

**College or Unit Level Annual Assessment Report
Template and Guidelines**
(Rev. May 30, 2016)

College or Unit Name: College of Arts and Sciences

Report Year: 2015-16

Submitted by: Doug Baker

Submitted on (date): **DUE JUNE 30**

EMU's Mission and Expectation for Assessment

[\(https://www.emich.edu/assessment/\)](https://www.emich.edu/assessment/)

Mission

EMU creates a culture of assessment through collaborative planning, systematic implementation, and rigorous analysis of collected data to make informed decisions that enhance opportunities for students to learn and to strengthen all curricular and co-curricular areas.

Expectation

EMU expects all curricular and co-curricular areas to generate and implement learning goals, collect relevant data, and use on-going assessment processes for continuous improvement.

Purpose of Unit Reports on Assessment of Student Learning

The nine units that report on assessment of student learning (see the list below), list their goals for the academic year, describe what goals were accomplished, and provide examples of how assessment data were used to enhance programs.

Note on Preparation for Preliminary Visit

EMU is preparing for a preliminary ("mock") Higher Learning Commission visit (scheduled for November 10, 2016); therefore, the information you provide may be useful to the HLC Planning Teams, particularly teams #3 (Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support) and #4 (Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Support).

For links to the assessment page for each of the following, go to

<https://www.emich.edu/assessment/unitsaessment.php>

- College of Arts and Sciences
- College of Business
- College of Education
- College of Health and Human Services
- College of Technology
- General Education
- Graduate School
- Student Affairs & Student Services
- University Library

1. **Description of Council/Committee.** Describe how your assessment council or committee is organized and provide a list of the faculty and staff who directly contribute to it.

The College of Arts and Sciences Assessment Committee (CASAC) is composed of four faculty members, three department heads, and three liaisons (one from the University Library, College of Education, and General Education Program). Associate Dean Kate Mehuron, critical to CASAC's effectiveness, represented the Dean's office and has been ex-officio. Faculty are nominated and approved through the College Advisory Council. CASAC meets twice a month through the academic year, and agenda and minutes are archived. Below are the committee members for 2015-16.

Faculty

Doug Baker, English <douglas.baker@emich.edu>
John Dunn, English <jdunnjr@emich.edu>
Jenny Kindred, CMTA <jkindred@emich.edu>
Cynthia Macknish, World Languages <cmacknis@emich.edu>

Department Heads

Arnold Fleischmann, Political Science <afleisch@emich.edu>
Jacqueline Goodman, Women's & Gender Studies <jgoodma9@emich.edu>
Richard Sambrook, Geography & Geology <rsambroo@emich.edu>

Ex-Officio & Liaisons

Kate Mehuron, Associate Dean, ex-officio <kmehuron@emich.edu>
Chris Foreman, Director General Education Program, <cforeman@emich.edu>
Suzanne Gray, Associate Professor, University Library, <sgray17@emich.edu>
Beth Kubitskey, Associate Dean of College of Education, <mkubitske1@emich.edu>

2. **CASAC Assessment Goals.** In addition to the primary goal of assessing student learning, list other 2015-16 unit goals that were to support assessment of student learning (note whether these are direct, indirect or operational).

In addition to the annual goal of assessing student learning from programmatic perspectives, and based on analysis and discussion of the 2014-15 annual report, CASAC strived to meet seven main goals for 2015-16:

- Continue to solicit and encourage faculty participation in the assessment system
- In terms of assessing student learning, continue to build capacity among the committee and CAS administrators and instructors
- Streamline and reconfigure the planning and reporting system so that programs submit only one annual report (in the fall semester)
- Enhance the online submission and response system
- Create more transparency in evaluating program assessment plans and reports
- Archive all plans and reports and meeting agendas and minutes in one place
- Build more online resources

3. **Summary of Accomplishments.** Summarize the accomplishments your unit achieved during 2015-16 toward assessing student learning (the primary goal). Next, summarize the activities your unit engaged in during 2015-16 toward meeting other goals listed above.

Sustained Overall Submission and Review Process. For 2015-16, CASAC reconfigured the reporting process: the committee solicited one report from programs (instead of two), and the report included a description of assessment of student learning efforts for 2014-15 and assessment plans for 2015-16. Table 1 (see below) shows the percentage of reports and plans received by CASAC for the past four years. Importantly, there was an increase in the number of programs that participated during this past academic year, or were accounted for (75% of 134 programs). However, the number represents a slight change in how participation was counted. Technically, 64% of CAS degree programs submitted assessment reports; however, because CAS’s Program Review now includes a section on assessment of student learning, CASAC included in its totals the programs that requested that their assessment description for program review count for CASAC’s request. The committee agreed, particularly since it strives to encourage participation, not redundancy.

Next, College of Education is coordinating with CAS secondary certification programs to prepare for its national (CAEP) accreditation (the visit will take place in Fall 2017); therefore, CAS certification programs that submitted reports to their Specialized Professional Associations (or SPAs) were counted toward the CASAC totals (e.g., English: Language, Literature, and Writing for Teachers). The combination of reports submitted to CASAC, programs that submitted Program Review and certification programs that submitted reports to their SPAs led to the final number of participating programs (75%).

As usual, CASAC provided two responses to each of the assessment reports. See Appendix: CAS Template for Assessment Reports & Plans (pp. 8-12). Furthermore, CASAC continued to use an in-house rubric to evaluate how well programs reported on assessment (for description of rubric and examples, see Appendix: Rubric for CAS Assessment Reports/Plans, pp. 13-14).

Table 1: Assessment Plans and Reports Received from CAS Degree Programs

Date	Plans	Reports	Notes
Fall 2012	-	-	CASAC is formed
Winter 2013	102/130 = 78.5%	-	Plans for 2012-13
Fall 2013		79/127 = 62%	Reports for 2012-13
Winter 2014	104/130 = 80%		Plans for 2013-14
Fall 2014		93/133 = 70%	Reports for 2013-14
Winter 2015	104/134 = 78%		Plans for 2014-15
Fall 2015	100/134 = 75%		Reports for 2014-15 & Plans for 2015-16

Number of Participants Contributing to Assessment of Student Learning Increased. Each degree program coordinator is typically the leader of his or her program’s assessment efforts, and that person organizes discussions among faculty—articulating with a departmental assessment or curriculum committee, with his or her department head, and with CASAC. Each voting member of CASAC (four faculty and three department heads) acts as a liaison to selected programs, particularly for purposes of encouraging program coordinators and department heads to recognize the support

offered by the committee, to negotiate aspects of the submission/review process (e.g., when to submit a report), and to consult on relevant issues. Therefore, at least 60 faculty are directly involved with generating the reports for assessment of student learning.

Over the past four years, the number of CAS faculty who have become directly involved with assessment has increased, evidenced by the changing lists of coordinators, by the number of CAS faculty who directly submitted plans, and the number of participants involved with the University Assessment Institute (May 2016). Approximately 50-58 CAS faculty and lecturers have been trained through the University Assessment Institute since 2011.

Improved Online Submission System. With the initial technical support of James Turner and later of Xunhang (Hank) Zhou of IRIM, and the leadership of committee member Jenny Kindred, CASAC designed and coordinated an online reporting system, which provided a more expedient way for programs to submit reports and plans. The online presence encourages programs to recognize CASAC as a particular body devoted to supporting their assessment efforts. Additionally, the online system better assists in accumulating data for future reporting, and archived documents are more conveniently available to programs—especially important with the brewing changes in program or department leadership.

In May/June 2016, Jenny Kindred & Doug Baker have coordinated with Bin Ning and Hank Zhou of IRIM to enhance the efficacy of the online system, which will be implemented for 2016-17. Most importantly, the revised system will allow for CAS program coordinators and department heads to access archived reports, etc.; and it will permit CASAC members to access all files. The goal of archiving all past reports and CASAC responses is in progress, and it is a critical part of demonstrating the effectiveness of the system over time.

Continued to Build Capacity Among Members of CASAC. By the end of 2014-15, nearly all members of CASAC had completed three years of service. During the past academic year, with the support of CAS Associate Dean Kate Mehuron and Dean Venner, CASAC welcomed three new members, all department heads (Arnold Fleischmann, Political Science; Jacqueline Goodman, Women's & Gender Studies; and Richard Sambrook, Geography & Geology), in order to continue to build leadership (of assessment) across the college. The inclusion of department heads has proved invaluable in strengthening the quality and number of participating programs. This year, for example, Rick Sambrook organized a visit of an outside reviewer of his department, and the review partly focused on how programs assess student learning. The outcome of the review led him to further encourage his faculty to design useful assessments in order to strengthen what students have access to for learning and to improve the programs.

HOWEVER, CASAC must have continued support from the Dean's office, from department heads, and from program coordinators. Critically, we must all learn to better represent the value of assessing student learning from programmatic perspectives and to inform stockholders of our progress, particularly the students!

4. **Examples.** Provide 2-3 descriptive examples from your unit's activities that highlight how you assessed student learning, including "closing the loop."
 - The examples might be ones that indirectly influence student learning (e.g., reorganizing assessment councils, revising templates, etc.).
 - However, at least one of the examples should describe a direct measure or approach to assessing student learning (e.g., an individual program's example).

Examples of Indirect Influences on Assessment of Student Learning

Reconfiguring Report & Submission Process. Requesting that programs submit only one report each year streamlines the assessment system and provides more time for CASAC members to enhance other parts of the process (e.g., offering online resources). Now, programs describe how they met the previous academic year's assessment goals and then provide a plan for the current year. For the first three years, CASAC collected two reports, assessment reports in the fall and plans in the winter.

Articulating with Faculty regarding General Education Program. CASAC made a concerted effort this past academic year to encourage faculty to contribute to assessing student learning from a General Education Program perspective. Although detecting benefits to CASAC and CAS faculty is a challenge, the committee views coordination between the General Education Program and CAS degree programs as crucial to the overall effectiveness of assessment efforts.

Building Capacity among CASAC Members. The four faculty members have served on the committee for at least the past three years; however, this past year, three new members included department heads. CASAC has discovered that departments with a committee representative are more likely to participate in assessment efforts (e.g., Steve Pernecky's contribution led to the Chemistry department developing a committee on assessment; Rick Sambrook's work with an external reviewer of Geography & Geology has led to a renewed interest in assessment in that department). Therefore, it is critical that CASAC continues to rotate department heads.

Examples of Direct Influences on Assessment of Student Learning

Refined Submission System. Although the revised submission system will be ready for Fall 2016, this past academic year represented another step toward achieving a more reliable and flexible online submission and archival system. As a direct influence on assessment, faculty can better see the whole process and past reports, and it provides a professional perspective of assessment.

Biology & Chemistry: Departments with Assessment Committees. Both of these departments continue to excel in their efforts to assess student learning. One key reason is that they both have assessment committees. Furthermore, they are both involved with assessing student learning from a General Education Program point of view, which is important for each program's evaluation of its effectiveness. In particular, both departments are striving to better understand how to support students during key gateway courses and to distinguish between General Education courses designed for majors and those for non-majors.

Programs Making Strides. Many programs (and departments) continue to enhance processes and procedures for assessing student learning, including, African American Studies, Art, Biology, Chemistry, CMTA, English, History & Philosophy, Music & Dance, Math, P&A, Psychology, World Languages, and Women & Gender Studies. Many faculty in these programs have consistently demonstrated how the culture of assessment continues to evolve in their departments. One other department that made an important step: Economics!

5. **Closing the Loop.** Discuss what your unit learned from the 2015-16 efforts of assessing student learning and how it will use the findings to improve the program(s), unit, and opportunities for students to learn. In other words, how will your unit use findings to “close the loop” and improve the program?

CASAC strived to “close the loop” in three main ways.

Using In-House Rubric for Evaluating Assessment Reports. By continuing to use an in-house rubric for evaluating the efficacy of program reports, CASAC has recognized that most contributing programs now have a perpetual assessment system and consistent leadership (e.g., see above list); four of the departments continue to work with CASAC and the Dean’s office to strengthen their progress (Computer Science, Economics, Political Science, and SAC). In particular, CASAC sees the need for continued interaction with department heads and coordinators—and especially coordinating with the dean’s office during the transition of leadership.

Improving Submission and Archival System. Although a constant challenge, the submission and archival system is improving and demonstrating the value of archived reports, etc. For example, CASAC is gaining perspective on patterns over time (e.g., which programs have consistently contributed and why). The CASAC web presence must continue to evolve and to coordinate with the University Assessment Committee’s webpage, and the additional online resources will have a direct impact on how programs assess students’ learning.

Training Instructors and Leaders. A key aspect, in conjunction with the Faculty Development Center, is the on-going training of instructors to assess student learning. Since 2011 nearly 60 CAS faculty have been trained through the University Assessment Institute (each May).

6. **Next Year’s Goals.** As you turn toward the next academic year (2016-17), list and briefly describe goals that emerged from the current year and that you will focus on next year?

Based on discussions among CASAC members, the following are assessment goals for 2016-17:

- Continue to build web resources for programs & to coordinate with University Assessment Committee and IRIM
- Continue to support CAS departments in sustaining productive systems for assessing student learning from programmatic perspectives.
- In particular, encourage and guide CAS faculty to more effectively communicate the purpose and value of assessment of student learning
- Continue to coordinate with the General Education Subcommittee on Assessment (GESA) to organize effective systems for assessing student learning, particularly as students make transitions from the General Education Program to degree programs.
- Support the new CAS Dean by providing information about CASAC and assisting in the accreditation process; and request further support.
- Archive all past assessment reports and CASAC responses so that programs can access theirs, and so CASAC members can access them.

7. **Provide Template used for Reporting.** Finally, please provide a copy of a representative template that you used for programs to report their assessment findings.

See Appendix for CASAC's Template for Reporting.

Reference Literature: Role of Assessment of Student Learning in the Accreditation Process

In order for EMU to earn institutional accreditation, The Higher Learning Commission expects the university to meet five criteria (<http://policy.ncahlc.org/Policies/criteria-for-accreditation.html>), and Criterion 4 focuses on assessment of student learning:

Criterion Four. Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement

The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs, learning environments, and support services, and it evaluates their effectiveness for student learning through processes designed to promote continuous improvement.

The Higher Learning Commission describes the value of assessing student learning as including the following: "For student learning, a commitment to assessment would mean assessment at the program level that proceeds from clear goals, involves faculty at all points in the process, and analyzes the assessment results; it would also mean that the institution improves its programs or ancillary services or other operations on the basis of those analyses. Institutions committed to improvement review their programs regularly and seek external judgment, advice, or benchmarks in their assessments." (The Criteria for Accreditation: Guiding Values, <http://www.ncahlc.org/Information-for-Institutions/guiding-values-new-criteria-for-accreditation.html>.)

Appendix

CASAC's Template for Reporting College of Arts and Sciences

Assessment of Student Learning from Programmatic Perspectives

Welcome back!

The College of Arts and Sciences Assessment Committee (CASAC) is beginning its fourth year of coordinating efforts to assess student learning across CAS. Thank you for your continued contributions and participation.

This academic year—based on faculty feedback and suggestions—your program will submit an assessment report for 2014-15 and assessment plans for 2015-16, *together*. These are due September 28 – October 26. Consequently, you will make submissions to CASAC only once this year, instead of twice a year (as we have done in the past).

Attached to this message are the following:

- A cover sheet for reporting
- Part I: Template for Report on the Assessment of Student Learning for 2014-15
- Part II: Template for Plans for Assessing Student Learning for 2015-16
- Part III: Information on a recommended Curriculum Map

Also, mark your calendars: EMU is planning a preliminary visit from external reviewers in Fall 2016 in preparation for the accreditation report due in Fall 2017 and reviewers from the Higher Learning Commission in Winter 2018. Your program's contributions will help EMU earn reaccreditation and improve students' opportunities for learning.

Please let us know how we can continue to support your efforts.

Thank you,

CASAC

Doug Baker, Faculty Chair, English

John Dunn, Faculty, English

Jenny Kindred, Faculty, CMTA

Cynthia Macknish, Faculty, World Languages

Arnold Fleischmann, Department Head, Political Science

Jacqueline Goodman, Department Head, Women's & Gender Studies

Richard Sambrook, Department Head, Geography & Geology

Kate Mehuron, Associate Dean, ex-officio

Chris Foreman, Liaison, General Education Program

Suzanne Gray, Liaison, Halle Library

Beth Kubitskey, Liaison, College of Education

**COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCE
ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING
Report for 2014-15
and
Plans for 2015-16**

DUE: SEPTEMBER 28 - OCTOBER 26, 2015

Overview. The CAS Assessment Committee (CASAC), with the approval of the College Advisory Council (March 2015), has revised its process for degree programs reporting on assessment of student learning and for planning next steps. Instead of submitting a report in September and plans in February, you will submit both parts in September/October.

Degree Program	[Please include name of the program and program code, if you know it.]
Department	
Submitted by	
Phone/email	
Date Submitted to CASAC	

You will submit TWO REQUIRED PARTS and ONE RECOMMENDED:

- ___ Report on Assessment of Student Learning for 2014-15
- ___ Plans on Assessing Student Learning for 2015-16
- ___ Curriculum Map (*recommended*)

<i>Please submit completed form to: www.emich.edu/cas_assessment/upload.php</i>
--

If you have questions, please contact Doug Baker or Cynthia Macknish, or one of the other members of the CASAC. Thank you.

Faculty	Doug Baker, English <douglas.baker@emich.edu> John Dunn, English <jdunnjr@emich.edu> Jenny Kindred, CMTA <jkindred@emich.edu> Cynthia Macknish, World Languages <cmacknis@emich.edu>
Department Heads	Arnold Fleischmann, Political Science <afleisch@emich.edu> Jacqueline Goodman, Women’s & Gender Studies <jgoodma9@emich.edu> Richard Sambrook, Geography & Geology <rsambroo@emich.edu>
Ex-Officio & Liaisons	Kate Mehuron, Associate Dean, ex-officio <kmehuron@emich.edu> Chris Foreman, General Education Program, <cforeman@emich.edu> Suzanne Gray, University Library, <sgray17@emich.edu> Beth Kubitskey, College of Education, <mkubitske1@emich.edu>

PART ONE
Report on Assessment of Student Learning
for 2014-15

Based on the assessment plans you submitted in Winter 2015, describe the analysis of the student performances you selected, discuss the “so what” of your findings, and describe or list the actions you plan for “closing the loop.” (“Closing the loop” refers to the actions that will lead to program improvement and the opportunities students will have for learning, especially toward meeting the programmatic learning outcomes.)

COPY AND PASTE
ASSESSMENT PLANS SUBMITTED IN WINTER 2015
HERE

Report for 2014-15

ANALYSIS OF STUDENT PERFORMANCES, DESCRIPTION OF FINDINGS, AND ACTIONS FOR “CLOSING THE LOOP”

Describe the results of analyzing student performances on the selected learning outcomes.

Describe the “so what” of the results for the program in terms of student learning.

Based on findings of the above process, describe actions the program plans to “close the loop” (i.e., how the program will use assessment findings to make improvements).

PART TWO
Plans for Assessing Student Learning
for 2015-16

As you prepare students to meet programmatic learning outcomes (among other instructional goals), and based on previous assessment findings, discussions among faculty, and visions toward improving your program, describe assessments plans your program has decided on for this academic year (2015-16).

PLANS FOR ASSESSING STUDENT LEARNING
TOWARD MEETING PROGRAMMATIC LEARNING OUTCOMES

List (or copy and paste) your program's Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs).
SLOs should be written in a way that specifies what students should be able to demonstrate (e.g., from Earth Science: Students will synthesize problems in Earth System Science using conceptual and quantitative approaches.)

List the Student Learning Outcomes your program will focus on for 2015-16?
(Select *at least two* outcomes from your approved list in section I.)
Students will be able to...

Describe the student artifacts or performances that the program will use to assess how well students met each SLO listed in the section above?

Describe the methods the program will use for collecting and analyzing information about student achievement toward meeting the selected SLOs?
Describe how the program plans to collect and analyze student performance samples (e.g., essays, projects, other artifacts, etc.) for purposes of assessing how well students met the selected learning outcome. Also, consider how the program will distinguish levels of performance.

PART THREE – RECOMMENDED

Curriculum Map*

(for examples, see,

http://www.emich.edu/cas_assessment/resources.php)

*A curriculum map shows in which courses in the program students will have access to learn and meet the learning outcomes. A curriculum map can help you uncover gaps or opportunities in the program.

COPY AND PASTE HERE

CASAC Response

The CASAC will respond to your program’s assessment reports and plans. The purpose of the response is to provide constructive and supportive feedback. The process also provides members of CASAC an opportunity to review reports and plans and to observe how well programs have designed systematic ways of assessing student learning, including how the findings are used to improve programs and opportunities for students to learn (i.e., how well programs “close the loop”). Each year, CASAC submits a report to the CAS Dean and the University Assessment Committee summarizing the college’s efforts in assessing student learning, and the Dean and UAC provide feedback for purposes of continuous improvement.

NOTES

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

- To provide evidence from programmatic perspectives for how well students are learning—mainly, toward achieving the program’s learning outcomes
- To enhance opportunities for students to learn and meet the learning outcomes
- To gather and discuss information that helps programs to improve
- To contribute to EMU’s efforts to retain accreditation from the Higher Learning Commission

All degree programs (undergraduate and graduate) must submit plans and 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. Contact Doug Baker if you have questions.

Rev. September 17, 2015

**Rubric for CAS Assessment Reports/Plans
Fall 2015**

(Rev. December 11, 2015)

For Assessment Reports for 2014-15, CASAC asked programs the state the following:

1. Describe the findings of the assessments.
2. Describe the implications of the findings. That is, describe the “so what” of the findings.
3. State what your program plans to do with the information. In other words, state how your program plans to “close the loop” to improve the program.

For Assessment Plans for 2015-16, CASAC asked programs to do the following:

4. List (or copy and paste) your program’s Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs).
5. List the SLOs your program will focus on for 2015-16?
6. Describe the student work (e.g., documents, exams, essays, performances, etc.) that the program will use to assess how well students met each SLO listed in the section above?
7. Describe how the program will collect and analyze selected student work.

CASAC also requested a curriculum map (optional).

Rubric for CASAC’s Evaluation Program Assessment Reports for 2014-15

- The program described the findings of the assessments.
- The program described the implications (the ‘so what?’) of the findings.
- The program described how it plans to “close the loop” to improve the program.

Rubric for CASAC’s Evaluation of Program Assessment Plans for 2015-16

- The program listed its SLOs.
- The program listed SLOs selected for this year.
- The program described the student work it will use to assess how well student meet each selected SLO.
- The program described how it will collect and analyze student work.

How well does the program represent each criterion:

- Exceptionally well = 5
- Average = 3
- Needs to improve = 1

Note

As we responded to the reports and plans and made decisions about the quality of the documents, we noticed that we do not have a recognized standard. So, we will need to post standards, ones that we use for the assessment of quality.

Examples of Rubric in Use

Program	Findings	Implications	Close Loop	List of SLOs	Focus SLOs	Planned Work	Collect Analyze	Overall
AAAS								
AAAS – UG	3	1	3	4	4	4	3	3
ART								
ART	4	3	4	5	5	4	4	4
ART SAR – G	4	4	4	5	5	4	4	4
ART SARF - G	4	4	4	5	5	4	4	4
ART STAR -UG	4	3	4	5	5	4	4	4
Biology								
BIO, EOBI, BIOT – UG	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
BIOG MCBI EOBI - G	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
COSC								
CSC – G	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CSCC & CSCA - UG	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CHEM								
CHM – G	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
CHM – UG	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5