements and recognized that there are four main categories that the GESA responsible for: the ones with learning outcomes (GEEC, etc.). We need to make sure that webpage is aligned with University Assessment, etc.

10:30-12:00

Phase One Update – Examined and Responded to Reports (ENGL 121 & CTAC 124)

- Read two reports submitted this year (ENGL 121 & CTAC 124)
- Developed a template for response
- Drafted response—Doug will send to committee for final response
- Next steps: Lessons learned from this phase? How do we use the information to enhance the system of assessing student learning? Answers to these questions will be in report for 2014-15.

12:00-12:30 – Lunch with Chris Foreman (Thanks, Chris!)

Resources

- Allen, Mary J. *Assessing General Education Programs*. San Francisco: Anker. 2006.
- Penn, Jeremy D. “The Case for Assessing Complex General Education Student Learning Outcomes.” *New Directions for Institutional Research*, no. 149, Spring 2011. Published online in Wiley Online Library (wileyonlinelibrary.com) • DOI: 10.1002/ir.376
- Richman, W. Allen, and Ariovich, Laura. “All-in-One: Combining Grading, Course, Program, and General Education Outcomes Assessment.” National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment. October 2013. Retrieved from: <http://www.learningoutcomeassessment.org/documents/Occasional%20Paper%2019%20FINAL.pdf>

12:30-3:00

Planned Next Phases of Gen Ed Assessment of Student Learning

Review Gen Ed Report 2013-14 and Past Work

- Discussed the observed needs for assessing student learning.
- What did the previous Gen Ed assessment committee accomplish? How can we build on their work? Discussed Michael Tew’s retrospective on the process and Chris Foreman’s “Five-Year Plan,” written a few years ago.

Examined the Following Examples

Grand Valley State University

<https://www.gvsu.edu/gened/assessment-process-139.htm>

University of Wisconsin – La Crosse:

<http://www.uwlax.edu/FacultySenate/Gen%20Ed/Gen%20Ed%20Assessment.htm>

Marshall University

<http://www.marshall.edu/assessment/GenEdAssessment.aspx>

Outlined the Following Phases, which will include all categories

- 2014-15: GEEC & GEQR
- 2015-16: GEQR (next phase of it); Knowledge of the Disciplines—Arts (GEKA) & Humanities (GEKH); Perspectives on a Diverse World: Global Awareness (GEGA)
- 2016-17: Knowledge of the Disciplines—Natural Sciences (GEKN) and Social Sciences (GEKS); GEEC

Discussed Rationale for Phases and Needs

The three-year plan will ensure that the GESA addresses all categories and generate consistency (e.g., GEQR will continue next year; GEEC will again be assessed in 2016-17).

Needs include the following:

- Create common rubrics and get faculty input and buy-in through established process
- Create calendar of when programs/courses turn in plans and reports
- Decide how many faculty are needed to respond to plans and reports
- Continue to discuss how many faculty are needed to build a sustainable system

Next Steps

- EMU's Assessment Institute – April 30-May 1: Doug, Sunny, Matt and David will plan to attend and build on today's work and prepare for a one-day Gen Ed Institute in early June.
- General Education Assessment Institute – Early June
- Gen Ed Assessment Report due June
- Design rubrics with help from faculty (and get these approved)
- Make clear what the GESA is asking programs to do and for what reason
- Finalize templates for planning, reporting and responding
- Number the Gen Ed learning outcomes
- ***Survey to DHs!***
- Doug will write draft to ENGL 121 and CTAC 124 coordinators and send to GESA members for final approval.
- Doug will meet with Chris Foreman, Bin Ning and Rhonda Longworth to discuss next steps and needs, especially faculty support.

Consider attending conferences on assessment

Example Association and Conference

Association of American Colleges & Universities

“General Education and Assessment” – February 18-20, 2016

New Orleans (see <http://www.aacu.org/meetings/generaleducation/gened2016>)

Note: For representative information, see the program for February 2015:

<http://www.aacu.org/sites/default/files/files/meetings/GEA15Program.pdf>

Appendix 3.2: CTAC 124 Assessment Report*

*Use of the CTAC 124 report approved by Doris Fields (May 11, 2015).

**General Education
ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING**

| | |
|--|--|
| Degree Program | Communication, Undergraduate-CTAC 124 Foundations of Speech Communication |
| Department/School | Communication, Media and Theater Arts |
| Academic Year | 2014-2015 |
| Report Submitted by | Doris Fields |
| Phone/email | Dfields1@emich.edu |
| Date Submitted to Department Head | Kathleen Stacey |

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.

| |
|--|
| <p>PLANNING: SECTIONS I - IV 2014-2015</p> |
| <p>I. What are your program's Student Learning Outcomes? Please list the program's Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To communicate oral messages intended for public audiences 2. To analyze oral messages presented to public audiences by others 3. To craft oral arguments intended for public audiences 4. To manage communication apprehension as related to the presentation of oral messages to public audience 5. To articulate the relationship between public oral communication and democratic life in historical and contemporary contexts 6. To demonstrate principles of ethical oral public communication |
| <p>II. What Student Learning Outcomes will your program focus on for 2014-15? (Select <i>at least two</i> outcomes from approved list in section I.)</p> <p>Learning Outcome: #6-To demonstrate principles of ethical oral public communication</p> <p>Learning Outcome: #3- To craft oral arguments intended for public audiences will be assessed during the 2015-2016 academic year.</p> |

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.

The graduate assistants collected 94 copies of the “I Believe” essays in Fall 2014. The graduate teaching assistants will determine if CTAC 124 students can demonstrate principals of ethical communication in a basic speech course. From the 94 collected papers, a sample of 50 “I Believe” essays were distributed for the assessment.

The assessment will be based on the “Ethical Principals for Public Speaking” (Speak 2, Verderber, Snellow and Verderber, 2014, p. 4-6)

1. Ethical communicators are honest.
2. Ethical communicators have integrity.
3. Ethical communicators are fair.
4. Ethical communicators demonstrate respect for others.
5. Ethical communicators are responsible.

Assessment Assignment:
Class lecture on Chapter One

Each CTAC 124 course requires one written assignment; Graduate Assistants will have each student submit this assignment to their course shell during the Fall 2014 academic year.

The Graduate Assistants for CTAC 124-Foundations of Speech Communication will randomly select essays from “I Believe Essay” assignment for assessment.

“I Believe Essay” (adapted from NPR’s “I Believe Essay/Story”)

Guidelines:

1. Write a 350-500-word essay on a personal belief (personal philosophy).
2. The essay can be based on a life experience, family situation, or media event.
3. Use “I” language (I believe.....)
4. Students need to apply the “Ethical Principals for Public Speaking to the “I Believe Essay”.
5. Students need to fact check and include at least TWO sources within the paper and on the works cited page.
6. Be positive; specify your beliefs, do NOT specify what you don’t believe within the essay.
7. Discuss how you were tested or change by the personal belief.
8. Reference page included with the paper.

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.

A focus group of eleven graduate teaching assistants who teach CTAC 124 reviewed 50 papers from randomly selected from CTAC 124 students.

| Graduate Teaching Assistants | CTAC 124 (course #1) | CTAC 124 (course #2) |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1 | 13303 (26) | 14041 (25) |
| 2 | 14037 (25) | 14047 (23) |
| 3 | 17946 (25) | 14036 (25) |
| 4 | 18206 (25) | 14045 (25) |
| 5 | 12881 (25) | 15922 (25) |
| 6 | 15919 (25) | - |
| 7 | 13291 (25) | 18274 (25) |
| 8 | 15144 (25) | - |
| 9 | 12885 (25) | - |
| 10 | 18205 (25) | 14043 (25) |
| 11 | 18197 (25) | 14046 (25) |
| Total= | 276 | 198 |
| Total amount of papers | 474 | |

| Graduate Teaching Assistants | CTAC 124 (course #1) | CTAC 124 (course #2) |
|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1 | 5 | 5 |
| 2 | 5 | 4 |
| 3 | 5 | 5 |
| 4 | 5 | 5 |
| 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 6 | 5 | 0 |
| 7 | 5 | 5 |
| 8 | 5 | 0 |
| 9 | 5 | 0 |
| 10 | 5 | 5 |
| 11 | 5 | 5 |
| Total= | 55 | 39 |
| Total Number of papers collected | 94 | |
| Total Number of papers reviewed for assessment | 50 | |

ANALYZING AND PLANNING: SECTIONS V - VII

V. What are the results?

Describe the results of analyzing student performances on the selected learning outcomes. The graduate teaching assistant's completed a sample assessment analysis for the learning indicator: #6 - To demonstrate principles of ethical oral public communication. The GA's were given three identical sample papers, varying from target, satisfactory and no met. The graduate teaching assistants reviewed the materials and completed a draft assessment. The Basic Course Director led a discussion to assess if the CTAC 124 students were meeting the ethical standards for public speaking. In the sample assessment 96% of the students meet the target goal of examining a life experience, family situation or media event while 4% did not meet the goal of the assignment. In contrast, 50% of the students were able to demonstrated ethical communication, 33% demonstrated satisfactory goal of ethical

communication and 17% did not meet the goal. Moreover, 40% of the students were able to apply ethical principles communication, 43% met the application of ethical principals and 17% did not meet the goal of applying ethical principals of communication. Only 26% of the students evaluated demonstrated appropriate use of citations and sources, 57% of the students demonstrated a satisfactory goal of using citations and sources and 17% did not meet the goal of demonstrated appropriate use of citation and sources. The GA's reviewed one identical paper in a controlled focus group, a week later to provide supplementary support for further discussion the assessment findings. The final assessment reviewed 50 randomly selected "I Believe" essays. The focus group results for student learning indicator #6-To demonstrate principles of ethical oral public communication were:

- A majority of the students (70%) evaluated met the target of understanding the assignment. This number is significant to the assessment because it demonstrates a basic understanding the course materials.
- A majority of the students (54%) evaluated posses a moderate understanding of ethical communication.
- A majority of the students (48%) evaluated have a moderate knowledge of applying ethical principles, while 30% of the student have a minimal knowledge of this content area
- A majority of the students (54%) of the students evaluated have a moderate understanding of citation within speeches and course content, while 36% of the students evaluated have minimal knowledge of citation of sources.

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.

- The final results of the assessment suggest that CTAC 124 students have a strong understanding for the course content and description of the course assignment. The majority of the students examined scored high on a life experience, family situation or media event.
- The majority of students are demonstrating a satisfactory knowledge of ethical communication. The rubric results suggest a continuous need to improve students' knowledge of ethical communication.
- Students demonstrated a moderate knowledge of ethical principles of communication. The rubric results suggest a continuous need for growth in demonstrating ethical principles.
- Students demonstrated a satisfactory goal of using citation in course assignment.
- The final data analysis proposes academic growth in ethical communication is satisfactory. Based on the results student's comprehension levels of ethical communication should be expanded in CTAC 124.

VII. What actions 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.

- Revise the ethical assessment tool, to demonstrate various methods of learning ethical communication.
- Create an assignment during the delivery workshop to enhance the student's citation during speeches and course assignments.

- Create a learning assignment to address the student’s weakness in ethical communication.
- Suggest additional reading to provide support for ethical communication in speeches and assignments.
- Encourage GA’s, instructors and faculty persons to integrate several ethical communication assignments during the semester to increase ethical communication standards.
- Revisit the assessment in two years to evaluate if assess if any academic growth occurred.

Learning Outcome #6 To demonstrate principles of ethical oral public communication

- **Target: 3 points**
- **Satisfactory: 2 points**
- **Not Met: 1 point**

Rubric

| Indicators of Student Learning | Target (3) | Satisfactory (2) | Not Met (1) |
|---|---|--|---|
| Students examine a life experience, family situation, or media event. | Explanation is fully clear and thorough, contains significant detail | Explanation is clear and contains some detail | Explanation is not clear and contains little or no detail |
| Students will be able to demonstrate ethical communication. | Student demonstrates a mastery level of understanding of ethics | Student demonstrates an adequate level of understanding of ethics | Student demonstrates no understanding of ethics |
| Students apply ethical principles of communication. | Student demonstrates a clear understanding of the ethical principals | Student demonstrates an adequate understanding of the ethical principals | Student demonstrates no understanding of the ethical principals |
| Students will demonstrate appropriate use of citation and sources. | The work demonstrates an advanced understanding of citation and sources | The work demonstrates an adequate understanding of citation and sources | The work demonstrates no understanding of citation and sources |

Student _____

| Indicators of Student Learning: Student A | Target (3) | Satisfactory (2) | Not Met (1) |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Students examine a life experience, family situation, or media event. | | | |
| Students will be able to demonstrate ethical communication. | | | |
| Students apply ethical principles of communication. | | | |
| Students will demonstrate appropriate use of citation and sources. | | | |

Sample Draft Assessment Results

| Indicators of Student Learning: Student E | Target (3) | Satisfactory (2) | Not Met (1) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Students examine a life experience, family situation, or media event. | 96% met the target goal of the assignment | N/A | 4% did not meet the goal of the assignment |
| Students will be able to demonstrate ethical communication. | 50% met the target goal of ethical communication | 33% met the satisfactory goal of ethical communication | 17% did not meet the goal of ethical communication |
| Students apply ethical principles of communication. | 40% met the target goal of applying ethical principals of communication | 43% met the satisfactory goal of applying ethical principals of communication | 17% did not meet the goal of applying ethical principals of communication |
| Students will demonstrate appropriate use of citation and sources. | 26% met the target goal of demonstrating appropriate use of citation | 57% met the satisfactory goal of demonstrating appropriate use of citation | 17% did not meet the goal of demonstrating appropriate use of citation |

Assessment Questions

Measurement of Student Learning: Discussion Questions

1. After reviewing the student papers, can you describe what the students did well and provide evidence of your observation.

Follow-up questions:

- Did the students comprehend the basic ethical standards of public speaking?
What evidence did you see that supports your observation....

- Did the students demonstrate a respect for others?
- Did the speaker include research citation in the paper?
- Did the students communicate with integrity and fairness?
- Did the students grasp the assignment?

2. *What are your preferred outcomes of the assignment?*

1. Demonstrate principals of ethical oral public communication
2. Citation of research sources
3. Demonstrated ethical speaking standards throughout the semester

3. *What improvements should be made in the assignment?*

1. What teaching methods can be improved?
2. What changes should be made in CTAC 124 to address learning outcomes....

Draft Assessment Results

| Indicators of Student Learning: Student E | Target (3) | Satisfactory (2) | Not Met (1) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Students examine a life experience, family situation, or media event. | 70% met the target goal of the assignment | 22% met the satisfactory goal of the assignment | 8% did not meet the goal of the assignment |
| Students will be able to demonstrate ethical communication. | 24% met the target goal of ethical communication | 54% met the satisfactory goal of ethical communication | 22% did not meet the goal of ethical communication |
| Students apply ethical principals of communication. | 22% met the target goal of applying ethical principals of communication | 48% met the satisfactory goal of applying ethical principals of communication | 30% did not meet the goal of applying ethical principals of communication |
| Students will demonstrate appropriate use of citation and sources. | 10% met the target goal of demonstrating appropriate use of citation | 54% met the satisfactory goal of demonstrating appropriate use of citation | 36% did not meet the goal of demonstrating appropriate use of citation |

Discussion Questions

- How do we close the “loop”?
- What specific changes should be made to the course content? (Lecture, textbook reading, additional readings)
- How do we address the student who does not understand proper citation?

Appendix 3.3: GESA's Response to ESLN 412 Assessment Report

General Education Subcommittee on Assessment (GESA) Response to Programmatic Report on the Assessment of Student Learning For School Year: 2014-15

DEPARTMENT/PROGRAM: **World Languages/ESLN 412**

Date: May 11, 2015

Overview to Response from CASAC to Program's Assessment Report

In Winter 2015, your program submitted an assessment report describing how it assessed students' learning on selected learning outcomes from a programmatic perspective. For the report, you were asked to report the following: (1) Describe the results of analyzing student performances on selected learning outcomes; (2) describe what the results mean or suggest for the program in terms of student learning; and, (3) based on findings of the above process, describe actions the program plans to implement.

Types of Responses to Report

Since GESA's goal is to support your efforts in creating a perpetual system to evaluate student learning from a programmatic perspective, the response includes observations, commendations, and suggestions. GESA recognizes that your program faculty are the experts in what students should learn, how they should learn it, and how well students have met the program's learning outcomes. The programmatic assessment process you have elected to construct should provide you with analysis and information that inform decisions to enhance students' opportunities to learn and to meet selected learning outcomes.

REPORTING SECTIONS V - VII

V. What were the results? Describe the results of analyzing student performances on the selected learning outcomes.

- Program has described results of analyzing student performances on SLOs listed on assessment plan.
- Program needs to describe results of analyzing student performances on SLOs listed on assessment plans.

Observations & Commendations: Your program included multiple instructors in the gathering of representative student performances, and, impressively, you coordinated their contributions in order to analyze the performances. Furthermore, you used the results attained by the group of instructors to make improvements to your program.

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

- Program has described what the results of analysis mean or suggest for improving the program and opportunities for students to learn.
- Program has not described what the results of analysis mean or suggest for improving the program and opportunities for students to learn.

Observations, Commendations, or Suggestions: One of the main findings you state is the following: the group agreed “to change the assignment types and grading category to better ensure students are accomplishing the targeted language proficiency in writing in this course” (Section V). You also point to what the students need to be more successful in meeting the outcomes: “students need more opportunities to write and to develop key features (grammatical and lexical accuracy, variety and sophistication) that are required for international students at this level” (Section VI).

VII. What action does the program plan for purposes of enhancing opportunities for student learning?

Based on findings described above, describe actions the program plans to implement.

- Based on findings described in V and VI, the program has described actions it plans to implement.
- The program has described actions it plans to implement, although the plans are not clearly related to the findings.
- The program has provided no evidence that the assessment plans informed decisions.

Observations, Commendations, or Suggestions: The information on students’ performances toward meeting selected learning outcomes gathered by the program and discussed among its faculty should inform curricular and programmatic decisions (in terms of assessing student learning, this process is often called, “closing the loop”). You have demonstrated this process. One of the key changes you plan to make is the following: “The faculty and lecturers have agreed to form a committee each semester to include all of the instructors teaching ESLN 412 to review syllabi, course assignments, student work, final exams, etc.” (Section VII). These additional practices will, as you state, help provide increased opportunities for students to meet the outcomes.

For future reports, consider presenting a chart that shows representative data and how it reflects your assessment process. Overall, thank you for contributing to the General Education Program’s assessment system.

GESA Peer Reviewer: Doug Baker

Voluntary Response to GESA

If you would like to respond, comment or raise questions about the response to your program’s report, please email Doug Baker.

GESA Committee Members

Director of Gen Ed: "Chris Foreman" <cforeman@emich.edu>,
CAS Rep: "W. Douglas Baker" <douglas.baker@emich.edu>,
CAS Rep: "Stephanie Casey" <scasey1@emich.edu>,
CHHS Rep: "Sun Hae Jang" <sjang3@emich.edu>
COE Rep: TBA
COT Rep: "David Gore" <dgore@emich.edu>,
COB Rep: "Matthew Hammond" <mhammon1@emich.edu>
Library: TBA

Appendix 3.4: Assessment of Student Learning: Phases 2 & 3

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

General Education Subcommittee on Assessment (GESA) Assessment of Student Learning: Phases 2 & 3 (June 25, 2015)

During the past academic year (2014-15), the General Education Subcommittee on Assessment (GESA) completed Phase 1 of a three-year cycle designed to assess student learning from a General Education programmatic perspective. The main purpose of this document is to outline the planned assessments that will address all categories of the General Education Program (for an updated list, go to: https://www.emich.edu/gened/docs/gen_ed_master_f15.pdf).

The draft was constructed following a full-day retreat on June 17, 2015, and the GESA will meet again in August to prepare the draft for Faculty Senate approval and distribution to stakeholders. The retreat, supported by Director Chris Foreman and organized by GESA chair Doug Baker, included the following contributors.

GESA Members in Attendance

- Doug Baker (Chair), Professor – English (CAS)
- Stephanie Casey, Assistant Professor – Mathematics (CAS)
- Sun Hae Jang, Assistant Professor – Orthotics and Prosthetics (CHHS)
- Matthew Hammond, M.B.A. – Data Analyst for Accreditation and Learning Assessment (COB)
- Maria Milletti, Professor – Chemistry (CAS)

Invited Participants

- Ann Blakeslee, Professor – English & Director of Writing Center
- Chris Gardiner, Department Head, Math
- John Koolage, Associate Professor – Philosophy & Chair Gen Ed Review Committee
- Peggy Liggitt, Professor – Biology & Director of Faculty Development Center
- Michael Tew, Professor – CMTA & former chair of GESA

General Education Program Assessment of Student Learning: Three-Year Cycle of Assessments

Phase 1 – 2014-15

GESA solicited and responded to plans and reports on assessment of student learning from the following categories and courses/programs of the General Education Program.

- GEEC (ENGL 121, CTAC 124, ESLN 412)
- GEQR (8 sections of three math courses, MATH 110, 110e, 170)

Phase 2 – 2015-16

The following actions are planned:

- *Survey of Department Heads* – Summer 2015: In order to gather information about existing efforts to assess student learning from a General Education Program perspective, GESA and the Faculty Development Center will survey department heads.
- *Analysis of Course Syllabi* – Fall 2015: Collect syllabi from all scheduled GE courses and analyze them for inclusion of assessment of student learning—particularly in comparison to the course document approved by the General Education Vetting Committee.
- *Pilot Assessments* – Fall 2015: Selected programs/courses from categories of Knowledge of the Disciplines (GEKH—Humanities and GEKN—Natural Sciences) will contribute pilot assessments, which will most likely emerge from information gleaned from the department head survey about what programs are already doing. Instructors of the participating courses, in consultation with members of GESA, will design the assessments.
 - Assessment Plans: Instructors of courses that participate will submit assessment plans to GESA, which will respond with comments and suggestions in order to support and guide efforts to assess student learning from a programmatic perspective.
 - Assessment Reports: Instructors will submit reports to GESA, which will respond with comments and suggested next steps in developing humane, doable, and sustainable assessments.
- *Assessments from Remaining General Education Categories* – Winter 2016: Based on analysis of the survey of department heads, particularly building on what is already happening in selected departments, and analysis of collected syllabi, GESA will, in consultation with program faculty and department heads, invite participation for assessments in the remaining General Education categories: Quantitative Reasoning, particularly courses outside of the Math department; Knowledge of the Disciplines (GEKA—Arts, GEKS—Social Sciences), Application of Core Requirements (GEGA—Global Awareness & GEUS—US Diversity), and GEL 1-6—Learning Beyond the Classroom and GEWI—Writing Intensive. Instructors of the participating courses will engage with GESA during the planning and reporting of the assessments.
 - Assessment Plans (due April 2016, see below): Instructors of courses that participate will submit assessment plans to GESA, which will respond with comments and suggestions in order to support and guide efforts to assess student learning from a programmatic perspective.
 - Assessment Reports (due December 2016, see below): Instructors will submit reports to GESA, which will respond with comments and suggested next steps in developing humane, doable, and sustainable assessments.

Phase 3 – 2016-17

- Fall 2016: Programs/courses that initiated assessments in Winter 2016 will complete data collection and analysis and submit reports to GESA by December.
- Winter 2017: GESA responds to assessment reports and provides analysis of the processes involved.

Next Three-Year Cycle

Phase 1 – 2017-18: Effective Communication & Quantitative Reasoning

Phase 2 – 2018-19: Knowledge of the Disciplines & Writing Intensive

Phase 3 – 2019-20: Application of Core Requirements & Learning Beyond the Classroom

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

NOTE: This draft is based on what the Gen Ed Subcommittee on Assessment proposed in February 2015. Each survey was to be revised for the particular program (e.g., Chemistry, see below). However, Doug Baker and Peggy Liggitt, as part of the University Accreditation Planning Team, will develop a more inclusive survey that includes information needed for criteria 3 & 4 (of the Higher Learning Commission).

**General Education – Assessment of Student Learning
Survey of Department Heads
February 2015**

Dear ,

This survey is designed to gather the following information about how your department assesses student learning in General Education courses, which is a requirement for inclusion of the course (see Gen Ed. Course inclusion form, <https://www.emich.edu/gened/gened/index.php>). In particular, the General Education Assessment Committee needs the following information:

1. For each of the General Education courses, are instructors listing the Gen Ed learning outcomes on their syllabus?
2. What are instructors (or programs) currently doing to assess students toward meeting Gen Ed learning outcomes?
3. What future plans does your department have to assess students toward meeting Gen Ed learning outcomes?
4. How do you support instructors in assessing students toward meeting Gen Ed learning outcomes?
5. What type of support do you need?

Background and Rationale. As you know, EMU's accrediting body, the Higher Learning Commission (HLC), expects that we are assessing students toward meeting approved learning outcomes. As a program, General Education has a list of outcomes for each category. Attached are the General Education courses that your department offers and the learning outcomes attached to those courses.

Attached is the survey in the form of a chart and a list of Gen Ed courses offered by your department. Please complete this survey and return it to Doug Baker (douglas.baker@emich.edu) by **xxxx , 2015**.

Thank you.

General Education Assessment Committee

Director of General Education "Chris Foreman" <cforeman@emich.edu>,
CAS Rep & Chair: "W. Douglas Baker" <douglas.baker@emich.edu>,
CAS Rep: "Stephanie Casey" <scasey1@emich.edu>,
CHHS Rep: "Sun Hae Jang" <sjang3@emich.edu>
COE Rep: TBA
COT Rep: "David Gore" <dgore@emich.edu>,
COB Rep: "Matthew Hammond" <mhammon1@emich.edu>

EXAMPLE**Department: Chemistry****Department Head: Steve Pernecky****Survey**

Based on the following questions, the list of Gen Ed courses in your department, and the learning outcomes* for the appropriate category(s) of the courses, please fill in the chart below. If your answers are the same or similar for all of the courses listed, you may fill in one row as representative of the rest. Or, if you would rather write a descriptive statement about how your department assesses student learning in Gen Ed courses, please do so below. As for Questions #4 & #5, please answer those at the end of the survey.

*Note: All of the courses appear in the Knowledge of the Disciplines section of General Education. The learning outcomes are listed on the next page (<https://www.emich.edu/gened/learningoutcomes.php>).

1. For each of the General Education courses, are instructors listing the Gen Ed learning outcomes on their syllabus?
2. What are instructors (or programs) currently doing to assess students toward meeting Gen Ed learning outcomes?
3. What future plans does your department have to assess students toward meeting Gen Ed learning outcomes?
4. How do you support instructors in assessing students toward meeting Gen Ed learning outcomes?
5. What type of support do you need?

| Course | Question 1 | Question 2 | Question 3 |
|---------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| CHEM 101 | | | |
| CHEM 115/116 | | | |
| CHEM 117/118 | | | |
| CHEM 120 | | | |
| CHEM 121/122 | | | |

Question #4:**Question #5:**

General Education Learning Outcomes: Area IV: Knowledge of the Disciplines

In **Natural Science** courses, students will:

Apply the scientific method and its assumptions to pose and answer questions.

- Make observations, develop appropriate classifications, and infer trends.
- Gather original data to verify the validity and reliability of accepted scientific principles.
- Analyze and solve a scientific problem by drawing conclusions based on original data gathered using appropriate experimental techniques.
- Use the processes and methods of science to demonstrate how reproducible experimental observations give rise to fundamental laws and theories.
- Demonstrate an understanding of the ways in which theories may evolve with time.
- Analyze and solve problems by identifying and utilizing appropriate data and methodology.

Attain a basic knowledge of current scientific understanding of the universe and the laws that govern it.

- Demonstrate a core knowledge base of facts and information.
- Demonstrate a working knowledge of the hierarchical structure of natural science.

Become a scientifically literate citizen.

- Acquire and apply an appropriate technical vocabulary.
- Interpret, analyze, and critically evaluate data and reports in the media relating to the natural sciences.
- Engage in informed discussions about the validity of the conclusions from reports in the media relating to the natural sciences.
- Employ available resources to find relevant scientific or technical information.
- Make informed decisions about scientific issues in daily life.