

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

**College or Unit Name:**           **General Education Program**

**Report Year:**                   **2015-16**

**Submitted by:**                 **Doug Baker**

**Submitted on (date):**         **JUNE 30, 2016**

**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

**Overview of Progress toward Assessing Student Learning:  
Role of the General Education Review Committee and Recommendations to the Provost**

*In May 2015 the General Education Review Committee* concluded its Provost-initiated two-year study of the General Education Program and issued a public report in September. As one of its five primary recommendations, the GERC urged the university to “Continue to Build a High-Quality and Sustainable System for Assessing Student Learning”; that is, to continue “to support and help the subcommittee on assessment to work with instructors and departments across the university to design and implement a cyclical system of assessment (i.e., from planning assessments, employing them, analyzing student work, and making instructional changes based on findings)” (p. 4).

After soliciting faculty input (e.g., Faculty Senate and public “listening” sessions) and further discussing the report for purposes of submitting a list of critical recommendations to the Provost, the GERC recommended first, “Assessment must be supported,” in order to create a humane, practical, and sustainable system of assessing student learning across the General Education Program.

*Brief Description of Past Assessment Efforts.* EMU revised its General Education Program in 2006-07. The General Education Subcommittee on Assessment (GESA) constructed initial outcomes (2008-09); from 2009 to 2012 a faculty-led initiative, the General Education Multicourse Assessment Project (GEMAP)—over 65 faculty members and department heads contributed—explored ways to assess student learning systematically. In 2012-13 an ad hoc committee led to a decision to reconstitute the subcommittee on assessment. In 2014-15 the GESA, led by Director Chris Foreman and Doug Baker and in consultation with past committee members (e.g., Michael Tew, Chris Gardiner, Ann Blakeslee, and Peggy Liggitt), was reconstituted. For the past two years it has made progress toward initiating an effective, practical, and sustainable system. However, more work and support is needed to achieve the assessment goals presented in the GERC report, including ones listed as top priority in a follow up report to the Provost.

*In 2016-17* GESA begins its third year and will continue to build a systemic approach to assessing student learning for the General Education Program, particularly by soliciting more participation in the categories of Arts, Humanities, Global Awareness, Learning Beyond the Classroom, and Writing Intensive. In preparation for the Higher Learning Commission report and visit in Fall 2017, GESA must meet these goals, among others (see #6 of the below report and the GERC list provided to the Provost). Because of the breadth and complexity of the program, GESA will need more faculty to contribute to building an assessment system that is *humane, doable, practical, and sustainable*.

Therefore, GESA suggests the following support.

- Continued support in terms of released time for chair Doug Baker and committee members Stephanie Casey, Maria Milletti, and at least one or two others who would coordinate Arts & Humanities, or Social Sciences and Global Awareness.
- Continued support for training of instructors (e.g., General Education Assessment Institutes in conjunction with the Faculty Development Center). This could be part of the internship program mentioned in the GERC report and follow up recommendations to the Provost.
- Continued articulation about the imperative of assessment and support for GESA among the General Education Advisory Council, Provost, department heads, among others.

## General Education Subcommittee on Assessment Report for 2015-16

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 General Education Subcommittee on Assessment (GESA) completed its second year as a reconstituted committee. Although the committee should have a representative from each college, only four voting members remain—College of Business’s representative (Matt Hammond) left the university and the College of Technology’s representative (David Gore) retired. GESA’s four voting members (Stephanie Casey, Sunny Jang, Maria Milletti, and Doug Baker), supported by Chris Foreman and faculty intern John Koolage, met at least once a month during the academic year, and the meeting agendas and minutes have been archived. Although it will be important for GESA to find representatives from COB, COE, and COT, the committee believes its urgent need is to find faculty who can represent particular categories of the General Education Program (e.g., Art, Humanities, and Social Sciences).

### *Members/Representatives*

Director of General Education: Chris Foreman <cforeman@emich.edu>

CAS Rep: W. Douglas Baker <douglas.baker@emich.edu>

CAS Rep: Stephanie Casey <scasey1@emich.edu>

CAS Rep: Maria Milletti <mmilletti@emich.edu>

CHHS Rep: Sun Hae Jang <sjang3@emich.edu>

COB Rep: TBA (Matt Hammond attended for Fall 2015)

COE Rep: TBA

COT Rep: TBA (David Gore attended for Fall 2015)

General Education Program Intern: John Koolage <wkoolage@emich.edu>

2. **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).

As GESA’s chair and a member of the General Education Review Committee, Doug Baker discussed the urgent need for GESA to continue developing a humane, doable, practical, and sustainable system to assess student learning across the program. The first year of the reconstituted committee (2014-15) led to the initiation of the assessment system. This past year was geared toward meeting the following goals.

- Increase the number of assessments across categories of the General Education Program
- Build more refined and sustainable assessment systems for Quantitative Reasoning and for Natural Sciences
- Solicit assessments across categories of Learning Beyond the Classroom
- Train more instructors, including lecturers, to assess student learning and to contribute to the assessment system
- Enhance articulation between GESA and CAS departments, particularly since most of the courses derive from CAS

As part of the goal of articulation, GESA compiled a list of key messages and principles of practices.

### **Key Talking Points**

- EMU's General Education Program guides students to develop experiences, practices, and skills in order to prepare for their major fields of study and to participate in the global community.
- Instructors should ensure that students know what they are expected to learn and how they will be assessed (see General Education Learning Outcomes, <http://www.emich.edu/gened/learningoutcomes.php>).
- Assessment of student learning from a programmatic perspective is critical in determining how the program is meeting its goals and for making improvements.
- Assessment of student learning should be *humane* and *doable, practical, and sustainable* and be supported by the General Education Program and by *relevant departmental interests* in improving programs and enhancing students' opportunities for learning.

### **Key Principles of Practice**

- Assess student performance beyond grades.
- Ground claims about student performance in assessment data.
- Start small.
- Talk productively about assessing student learning.
- Invite students and other stakeholders into the conversations.

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.

**GESA Members Coordinated Efforts Across Units.** First and most importantly, with the support of Chris Foreman and the Provost, all four GESA committee members and Faculty Intern John Koolage worked together to continue creating and strengthening the General Education Program system for assessing student learning. Articulation among GESA members and across the university proved critical for effective implementation assessments and use of the data and findings.

### **GESA Achieved Five Main Goals**

- Increased the number of assessments and number of General Education Program categories reflected in assessment reports. In 2014-15 two categories (Effective Communication & Quantitative Reasoning) were the focus; in 2015-16 assessments were implemented from *nine* categories (GEEC—CTAC 124; GEQR—five Math courses and one COT course; GEKN—from all represented departments; selected courses in GEKA, GEKH, and GEKS; and selected courses in Learning Beyond the Classroom, and one in GEWI). Table 1 presents the list of plans and reports submitted to GESA.
- Refined and strengthened sustainable assessment systems for GEQR and GEKN
- Solicited participation from different categories of LBC (#1 & #3)
- Trained more instructors, including lecturers, to assess student learning from a programmatic perspective and to contribute to the assessment system
- Enhanced articulation between GESA and CAS departments—critical since most of the General Education courses are housed in CAS

**TABLE 1 – List of Assessment Plans & Reports Submitted to GESA**

General Education Subcommittee on Assessment (GESA)  
 Assessment Plans Submitted for 2015-16  
 (Rev. December 23, 2015)  
 Assessment Reports Submitted for 2015-16  
 (Rev. June 29, 2016)

<b>Course</b>	<b>GE Category</b>	<b>Contact Person</b>	<b>Plans</b>	<b>Report</b>	<b>Reviewers</b>
<b><i>Effective Communication</i></b>					
CTAC 124	GEEC	Doris Fields	X	X	Baker
<b><i>Quantitative Reasoning</i></b>					
COT 224	GEQR	Sema Kalaian skalaian@emich.edu	X	X	Casey & Baker
MATH 105	GEQR	Stephanie Casey	X	X	Casey & Baker
MATH 110	GEQR	Stephanie Casey	X	X	Casey & Baker
MATH 110E	GEQR	Stephanie Casey	X	X	Casey & Baker
MATH 170	GEQR	Stephanie Casey	X	X	Casey & Baker
<b><i>Arts</i></b>					
ART 101, 103, 104, 105, 106L	GEKA	Ryan Molloy, mryan7@emich.edu	X	X	Baker
MUSD 220	GEKA	Heather Shouldice hshouldi@emich.edu	X	X	Baker
<b><i>Humanities</i></b>					
FRNH	GEKH	Genevieve Peden	X	X	Baker
GERN 121, 122, 179, 221, 222, 233, 234	GEKH	Carla Damiano & Margrit Zinggeler	X		Baker
SPNH	GEKH	Monica Millan	X	X	Baker
<b><i>Natural Sciences</i></b>					
BIO 110	GEKN	Katherine Greenwald katherine.greenwald@ emich.edu	X	X	Millett & Baker
CHEM 121	GEKN	Heather Holmes Hholmes1@emich.edu,	X	X	Millett & Baker
ESSC 202	GEKN	Katherine Ryker kryker@emich.edu	X	X	Millett & Baker
PSYCH	GEKN	Sylvia von Kluge svonkluge@emich.edu	X	X	Millett & Baker

PSY 221	GEKN	Marshall Thomsen jthomsen@emich.edu	X	X	Milletti & Baker
<b><i>Social Sciences</i></b>					
ECON 100, 201, 202	GEKS	James Saunoris jsaunori@emich.edu	X	X	Baker
<b><i>Global Awareness</i></b>					
ECON 108	GEGA	James Saunoris jsaunori@emich.edu	X	X	Baker
GERN 111	GEGA	Carla Damiano & Margrit Zinggeler	X		Baker
<b><i>Learning Beyond Classroom</i></b>					
ECON 103L1	GEL – 1	James Saunoris jsaunori@emich.edu	X	X	Baker
PEGN	GEL – 1	Sun Hae Jang	X	X	Jang & Baker
UNIV*	GEL – 3	Christine Deacons			In progress
<b><i>Writing Intensive</i></b>					
GERN 443W	GEWI	Carla Damiano & Margrit Zinggeler	X		Baker

Learning Beyond the Classroom (GEL 1-6)

- 1 – Self and Well-Being
- 2 – Community Service, Citizenship and Leadership
- 3 – Cultural and Academic Activities and Events
- 4 – Career and Professional Development
- 5 – International and Multicultural Experience
- 6 – Undergraduate Research

\*UNIV: Christine Deacons has agreed to forward to GESA the assessment of student learning part of her annual report. Recently (June 29), she sent an email message to Doug Baker stating that the report would be completed in the next few weeks.

***Description of Accomplishments***

*Increased the number of assessments and General Education Program categories represented.*  
In 2014-15 GESA focused on all three courses/programs in GEEC (WRTG 121, CTAC 124, ENGL 412) and selected courses in GEQR. In 2015-16 GESA solicited, received, and responded to assessments of at least 35 courses (multiple sections for some of them—e.g., PEGN, CTAC 124, Math courses, etc.) across 9 categories (GEEC, GEQR, GEKA, GEKH, GEKN, GEKS, GEGA, GEL, GEWI).

*Strengthened sustainable assessment systems for Quantitative Reasoning, Natural Sciences, and a representative course from Learning Beyond the Classroom.* Through the leadership of Stephanie Casey and Maria Milletti, respectively, GESA coordinated with instructors of all departments and most courses represented in GEQR and GEKN categories. Stephanie and Maria met consistently with department heads and instructors, among others (e.g., Faculty Development Center and Peggy Liggit) to design humane, doable, practical and sustainable assessment systems.

In particular, Stephanie coordinated efforts to build capacity and train instructors to assess student learning based on the General Education Program outcomes for the QR category. Building on Chris Gardiner's pilot study (2014-15), she diligently encouraged and trained at least 16 math instructors and one COT instructor to contribute to a systemic approach to assessing student learning (over 650 students were assessed). Furthermore, with the support and expertise of Peggy Liggit (FDC), Bin Ning (IRIM), and Bill Jones (IT), Stephanie led the 17 instructors from five QR courses (MATH 105, 110, 110e, 170 and COT 224) in a one-day training session (February 5<sup>th</sup>) on how to assess student learning and how to use Canvas to manage and archive data. (See Appendix for MATH 2015-16 Report, pp. 11-17 of this report.)

Similarly, Maria Milletti coordinated efforts among instructors and departments of Natural Sciences to demonstrate how students were assessed in selected General Education courses. As she states in her report (see Appendix: GEKN 2015-16 Report, pp. 18-21 of this report): "All departments [represented in the Natural Science category] are on track for assessing one or more General Education SLO's in one of their foundational courses. [Based on assessment findings,] they have all identified one or more changes that they will implement either in how the courses are taught or in the way in which the assessment is carried out. During the next academic year [2016-17], each department will again gather assessment data and analyze the results to determine whether the changes they implemented resulted in improvements in student learning" (p. 21).

Finally, Sunny Jang organized and coordinated efforts to assess students in selected PEGN courses through a two-part process. First, she examined 32 syllabi of the 43 PEGN sections offered in Fall 2015 in order to ensure that all provided a rationale for inclusion as a General Education course and that the General Education Program learning outcomes were represented; next, she surveyed instructors (13 responded) who briefly described how they knew how well students were meeting the outcomes. As Sunny states in her report (see Appendix: GEL PEGN 2015-16 Report, pp. 22-25): "As with most surveys, encouraging all to contribute was a challenge; however, the coordination among Chris Karshin (CHHS Associate Dean), Christopher Herman (HPHP Director), Sunny Jang (GESA member), and Suzanne Zelnik Geldys (PEGN Program Coordinator) led to a process that provided useful information" (p. 25).

*Articulation between GESA & CAS and Increased Participation.* During summer 2015 Doug Baker met with all 19 CAS department heads to discuss the role and need of assessing student learning from a General Education Program perspective. Although most of the DHs recognized the expectation of assessing student learning as a responsibility for participating in the General Education Program, newer or interim DHs were less familiar with the expectations and with how to support assessment efforts among faculty and lecturers, especially lecturers, who teach a large portion of General Education courses. Through his faculty links because of his role with the CAS Assessment Committee, Doug contacted faculty across categories to solicit contributions. Faculty from World Languages (Genevieve Peden, Monica Millan, Carla Damiano & Margrit Zinggeler), Art (Ryan Malloy), and Economics (James Saunoris), and Music & Dance (Heather Shouldice) added to a growing list of participants.

*GESA's Response to Assessment Plans & Reports.* GESA responded to assessment plans and reports, and it used a rubric for the plans (see Appendix: GESA Rubric for Assessment Plans 2015-16, p. 26).

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**

***Focusing Efforts on Selected Categories—A Pilot.*** GESA met at least monthly to continue building the assessment system; however, one major change concerned a decision to focus on two categories. As mentioned, Stephanie Casey (Assistant Professor of Math) and Maria Milletti (Professor of Chemistry), supported by the Provost with released time, coordinated efforts to assess students in courses GEQR and GEKN, respectively. GESA recognized the value of this approach in three ways: (1) observation and discussion of consistent meetings between Stephanie or Maria and department heads and instructors; (2) the plans and reports submitted to GESA; and (3) the commitment these leaders developed as they articulated and formed professional relationships with instructors. Their efforts piloted an approach that appears more effective: *a committee member with a disciplinary connection to a particular category.*

***Training of Instructors.*** Two main training events contributed to GESA efforts to build capacity among instructors toward assessing student learning. First, Stephanie, as mentioned, led a one-day (February 5<sup>th</sup>) training of 17 QR instructors, especially ensuring that the instructors learned how to use Canvas to manage and archive assessments. Next, in cooperation with the General Education Program, IRIM and Faculty Development Center, Doug Baker, John Koolage, Peggy Liggitt, and Maria Milletti led and centered the annual University Assessment Institute (May 2-3) on General Education—Stephanie contributed as a presenter. The 25 participants learned principles and practices of assessing students from the General Education Program perspective.

***Coordinating Assessment Efforts among GESA, Administrators, and Instructors.*** Although the report on PEGN courses showed the need for all instructors to include a rationale for inclusion as General Education courses and a link to the learning outcomes, the coordination among GESA, an associate dean (Chris Karshin), and program coordinator proved the value and necessity of this type of coordination toward developing effective assessments.

### **Examples of DIRECT INFLUENCES on Assessment of Student Learning**

#### ***Four Approaches to Assessing Student Learning***

***1. Quantitative Reasoning: One Approach to Multiple Courses and Sections.*** As described in the Math report (see Appendix, pp. 11-17), instructors of the selected General Education Program math courses and COT 224 used a common rubric to assess over 650 students’ learning on the four GEQR learning outcomes.

***2. Natural Sciences: Multiple Approaches to Multiple Courses and Sections.*** As described in the report of the assessments in multiple courses across disciplines in the Natural Sciences (see Appendix, pp. 18-21), instructors used assessments chosen by leaders connected to degree programs.

***3. Humanities: World Languages: French & Spanish.*** Two faculty leaders, Genevieve Peden and Monica Millan, respectively, have consistently coordinated assessments for degree programs



(and for the CAS Assessment Committee). This year both organized assessments for their programs' General Education courses. Each year they both focus on a particular outcome, which they did again (on "cultural acquisition and competence").

4. *Effective Communication: CTAC 124: Example of a Sustained Assessment System.* For the second consecutive year, program director Doris Fields and ten instructors (all Graduate Assistants) who teach this course assessed about 250 students' learning on another learning outcome (on preparing for and presenting a persuasive speech). Doris organized a sequence similar to the one she and the instructors conducted last year. As Doris states in her report, "The GA's were given three identical sample papers; using a rubric the graduate assistants rated the outlines on a scale; varying from target, satisfactory and not met. The Basic Course Director [Doris] led a discussion to assess if the CTAC 124 students were meeting the requirements for crafting an oral argument intended for public audiences." Although the group observed that most students were meeting the outcome, Doris and GA's listed six changes or improvements for next year, including a revised approach to the workshop presented to students on the topic, recognizing and addressing students' weaknesses on selected aspects before the final project is due, and suggesting additional readings that would help students better prepare.

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?

The General Education Program, particularly GESA, recognized the need to focus on assessment of student learning through more in-depth approaches, yet ones that also acknowledge the complexities of the Program. The four representative approaches described in section 4 of this report demonstrate how GESA is coordinating with departments and instructors across the General Education Program categories to build unique assessments systems that fit the local context. Furthermore, GESA has continued to discuss with leadership how to better train instructors and to encourage more participation across campus.

The Provost (Rhonda Longworth) and the program director (Chris Foreman) have continued to support GESA through released time for selected GESA members. The description of how the time was used to coordinate an increase in the number of assessments and categories represented demonstrates the importance of this support. The use of Canvas as an assessment management and archival tool required a huge time commitment across units (Faculty Development Center, IT, and GESA), and the GEQR results and use of Canvas demonstrates that the time was well spent.

As GESA continues to respond to assessment plans and reports, it continues to recognize strengths of the General Education Program assessment system (e.g., more faculty are becoming involved and students are increasingly being assessed on performances beyond grades) and areas that need further improvement (e.g., how to assess multiple sections of a course—as instructors in GEQR did; or how to assess student learning across a category—as exemplified in GEKN).

Finally, GESA is committed to generating and delivering messages to stakeholders about the necessity and possibilities of assessing student learning from a programmatic perspective. Continued support is essential—particularly at the administrative leadership level. The General

Education Review Committee and Advisory Council have continued to strengthen the message of the need for more support for assessing student learning. The training of instructors, the focus on two more categories this year (GEQR & GEKN), and the consistent articulation across units contributed to the growth of the systemic assessment approach. Stakeholders must see assessment in action, that the university values assessment of student learning, and that students are well served by the systematic approaches designed and implemented.

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 GESA members, the following are goals for the 2016-17 academic year:

- Increase the number of courses and categories that contribute to the assessment system
- Increase the number of GESA members, particularly for purposes of securing representation for the following categories: Arts, Humanities, Social Sciences and Global Learning
- Continue to articulate with the Provost, department heads, and program coordinators about the value and need for more commitment to assessment of student learning
- Build a webpage that supports instructors in their efforts to contribute to the assessment system for the General Education Program

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: GESA Template for Reporting & Responding to Assessment Plans/Reports, pp. 27-29.

#### **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

### Quantitative Reasoning: MATH 2015-16 Report

**General Education Program**  
**General Education Subcommittee on Assessment (GESA)**  
**ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING**  
**Plans for 2015-16**  
 (Rev. September 9, 2015)

<b>Course in the General Education Program</b>	MATH 105: College Algebra MATH 110: Mathematical Reasoning MATH 110E: Mathematical Reasoning: Applications for Elementary School Teachers MATH 170: Elementary Statistics
<b>Category of Core Requirements</b>	Check the category in which the course is listed: <input type="checkbox"/> GEEC – Effective Communication <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GEQR – Quantitative Reasoning <input type="checkbox"/> GEKA – Knowledge of the Arts <input type="checkbox"/> GEKH – Knowledge of the Humanities <input type="checkbox"/> GEKN – Knowledge of the Natural Sciences <input type="checkbox"/> GEKS – Knowledge of the Social Sciences <input type="checkbox"/> GEGA & GEUS – Perspectives on a Diverse World <input type="checkbox"/> GEL 1-6 – Learning Beyond the Classroom  For list of courses and categories, <a href="https://www.emich.edu/gened/docs/gen_ed_master_f15.pdf">https://www.emich.edu/gened/docs/gen_ed_master_f15.pdf</a>
<b>Academic Year</b>	2015-16
<b>Contact Person</b>	Stephanie Casey
<b>Contact Phone/email</b>	7-1664/scasey1@emich.edu
<b>Date Submitted to GESA</b>	5/24/2016

### WHERE TO SUBMIT ASSESSMENT PLANS

**Based on the category listed above, please submit assessment plans to the appropriate person:**

- Doug Baker ([douglas.baker@emich.edu](mailto:douglas.baker@emich.edu)): GEEC, GEKA, GEKH, GEKS, GEGA & GEUS, GEL
- Stephanie Casey ([scasey1@emich.edu](mailto:scasey1@emich.edu); x7-1664): GEQR
- Maria Milletti ([mmilletti@emich.edu](mailto:mmilletti@emich.edu); x7-1183): GEKN

**PLANNING: SECTIONS I – IV**

**DUE October 30, 2015**

**I. List (or copy & paste) the General Education Program Student Learning Outcomes that are linked to the courses.**

Students will learn to solve real-life problems using a mathematical modeling process.

They will learn to:

**1) Build an appropriate model.**

- a) Estimate an answer to the problem
- b) Identify important components of the model
- c) Collect or generate appropriate data
- d) Analyze the situation using arithmetic, algebraic, geometric, and/or probabilistic and statistical methods.

**2) Use the model to solve the problem.**

- a) Propose a solution
- b) Evaluate the reasonableness of the solution

**3) Communicate the results of their analysis.**

- a) Share the findings in oral OR written reports using appropriate mathematical language
- b) Write summaries to explain how they reached their conclusions.
- c) Communicate quantitative relationships using symbols, equations, graphs, and tables.

**4) Evaluate the model.**

- a) Draw other inferences from the model.
- b) Identify the assumptions of the model
- c) Discuss the limitations of the model.

**II. List the Student Learning Outcomes that assessment efforts will focus on in the course.**

(Select *at least two* outcomes from the list in section I.)

Students will be able to...

Students will learn to solve real-life problems using a mathematical modeling process.

They will learn to:

**1) Build an appropriate model.**

- a) Estimate an answer to the problem
- b) Identify important components of the model
- c) Collect or generate appropriate data
- d) Analyze the situation using arithmetic, algebraic, geometric, and/or probabilistic and statistical methods.

**2) Use the model to solve the problem.**

- a) Propose a solution
- b) Evaluate the reasonableness of the solution

**3) Communicate the results of their analysis.**

- a) Share the findings in oral OR written reports using appropriate mathematical language
- b) Write summaries to explain how they reached their conclusions.

- c) Communicate quantitative relationships using symbols, equations, graphs, and tables.

**4) Evaluate the model.**

- a) Draw other inferences from the model.
- b) Identify the assumptions of the model
- c) Discuss the limitations of the model.

**III. Describe the activity(s) or student performance(s) that the instructor(s) plans to assess.**

The Mathematics Department's Assessment Committee will provide Winter 2016 instructors of the above listed courses with up to 3 sample QR projects. Instructors may choose to use one of the QR projects provided OR one of their own choosing during the Winter 2016 semester. All QR projects will assess the entire mathematical modeling process.

**IV. Describe how the instructor(s) plans to collect and analyze student performance samples (e.g., essays, projects, other artifacts, etc.) for purposes of assessing how well students met each selected learning outcome.**

Instructors will utilize the QR Assessment Rubric to evaluate student performance on the assigned QR project. Data will be collected through the mathematics department's instructor resources site on Canvas. The Mathematics Department's Assessment Committee will lead efforts to analyze the collected data and close the loop.

**ANALYZING AND "CLOSING THE LOOP": SECTIONS V – VII  
DUE MAY 2, 2016**

**V. Summarize and interpret the results of the assessments.**

Instructors from MATH 105, MATH 110, MATH 110E, and MATH 170 assigned a project and used the QR Assessment Rubric to evaluate student performance for each of the four student learning outcomes listed in Section II. Each student was ranked target (3 points), acceptable (2 points), or unacceptable (1 point) for each of the four QR outcomes. A student was given a score of 0 points for an outcome if they did no works towards that outcome. Instructors filled out an additional questionnaire in which they described their assessment, student performance, and changes that could be made to improve student learning.

Tables summarizing student performance for each course and each QR outcome are included at the end of this section.

In all courses combined, approximately 60% of students were ranked target for QR outcome 1, approximately 53% for QR outcome 2, approximately 38% for QR outcome 3, and approximately 40% for QR outcome 4. In every course, at least two-thirds of the students were ranked target or acceptable for all of the QR outcomes. Thus the tables indicate that instructors perceive their students to be successful overall in achieving all of the QR outcomes.

The results for each individual QR course suggest student strengths and needs for improvements for each course. MATH 105 students were most successful at building appropriate models, but they must improve their abilities to evaluate models. MATH 110

students were most successful at using a model to solve a problem. Their biggest weakness in general was communicating results. MATH 110E students were very successful in general at both building a model and also using it, but they were weaker at evaluating the model and communicating results. MATH 170 students performed best at building models, but they also must work on communicating results.

The data show that in general, students performed well at building and using models, but were weaker at communicating and evaluating the models. These trends were also frequently mentioned in the instructor questionnaires. Particular issues with communicating the results included poor choice and use of graphs, struggling to present findings in an organized way, and failing to draw appropriate conclusions. Particular issues with evaluating results included difficulties in differentiating between approximate and exact and in noting assumptions and limitations.

<b>Learning Outcomes (Cumulative data)</b>					
	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	
		<b>unacceptable</b>	<b>acceptable</b>	<b>target</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>QR1 - Build an Appropriate Model</b>	81 12.3%	40 6.1%	138 21.0%	399 60.6%	658
<b>QR2 - Use the Model to Solve the Problem</b>	83 12.6%	76 11.5%	145 22.0%	355 53.9%	659
<b>QR3 - Communicate the Results of Their Analysis</b>	82 12.4%	97 14.7%	220 33.4%	260 39.5%	659
<b>QR4 - Evaluate the Model</b>	82 12.5%	92 14.0%	213 32.5%	269 41%	675

<b>Learning Outcomes MATH 105 College Algebra</b>					
	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	
		<b>unacceptable</b>	<b>acceptable</b>	<b>target</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>QR1 - Build an Appropriate Model</b>	50 17.3%	10 3.4%	45 15.5%	184 63.7%	289
<b>QR2 - Use the Model to Solve the Problem</b>	50 17.3%	29 10.0%	66 22.8%	144 49.8%	289
<b>QR3 - Communicate the Results of Their Analysis</b>	51 17.6%	27 9.3%	88 30.4%	123 42.6%	289
<b>QR4 - Evaluate the Model</b>	50 17.3%	25 8.7%	106 36.7%	107 37.0%	289

<b>Learning Outcomes</b>					
<b>MATH 110 Mathematical Reasoning</b>					
	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	
		<b>unacceptable</b>	<b>acceptable</b>	<b>target</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>QR1 - Build an Appropriate Model</b>	10 6.4%	20 12.8%	53 33.9%	72 46.1%	155
<b>QR2 - Use the Model to Solve the Problem</b>	12 7.7%	16 10.3%	31 19.9%	96 61.5%	155
<b>QR3 - Communicate the Results of Their Analysis</b>	10 6.4%	32 20.5%	65 41.7%	48 30.8%	155
<b>QR4 - Evaluate the Model</b>	10 6.5%	26 16.8%	50 32.3%	68 43.9%	155

<b>Learning Outcomes</b>					
<b>MATH 110E Mathematical Reasoning: Applications for Elementary School Teachers</b>					
	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	
		<b>unacceptable</b>	<b>acceptable</b>	<b>target</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>QR1 - Build an Appropriate Model</b>	10 21.3%	0 0%	1 2.1%	36 76.6%	47
<b>QR2 - Use the Model to Solve the Problem</b>	10 21.3%	0 0%	2 4.3%	35 74.5%	47
<b>QR3 - Communicate the Results of Their Analysis</b>	10 21.3%	0 0%	15 31.9%	22 46.8%	47
<b>QR4 - Evaluate the Model</b>	10 21.3%	1 2.1%	15 31.9%	21 44.7%	47

Learning Outcomes MATH 170 Elementary Statistics					
	0	1	2	3	Total
		unacceptable	acceptable	target	
<b>QR1 - Build an Appropriate Model</b>	11 6.6%	10 6%	39 23.2%	107 63.7%	167
<b>QR2 - Use the Model to Solve the Problem</b>	11 6.6%	31 18.5%	46 27.4%	80 47.6%	168
<b>QR3 - Communicate the Results of Their Analysis</b>	11 6.6%	38 22.6%	52 30.9%	67 39.9%	168
<b>QR4 - Evaluate the Model</b>	12 7.1%	40 23.8%	42 25%	73 43.4%	167

**VI. Describe implications of the results for the course.**

Instructors suggested how they could change course work to improve student learning towards QR outcomes 3 and 4. To help students better communicate their results, instructors plan to include more practice problems that emphasize the types of conclusions that can be drawn in different situations and more practice interpreting graphs, especially noting the difference between good and bad graphs. To improve student performance in evaluating models, instructors plan to include more class work about limitations of models. They would also like to focus more on understanding approximation, including lower and upper bounds. Overall, instructors also feel the need to spend more time covering Excel.

**VII. State implications for possible changes or improvements to the assessment process, or for other aspects observed (e.g., suggested revisions for a learning outcome).**

The assessment process seemed to be reasonably successful. However, there are several ways in which the Assessment Committee plans to improve the process in the future.

The committee would like to update the sample projects that are made available for instructors on Canvas. More information could be provided in a project's directions and grading rubric to clarify expectations. A completed sample project that could be distributed to students could further clarify expectations. Some instructors would have preferred to assign several smaller projects, each covering just some of the QR outcomes, rather than assigning one large project. Examples of smaller projects could be added to Canvas. The committee plans to solicit feedback from instructors about the current projects to determine what other changes should be made.

The Assessment Committee would also like to improve the procedure for completing the loop following the assessment process. Right now, instructors are only using the results from their own sections to determine ways of improving student learning. The committee would like to find a way to facilitate the sharing of all results among all instructors of each course.



MATH 120 (Calculus I) is another QR course that many students take. This course was not a focus of the current round of assessments. The Assessment Committee would like to find ways to assess the QR outcomes for this course in the future.

## NOTES

***The main purposes for constructing assessments of student learning from a General Education Program perspective are the following:***

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

## **GESA Response and Support**

Members of GESA will offer a written response to each assessment plan submitted. The purpose of the response is to support instructors' efforts in shaping an approach to assessing student performance toward meeting the selected outcomes, and to contribute to the overall assessment system.

Each June, GESA writes a report describing assessment efforts across the program, and the report is submitted to the Director of the General Education Program, Chris Foreman, to the CAS Dean's office, and to the University Assessment Committee.

***All departments that house General Education courses, as part of the vetting process for courses, have agreed to assess student learning in terms of the General Education Program learning outcomes.***

GESA functions to coordinate and support department heads and instructors' efforts toward creating a system of programmatic assessment of student learning on selected outcomes.

**Thank you for your contributions to the program, to the accreditation process, and to the EMU students!**

## **GESA Members/Representatives**

Director of Gen Ed: "Chris Foreman" <cforeman@emich.edu>,  
CAS Rep, Chair: "W. Douglas Baker" <douglas.baker@emich.edu>,  
CAS Rep: "Stephanie Casey" <scasey1@emich.edu>,  
CAS Rep: "Maria Milletti" <mmilletti@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  
Gen Ed Liaison: "W. John Koolage" <wkoolage@emich.edu>

## Natural Sciences: GEKN 2015-16 Report

### General Education Program General Education Subcommittee on Assessment (GESA) Report of Assessment of Student Learning Knowledge of the Disciplines – Natural Sciences

**Maria C. Milletti**

This report is a summary of my activities during the 2015-16 academic year coordinating assessment of General Education student learning goals (SLO's) by five Natural Science departments.

#### **Timeline**

- I contacted the five departments (Biology, Chemistry, Geology & Geography, Physics & Astronomy, and Psychology) early in Fall 2015 and solicited their plans for assessing General Education SLO's in one of their courses.
- Each department submitted plans by the end of the Fall semester, including the choice of course to be assessed, selection of SLO's (at least two), and description of assessment activities to be carried out during the Winter term. Doug Baker and I wrote responses to each of the departments.
- Departments submitted reports on the results of their assessment by the end of the Winter semester. The reports also included plans for modifications to the course and/or assessment instruments aimed at improving student learning. Doug Baker and I wrote responses to each of the departments.

Below is a summary of assessment activities and results for each of the five Natural Science departments.

#### **Biology**

The Biology department assessed one General Education SLO in their course BIO 111, Introductory Biology I Laboratory. This is the companion laboratory course to BIO 110, the first lecture course in the core sequence for Biology majors and minors. The lecture/laboratory combination can also be used to partially satisfy the Knowledge of the Disciplines – Natural Sciences category of the General Education program.

The department planned to assess two related SLO's:

1. Gather original data to verify the validity and reliability of accepted scientific principles
2. Analyze and solve a scientific problem by drawing conclusions based on original data gathered using appropriate experimental techniques

However, because of miscommunication with the course instructors, data was collected pertaining to the first SLO only. Results were collected from the results section of four lab exercises for 116 students.

On average, students earned 80% of the possible points for the results section of the exercises. This suggests that students in the course are meeting the SLO more than adequately. Some variation was noticed in the percentages for individual lab exercises; these were interpreted as stemming from

the first two exercises occurring early in the semester, before the students had completely mastered the complexities of data gathering. However, the data indicates that 73% of students performed better in the third exercise compared to the first exercise, suggesting that course activities are successful in helping students meet this SLO. Variation in proficiency was also tied to the difficulty of the experiment, as well as GA performance.

As a result of this analysis, the department plans to modify the course schedule so that students will have an opportunity to receive feedback about the first lab report before submitting the second one. In addition, the department plans to expand GA training in an effort to improve the GA's ability to help student meet this SLO.

Finally, the department plans to revise the assessment data-gathering procedure in a way that more fully involves course instructors. The procedure will be streamlined and the sample size increased. Both SLO's will be assessed. Overall, this department did an excellent job of identifying appropriate student artifacts to assess the appropriate SLO's. The data analysis was clear and thorough, leading to practical changes in the course that promise to improve student learning.

### **Chemistry**

The Chemistry department assessed two General Education SLO's in their linked courses CHEM 121 & 122, General Chemistry I & Laboratory. This is the first course in the core sequence for Chemistry majors and minors. The lecture/laboratory combination can also be used to partially satisfy the Knowledge of the Disciplines – Natural Sciences category of the General Education program.

The department assessed two related SLO's:

1. Demonstrate a core knowledge base of facts and information
2. Acquire and apply an appropriate technical vocabulary

Results were collected from fifteen questions that are part of the multiple-choice, cumulative final exam. The data set is for 316 students. Due to the nature of the questions and the two SLO's that have been selected, it is not possible to assign individual questions to either of the SLO's, so the data is analyzed for both. This is an indication of the overlap between these two SLO's and it may be useful to consider combining them.

The percentage of correct answers varies widely, from 42% for a question on electron configuration to 97% for a question about temperature unit conversion. The average for the fifteen questions is 69%. The department provided a question-by-question analysis of the data, tying poor student performance to common misconceptions or conceptual difficulties. In many cases, the department concluded that more information is needed in order to accurately determine the cause for poor student performance.

The plan for the next academic year is to share the results of this assessment with all instructors for the course and to analyze whether the questions on the final exam need to be modified to more accurately assess these SLO's. In addition, short-answer questions will be considered as a better alternative to assess core knowledge.

### **Geology**

The Geology & Geography department assessed three General Education SLO's in their course ESSC 202, Earth Science for Elementary Teachers. This is a lecture/laboratory course that introduces future elementary teachers to earth science concepts and teaching methodology. This course can

also be used to partially satisfy the Knowledge of the Disciplines – Natural Sciences category of the General Education program.

The department assessed three SLO's:

1. Make observations, develop appropriate classifications, and infer trends
2. Gather original data to verify the validity and reliability of accepted scientific principles
3. Use the processes and methods of science to demonstrate how reproducible experimental observations give rise to fundamental laws and theories

The data was collected for one of the laboratory exercises where students employ the scientific method to test a hypothesis. Results were collected for 42 students. Each question that students answered as part of this exercise was classified as addressing one of the three SLO's listed above. The average percent of correct responses was greater than 90% for questions addressing SLO 1 and 2. The average percent of correct responses for questions addressing SLO 3 was 76%. In general, student performance improved between pre-lab and post-lab questions. The report discusses sources of student misconceptions and compares the data to that obtained at another institution (North Carolina State University).

As a result of this analysis, the department plans to use the Conceptual Change Model to correct common misconceptions among students about density and formulating hypotheses. In a future assessment cycle, the department plans to focus on SLO's 2 and 3, as students seem to have mastered SLO 1.

### **Physics**

The Physics & Astronomy department assessed two General Education SLO's in their course PHY 221 & 222, Mechanics, Sound and Heat. This is the first lecture/lab course in the two-course sequence in General Physics that does not require calculus. This course can also be used to partially satisfy the Knowledge of the Disciplines – Natural Sciences category of the General Education program.

The department assessed two SLO's:

1. Demonstrate a core knowledge base of facts and information
2. Analyze and solve problems by identifying and utilizing appropriate data and methodology

The department focused on two major concepts in physics: Newton's Laws of Motion and torque. They analyzed how different instructors for the course cover these concepts (quantitatively, qualitatively, or both) and found that most instructors discuss both aspects of Newton's Laws (quantitative and qualitative), while not all instructors discuss torque to the same depth.

With regard to the first concept, analysis of a variety of in class assessment was inconclusive since the assessments vary widely among instructors and the assessments don't necessarily focus on Newton's Laws exclusively. Analysis of the results of a pre-lab exercise involving Newton's Second Law was more productive, as the exercise is the same for all lab sections (data was collected for 117 students). The results indicate that most students know how to add force vectors. Whether this implies that students understand Newton's Second Law is not clear. The report does not explain which of the two SLO's is addressed by this data. With regard to the second concept (torque) again a pre-lab exercise was used to gather data from 117 students. In this exercise students were asked to define the concept and solve two problems using the concept. The average score was 1.56 out of 2, indicating that students can solve problems involving torque (SLO 2).

Overall this report focused heavily on depth and uniformity of coverage of the two topics in various sections of the course. Less emphasis was given to *student learning*, which was analyzed by examining one question per topic, graded on a scale of 0-2. The department is considering creating a number of test questions to be used uniformly across all sections and that can address specific SLO's. They will make an effort to balance assessment needs with individual instructors' academic freedom to teach the class in a style of their choosing.

### **Psychology**

The Psychology department assessed two General Education SLO's in their course PSY 103, General Psychology Laboratory. This is the companion course to the General Psychology lecture course where the basic principles of the field are introduced. The lecture/laboratory combination can also be used to partially satisfy the Knowledge of the Disciplines – Natural Sciences category of the General Education program.

The department assessed two related SLO's:

1. Demonstrate a core knowledge base of facts and information
2. Acquire and apply an appropriate technical vocabulary

Results were collected using a 30-item test that was completed by 209 students. The test was developed by the American Psychological Association to assess basic knowledge of the philosophy of science in psychology. As was the case for the Chemistry Department, it is not possible to assign individual questions to either of the SLO's, so the data is analyzed for both. The percentage of correct answers varies widely, from 17% to 100%, with a median score of 70.6%. The department is satisfied overall with student performance, but there are some concerns about students' being able to differentiate among focus areas in the field. The plan for the next academic year is to provide students with more specific information about focus areas.

### ***Summary and Upcoming Activities***

All departments are on track for assessing one or more General Education SLO's in one of their foundational courses. They have all identified one or more changes that they will implement either in how the courses are taught or in the way in which the assessment is carried out. During the next academic year, each department will again gather assessment data and analyze the results to determine whether the changes they implemented resulted in improvements in student learning.

Two issues that arose in the course of examining the reports are described below.

1. Only one of the SLO's examined comes from the category "Become a Scientifically Literate Citizen" and it is arguably the lowest one in terms of Bloom's taxonomy of learning domains. The GESA committee is hopeful that in future assessment cycles the Natural Science departments will tackle some of the other SLO's in this category.
2. Most departments seem to find the SLO's they examined relevant to their courses and educational mission. However, the GESA committee suggests that it may be beneficial to combine the SLO's
  - Demonstrate a core knowledge base of facts and information
  - Acquire and apply an appropriate technical vocabulary into a single one, as it can be difficult to find assessment instruments that distinguish between the two. For example, this SLO could be worded as follows:
  - Demonstrate knowledge of basic facts and information and describe them using an appropriate technical vocabulary

## Learning Beyond Classroom: GEL PEGN 2015-16 Report

### College of Health and Human Services Report of Assessment of Student Learning for General Education

Submitted by Sun Hae (Sunny) Jang

Rev. April 15, 2016

#### **General Education Category**

All PEGN courses are the part of General Education Category, Learning Beyond the Classroom (LBC)

– Area 1: Self and Well-Being. The SLOs are:

1. Learn to achieve a balance between education, work, and leisure.
2. Choose behaviors and environments that promote health and reduce risk.
3. Develop skills and habits that aid in future life and career pursuits.

Each instructor of any PEGN course should list (1) a rationale for the course and its inclusion in the General Education Program; or (2) list the General Education learning outcomes (or a link to them) on their syllabi.

#### **Overview of Assessment of Student Learning and Data Process: Two-Parts**

Physical Education Activity Program (PEGN) offered 43 sections of a range of courses (e.g., ballroom dancing, yoga, etc.) in Fall 2015.

**Part I:** Syllabi were submitted to the department for all 32 courses. GESA representative, Sun Hae (Sunny) Jang reviewed them. In particular, she sought to observe two main components: (1) a rationale for the course and its inclusion in the General Education Program; and (2) whether or not the General Education learning outcomes were listed (or a link to them was provided).

#### ***Findings of Part I***

Of the 32 syllabi examined, 23 described a rationale for the course as part of the General Education Program, and each of these listed (or provided a link) to the General Education Program's learning outcomes.

#### **Part II: Survey of Instructors**

Instructors were asked to complete a survey (see Appendix) to self-report information about how their course meets the General Education learning outcomes for LBC, how the students learning outcomes were assessed, and how well students met the representative outcomes. In particular, instructors were asked to list which of the outcomes (see above) were addressed in the course and how well students performed.

To assist with the process, the survey request was mentioned at a November HPHP faculty meeting, and the PEGN coordinator, Suzanne Zelnik Geldys, sent email messages to instructors to encourage participation. Furthermore, Sunny offered two open sessions for instructors to meet with her to discuss the process and answer questions. Completed surveys were turned in by December 17.

#### ***Findings of Part II***

At the beginning of the fall, 43 distinct courses were offered (some had multiple sections). Of those, 32 syllabi were submitted to the department. Of those 32 courses, 13 surveys were completed. Of the 13, eleven were from instructors for PEGN courses in Fall 2015, and the results will focus on

these (see Table 1). Of the 11, only one did not provide information about “how well students met the representative outcomes” at the end of the semester.

**Table 1**

Surveys	Number of Completed Surveys	Number of Incomplete Surveys	*Missing Parts
11	10	1*	Did not provide information about “how well students met the representative outcomes”

1. Regarding “how their course meets the General Education Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for LBC”, it appeared that the course learning objectives of the 11 courses were linked to and well matched with the statements of the GE SLOs for LBC (See the Table 2 below).

**Table 2**

Statements of General Education SLOs 11 PEGN Courses	1. Learn to achieve a balance between education, work, and leisure.	2. Choose behaviors and environments that promote health and reduce risk.	3. Develop skills and habits that aid in future life and career pursuits.
Course A	X	X	X
Course B	X	X	X
Course C	X	X	X
Course D	NM	X	X
Course E	NM	X	X
Course F	X		X
Course G	X	X	X
Course H	X	X	X
Course I	NM	X	X
Course J		X	X
Course K			X

X: Instructor provided about which course learning objective is well matched with specific statement of the GE SLOs.

NM: Instructor provided about which course learning objective is well matched with the specific statement of the GE SLOs. The course learning objectives provided are not aligned with the GE SLO.

2. Regarding “how the students learning outcomes are assessed,” Table 3 shows that instructors used different types of assessment methods (See the Table 3 below). A reflective essay method and a performance task method were most commonly used to assess General Education SLOs.

3. The survey results about “how well students met the representative outcomes” are shown in the Table 4 below.

**Table 3**

Statements of General Education SLOs	Assessment Types used in 11 PEGN Courses to measure General Education SLOs	Frequency of Assessment Types used in 11 PEGN Courses
1. Learn to achieve a balance between education, work, and leisure	1. Reflective essay 2. Performance/ Skill tests 3. Class attendance	5 3 1
2. Choose behaviors and environments that promote health and reduce risk	1. Reflective essay 2. Class participating and following safety rules 3. Daily log and analysis 4. Quizzes/Exams 5. Performance/ Skill tests	4 3 1 1 1
3. Develop skills and habits that aid in future life and career pursuits	1. Performance/ Skill tests 2. Reflective essay 3. Quizzes/Exams	10 1 1

**Table 4**

Statements of General Education SLOs	General Education SLOs measured in 11 PEGN Courses		
	#: Number of Total Students		
	Target	Acceptable	Unacceptable
1. Learn to achieve a balance between education, work, and leisure	Student has consistently demonstrated a balance among education, work, and leisure by the assignment/activity  #: <u>243</u> / <u>284</u> 85.5%	Student has at times demonstrated a balance among education, work, and leisure by the assignment/activity  #: <u>30</u> / <u>284</u> 10.5%	Student has not demonstrated balance among education, work, and leisure.  #: <u>11</u> / <u>284</u> 4%
2. Choose behaviors and environments that promote health and reduce risk	Students has consistently chosen behaviors that promote health and reduce risk, particularly in areas of the assignment/activity  #: <u>253</u> / <u>304</u> 83%	Student has at times chosen behaviors that promote health and reduce risk, particularly in areas of the assignment/activity  #: <u>38</u> / <u>304</u> 13%	Student has not demonstrated behaviors that promote health and reduce risk, particularly in areas of the assignment/activity  #: <u>13</u> / <u>304</u> 4%
3. Develop skills and habits that aid in future life and career pursuits	Student has consistently developed skills and habits that aid	Student has at times developed skills and habits that aid in future	Student has ha not developed skills and habits that aid in future life and



	in future life and career pursuits, especially in areas of the assignment/activity	life and career pursuits, especially in areas of the assignment/activity	career pursuits, especially in areas of the assignment/activity
	#: <u>217</u> / <u>238</u> 91.2%	#: <u>13</u> / <u>238</u> 5.5%	#: <u>8</u> / <u>238</u> 3.3%

**Observations about Assessments:**

Overall, the eleven surveys provided evidence that PEGN instructors are addressing the learning outcomes for the particular LBC category. As with most surveys, encouraging all to contribute was a challenge; however, the coordination among Chris Karshin (CHHS Associate Dean), Christopher Herman (HPHP Director), Sunny Jang (GESA member), and Suzanne Zelnik Geldys (PEGN Program Coordinator) led to a process that provided useful information. The one main weakness of the survey is that it did not request that programs suggest ways to improve the courses, or the overall program. One final concern: on two-three of the surveys, instructors signaled that they had aligned the General Education Program’s SLOs with the course; however, there were three instances where that was not the case.

**Observations about “Closing the Loop” (i.e., how the program described how it used results)**

As mentioned above, closing the loop was discussed in conversations but not explicitly requested on the survey. Therefore, closing the loop will be asked for on the next survey. The main aspects of the reporting and analyzing process that need to improve are the following: (1) all syllabi need a statement (or link to) about how the course addresses the General Education Program learning outcomes; (2) the course outcomes must include the General Education Program outcomes; (3) assignments selected for assessment of outcomes should be aligned. For the latter, it will be important to better observe how multiple sections of a course assess student learning—especially across instructors. One final recommendation: the survey will also ask instructors to attach the rubric used to assess students.

**Appendix**

**Assessment Survey of Student Learning**

Course: PEGN\_\_\_\_\_, or RECR\_\_\_\_\_

Statements of the General Education, Student Learning Outcomes (GE SLOs)	Check the well-matched statement(s) of GE SLOs to your course objective(s) as stated in your syllabus.	List at least one student activity (e.g., skill test, etc.) that you assess for each statement you checked.	Write the number of students who met each level at the end of the semester for the activity you listed.		
			Total students who participated in class = _____		
			Target: Evidence demonstrates that the student has mastered this outcome at a high level	Acceptable: Evidence shows that the student has generally attained this outcome.	Unacceptable: Evidence that the student has mastered this outcome is provided, but it is weak or incomplete
1. Learn to achieve a balance between education, work, and leisure					
2. Choose behaviors and environments that promote health and reduce risk					
3. Develop skills and habits that aid in future life and career pursuits					

**GESA Rubric for Assessment Plans 2015-16**

**General Education Program  
General Education Subcommittee on Assessment (GESA)  
Rubric for Plans to Assess Student Learning in 2015-16  
(Rev. November 19, 2015)**

**For Assessment Reports for 2014-15, GESA asked instructors/coordinators to:**

1. List the General Education Program learning outcomes for the course.
2. List Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) that the assessment efforts will focus on in the course.
3. Describe the activity(s) or student performance(s) that the instructor(s) plans to assess. (The performance should be assessed based on the General Education Program learning outcomes for the course.)
4. Describe how the instructor(s) plans to collect and analyze student performance samples (e.g., essays, projects, other artifacts, etc.) for purposes of assessing how well students met each selected learning outcome.

**Rubric for GESA’s Evaluation Assessment Plans for 2014-15**

1. The General Education Program SLOs for the course are listed.
2. The two or more SLOs that the assessment efforts will focus on in the course are listed.
3. The activity(s) or student performance(s) that the instructor(s) plans to assess is organized well and addressed in adequate detail, and the description is appropriate for assessing student learning.
4. How the instructor(s) plans to collect and analyze student performance samples (e.g., essays, projects, other artifacts, etc.) are described well.

**How well does the program represent each criterion:**

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

**Note**

As we respond to the assessment plans, we must evaluate the quality of the plans. Also, reflect on the process as you go through it and prepare to offer suggestions for next time.

<b>Course(s)/Category</b>	<b>Contact</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>Reviewers</b>
Art/GEKA	Ryan Molloy <a href="mailto:Mryan7@emich.edu">Mryan7@emich.edu</a>						

**GESA Template for Reporting & Responding to Assessment Plans/Reports**

**General Education Program  
General Education Subcommittee on Assessment (GESA)  
Response to Plans to Assess Student Learning in 2015-16  
(Rev. November 19, 2015)**

**Course:**

**General Education Program Category:**

**Department:**

**Contact Person/Email:**

**Purpose of GESA's Response**

In Fall 2015, you submitted plans to assess student learning in terms of the outcomes for your General Education course(s). Below is GESA's response to your plans. The main goals of the response are to provide feedback and help you prepare to assess students and to submit a report on your efforts and findings to GESA in Winter 2016.

**GESA's RESPONSE TO ASSESSMENT PLANNING: SECTIONS I - IV**

**I. List of General Education Program Learning Outcomes**

\_\_\_ The General Education Program learning outcomes for the course are listed.

\_\_\_ The learning outcomes are not listed.

For a complete list of the program's learning outcomes, go to:

<http://www.emich.edu/gened/learningoutcomes.php>

Observations, Commendations, or Suggestions:

**II. List of Student Learning Outcomes that assessment efforts will focus on in the course.**

\_\_\_ At least two learning outcomes that the course will focus on are listed.

\_\_\_ At least two learning outcomes that the course will focus on are not listed.

Observations, Commendations, or Suggestions:

**III. Describe the activity(s) or student performance(s) that the instructor(s) plans to assess. The performance should be assessed based on the General Education Program learning outcomes for the course.**

\_\_\_ The activities or student performances that the instructor plans to use for assessing student learning appear appropriate for the goals of the assessment.

\_\_\_ The activities or student performances that the instructor plans to use for assessing student learning appear incongruent or incomplete in terms of the goals for the assessment.

Observations, Commendations, or Suggestions:

**IV. Describe how the instructor(s) plans to collect and analyze student performance samples (e.g., essays, projects, other artifacts, etc.) for purposes of assessing how well students met each selected learning outcome.**

\_\_\_ The plans are detailed, organized, and appropriate for purposes of assessing how well students have met the selected learning outcomes.

\_\_\_ The plans lack details or organization in describing how well students have met the learning outcomes; or, the plans appear inappropriate for the purposes of assessing student learning.

Observations, Commendations, or Suggestions:

**ANALYZING AND "CLOSING THE LOOP": SECTIONS V – VII  
DUE MAY 2, 2016**

**V. Summarize and interpret the results of the assessments.**

\_\_\_ The summary and interpretation of the results of the assessments are appropriate and accurate. They provide an adequate description of how the assessments were analyzed and interpreted.

\_\_\_ The summary and interpretation of the results of the assessments include some inappropriate or inaccurate analyses. They provide some description of how the assessments were analyzed and interpreted; however, some gaps appear and should be addressed.

Observations, Commendations, or Suggestions:

**VI. Describe implications of the results for the course.**

\_\_\_ Implications of the assessment results demonstrate how the assessments and findings are connected and describe what the findings suggest for the course.

\_\_\_ Implications of the assessment results do not indicate how the assessments and findings are connected or provide limited description of what the findings suggest for the course.

Observations, Commendations, or Suggestions:

**VII. State implications for possible changes or improvements to the assessment process, or for other aspects observed (e.g., suggested revisions for a learning outcome).**

\_\_\_ Descriptions of implications of the assessments provide suggestions for possible changes or improvements to the assessment process, or other stated aspects.

\_\_\_ There is limited description of implications of the assessments and suggestions for possible changes or improvements to the assessment process, or other stated aspects.

Observations, Commendations, or Suggestions:

**NOTES**

***The main purposes for constructing assessments of student learning from a General Education Program perspective are the following:***

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

**GESA Response and Support**

Members of GESA will offer a written response to each assessment plan submitted. The purpose of the response is to support instructors' efforts in shaping an approach to assessing student performance toward meeting the selected outcomes, and to contribute to the overall assessment system. Each June, GESA writes a report describing assessment efforts across the program, and the report is submitted to the Director of the General Education Program, Chris Foreman, to the CAS Dean's office, and to the University Assessment Committee.

***All departments that house General Education courses, as part of the vetting process for courses, have agreed to assess student learning in terms of the General Education Program learning outcomes.***

GESA functions to coordinate and support department heads and instructors' efforts toward creating a system of programmatic assessment of student learning on selected outcomes.

**Thank you for your contributions to the program, to the accreditation process, and to the EMU students!**

**GESA Members/Representatives**

Director of Gen Ed: "Chris Foreman" <cforeman@emich.edu>,  
CAS Rep, Chair: "W. Douglas Baker" <douglas.baker@emich.edu>,  
CAS Rep: "Stephanie Casey" <scasey1@emich.edu>,  
CAS Rep: "Maria Milletti" <mmilletti@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>  
Gen Ed Fellow: "W. John Koolage" <wkoolage@emich.edu>