College or Unit Level Annual Assessment Report
(Rev. June 16, 2017)

College or Unit Name: General Education Program

Report Year: 2016-17

Submitted by: Doug Baker

Submitted on (date): June 5, 2017

EMU's Mission and Expectation for 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 (i.e., to "close of the loop" of the assessment cycle).

Unit Reports and Final Preparation for HLC's Campus Visit (October 23-24, 2017)
EMU is preparing its self-study and accreditation report for the Higher Learning Commission. By the beginning of July, a draft of the report will be submitted to the Board of Regents, the University President, and Provost. A final draft should be ready by September 1. The information you provide will 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/unitsaaessment.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.** Briefly describe how your assessment council or committee is organized, *provide a list of the faculty and staff* who directly contribute to it. Please describe any changes to the structure that were based on analysis and observations of assessment processes or practices.

   The General Education Subcommittee on Assessment (GESA), in its third year as a reconstituted committee, has grown from its original four members to ten. With the support from Interim Director of Undergraduate Education, Michael Tew, and Interim Director of the General Education Program, John Koolage, the committee solicited new members from Faculty Senate, particularly requesting faculty from departments that enhance representation of the program's categories and offer assessment experience.

   The new members added much needed diversity of disciplines and experience: Jean McEnery (College of Business) has been a reviewer for the Higher Learning Commission for years and adds accreditation expertise; Ramona Caponegro (CAS—English), John McCurdy (CAS—History), You Li (CAS-CMTA), and Laura McMahon (CAS—Philosophy) provide much needed expertise for the categories of the Humanities, Social Sciences, and Perspectives on a Diverse World; Sara Memmott adds the University Library perspective, a critical one for the General Education Program, particularly, in terms of assessment of student learning, for information literacy.

   Below is a list of GESA committee members.
   John Koolage (ex-Officio), Interim Director of the General Education Program
   W. Douglas Baker (Chair), CAS-English <douglas.baker@emich.edu>,
   Ramona Caponegro, CAS-English <rcapneg@emich.edu>,
   Stephanie Casey, CAS-Math <scasey1@emich.edu>,
   You Li, CAS-CMTA <you.li@emich.edu>
   John G. McCurdy, CAS-History <jmccurdy@emich.edu>,
   Laura McMahon, CAS-Philosophy <lmcmaho1@emich.edu>
   Maria Milletti, CAS-Chemistry < mmilletti@emich.edu>
   Sun Hae Jang, CHHS-Orthotics <sjang3@emich.edu>
   Jean McEnery, COB <jmcenery@emich.edu>
   Sara Memmott, University Library <smemmott@emich.edu>

2. **Assessment Goals.** In addition to the primary goals of assessing student learning and using gathered information to improve programs and opportunities for students to learn, list other 2016-17 unit goals that were designed to support student learning or assessment of student learning. (Please note whether these were direct, indirect or operational.)

   As GESA began the academic year, the committee had four members and an ex-officio, John Koolage, who at the time was a General Education Fellow. The five agreed to seek participation from all of the curricular categories of the Program and solicit assessment plans, and encourage support through individual meeting with administrators and instructors. However, the committee recognized the need for more members to achieve the goals linked with assessing student learning, and requested them from Faculty Senate. The following indirect goals were also outlined in September, and the committee made progress on all four:
   - Continue to meet with CAS department heads (especially recently hired ones)
   - Coordinate communication with GESA and the Provost, departments via Chris Foreman (and John Koolage, beginning in winter), and Michael Tew
   - Request new members from Faculty Senate
   - Create a 5-year plan

Part of coordinating the General Education Program's assessment system includes talking with and informing department heads about the urgency of commitment to the task of assessing students from the Program's perspective. Suggesting and negotiating next steps for departments is part of GESA's challenge and opportunity. Therefore, the four members worked with their immediate department heads and continued to meet with others: Doug Baker met with three of the new CAS department heads (Art; Sociology, Anthropology, and Criminology; and Math); Stephanie Casey worked closely with the latter and with the new Head of Political Science, among others; Maria Milletti continued to coordinate with all assessment leaders from the five departments in the Natural Sciences category; and Sunny Jang coordinated with administrators of the College of Health and Human Services and instructional staff of all PEGN courses. However, GESA needed further representation from faculty across categories of the Program and requested more committee members from Faculty Senate, which approved the appointment of six new members, as mentioned.

A critical part of the past year was negotiating with Interim Director of the Program, John Koolage, and Interim Director of Undergraduate Education, Michael Tew. Coordinating closely with both, and with the Provost through them, GESA discussed its goals and rationale, and confirmed its commitment to the Program and expanded its capacity. For example, one of the Program's goals is to encourage scholarly work. In terms of assessment, for example, Derek Mueller, Steve Krause, Ann Blakeslee, and Doug Baker, among others, have agreed to explore longitudinal assessment of student writing across WRTG 121, selected 200-level, and Writing Intensive courses. Stephanie Casey and Maria Milletti continue to work closely with faculty in the categories of Quantitative Reasoning and Natural Science to figure best ways to observe and chart progress across courses and years, including the role of Canvas in helping to manage these actions. New members are involved with similar projects. For example, John McCurdy and Ramona Caponegro, among other faculty (e.g., Keon Pettiway of CMTA and Ana Ferriera of AAAS) are contributing to efforts in the US Diversity subcategory; and Sara Memmott is invested in integrating the University Library's project on informational literacy to courses across General Education courses.

These efforts, among others, contribute to GESA's developing five-year plan.

3. **Summary of Accomplishments.** Summarize the accomplishments your unit achieved during 2016-17 toward assessing student learning and "closing the loop" of the assessment cycle. Next, summarize the activities your unit engaged in during 2016-17 toward meeting other assessment goals listed above in #2.

Accomplishments: Improvement of Processes of Assessing Student Learning
GESA's capacity to solicit and respond to assessment plans and reports—and to encourage more quality of processes, practices, and reports—expanded, as demonstrated by the number instructors and courses participating this past year and by the quality of data and reports. In particular, below are selected highlights, and see Appendix I: Assessment Plans & Reports for 2016-17 (pp. 8-13) for a comprehensive list of contributors and further items and accomplishments.

GESA solicited and responded to 26 assessment *plans* that represented at least 40 courses across all categories of the Program. Significant contributions came from the following categories: Effective Communication, Quantitative Reasoning, Natural Sciences, Learning Beyond the Classroom (category 5—the PEGN courses), and Writing Intensive. Furthermore,

GESA solicited and responded to assessment plans from other categories that had been underrepresented (e.g., Humanities, Social Sciences, and Perspectives on a Diverse World).

GESA also solicited and responded to 23 assessment *reports* that represented at least 40 courses across all categories of the Program. In particular, coordinators of three of the categories strived to improve processes of assessing students and the reporting of data: Stephanie Casey, Maria Milletti, and Sunny Jang worked closely with instructional staff of courses in Quantitative Reasoning, Natural Sciences, and PEGN, respectively, to ensure increased participation and improvements, especially developing illustrative examples of closing the loop of assessment cycles.

See Appendix II: Template for Reporting (pp. 14-18); and Appendix III: Template used for Responding to Reports (pp. 19-21).

Specific Areas of Improvement
Faculty representatives from particular categories have consistently contributed and improved processes for assessing student learning. For example, instructional leaders of courses in Effective Communication (e.g., WRTG 121 and CTAC 124), Quantitative Reasoning (nearly all Math courses, and PLSC 210 and COT 224), and Natural Sciences (all departments in the category participate) continued to enhance assessment practices, particularly garnering support from more instructors (e.g., Stephanie Casey coordinated efforts with 33 QR instructors), and coordinating with e-Learning (Bill Jones, Garrett Whitehead, and Matt King) to build an electronic assessment system through Canvas, the university's course management system.

GESA solicited and received assessment plans and reports from all categories of the General Education Program. With the additional committee members, GESA was better able to coordinate with instructors from all categories. Laura McMahon (Philosophy—Humanities), John McCurdy (History—Humanities and US Diversity), Ramona Caponegro (Children's Literature—Humanities and US Diversity), and You Li (Journalism—Social Science) ensured that GESA solicited and responded to assessment plans and reports in the relevant categories.

"Closing the Loop" has become more specific. First, through the efforts of Stephanie Casey, Maria Milletti, and Sunny Jang, the categories of Quantitative Reasoning, Natural Sciences, and Learning Beyond the Classroom (#5) have demonstrated improvement based on the previous year's analysis of assessment data. Each of these areas described improvement in processes and practices of assessing students, and showed an increase in instructional staff participation. At the course level, there are many illustrative examples of how faculty are closing the loop of the assessment cycle, including for purposes of improving instructional strategies (e.g., CHL 208 instructors plan to improve classroom discussion so students are better able to express their perspectives of diversity and engage with others), contrasting assessment data across courses or sections (e.g., CTAC 275 & 260 instructors plan to examine student essays across courses to ensure that students achieve the learning outcomes regardless of the class they elect), and improving processes of assessment for majors and non-majors (e.g., the Natural Science courses).

4. **Examples.** Provide 2-3 descriptive examples from your unit's activities that highlight how you (1) assessed student learning and, (2) "closed the loop." (This is a critical part!)
   - The examples might be ones that *indirectly* influenced student learning (e.g., reorganizing assessment councils, revising templates or outcomes, etc.).
   - At least one example should describe a *direct* measure or approach to assessing student learning and *how you closed the loop of assessment* to improve the program or opportunities students will have for learning.

   Use of Canvas and an Increase in Numbers of Students Assessed and in Instructor Participation. Each year GESA has strived to increase the number of students assessed and to improve the system of doing so. Quantitative Reasoning and Writing Intensive categories, through the efforts of Stephanie Casey and Ann Blakeslee—and with the support of e-Learning (Bill Jones, Garrett Whitehead, and Matt King) and the Faculty Development Center (Peggy Liggit), continued to improve on the process of assessing student learning via Canvas. Further, these leaders, and Maria Milletti and Doug Baker (for the "other" categories), and Peggy Liggit offered training on using Canvas as an assessment tool to nearly 50 more instructors. Therefore, the amount of students assessed rose dramatically from the previous academic year, as did the number of instructors participating. Furthermore, the increase in instructors and students provided a wider representation of students and more useful data that will lead to further improvements.

   Closing the Loop Over Time. As Maria Milletti points out in her report on the category of Natural Sciences, all courses demonstrated improvements in how students were assessed and how "closing the loop" reflected the past two years—that is, assessment coordinators (and their committees) examined assessments over time. Coordinating with assessment representatives from all five departments (BIO, CHEM, G&G, PSY, PHY), Maria stressed the importance of closing the loop from year to year and the value of departments creating assessment committees, which all Natural Sciences contributors have done. Writing Intensive courses showed similar improvements over the previous year.

   Specific Example from an Illustrative Course/Program. In ESSC 110 (part of the GEKN category), 103 student final exams were analyzed toward understanding how well students had achieved two selected learning outcomes. Furthermore, historical trends over the past decade were also considered. Based on the analysis of the two forms of data, the coordinator for the course (Katherine Ryker) and her colleagues have decided to make changes to experiments, particularly because of the apparent decline in student performance over the past ten years. Additionally, they will include another type of assessment to monitor student learning and effectiveness of the planned implementations.

5. **Closing the Loop: Over Time Analysis.** For the past few years, we have focused on how information collected and analyzed during assessment of student performances is used to close the loop of assessment. Peruse your past two or three annual reports and describe how programs in your unit have strived to close the loop. You might consider processes coordinated by your assessment council/committee (e.g., how you ensured quality across assessments, etc.); patterns of actions; or how you have improved upon the process of closing the loop over time.

GESA strives to "close the loop" in multiple ways. Most importantly, over the past three years as a reconstituted committee, it has done the following:

- *Enhanced the process of assessing student learning by offering more training of instructors*. This academic year, three training sessions were provided with the support of the Faculty Development Center and General Education Program leadership: Quantitative Reasoning (33 instructors have now been trained); Writing Intensive (approximately 25); and other categories (12). Furthermore, GESA training organizers, with the support of FDC and Peggy Liggit, encouraged participants to become assessment leaders, instructors who will work with colleagues to develop systemic change and improve assessment processes and practices.

- *Improved responses to assessment plans and reports*. Each assessment plan and report is responded to by at least two GESA committee members. Responses include recognition of what instructors of a course have planned or reported, comments or suggestions on the plan or report, commendations for contributing to the General Education Program assessment system, and suggested next steps. The committee has also worked to coordinate among faculty members within particular categories (e.g., Natural Sciences, Quantitative Reasoning, and Perspectives of a Diverse World—US Diversity) in order to move toward a more comprehensive model of assessing learning outcomes within a group.

- *Generated a process and template for revising learning outcomes*. One main goal of assessment has been to validate the efficacy of the Program's learning outcomes. During the past year, in coordination with the Provost, Interim Director of Undergraduate Education, and Interim Director of the General Education Program, GESA designed a process for faculty—in consultation with, and consensus from, others faculty within a category—to revise learning outcomes. The input system included soliciting approval from the following: GESA, General Education Advisory Council, Faculty Senate, Director of Undergraduate Education, and the Provost. The process proved effective as coordinators of WRTG 121 proposed revisions to the learning outcomes, and GESA orchestrated and strengthened the negotiated process, guiding the proposal through the input system toward approval. The WRTG 121 learning outcomes were approved.

6. **Next Year's Goals.** As you turn toward the next academic year (2017-18), list and briefly describe goals that emerged from the current year and that you will focus on next year? As part of developing a five-year plan, GESA will work with the Provost, the Director of Undergraduate Education, and the Director of the General Education Program to do the following, among other goals:
   - Enhance and improve an electronic assessment system (mainly via Canvas)
   - Solicit and encourage representation from all courses
   - Archive all documents electronically
   - Contribute scholarship of General Education
   - Build additional support structures to accomplish the multiple goals that GESA is tasked with, or may be expected to achieve (e.g., observing links among courses and retention, persistence, and completion).
   - Contribute to an annual conference to highlight achievements and possibilities of and for General Education

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

See Appendix II: Template for Reporting (pp. 14-18) and Appendix III: Template for Responding to Reports (pp. 19-21).

General Education Subcommittee on Assessment (GESA)
Assessment Plans & Reports for 2016-17
(Rev. June 16, 2017)

Overview
Below is quantitative data on the number of assessment plans and reports received, and responded to, by GESA.

Assessment Plans = 26 Number of Courses = 65*	Assessment Reports = 23 Number of Courses = 58*
Conservative Estimate of Number of Students Assessed: 3,908 – 4,250**	

*The number of assessment plans and reports refer to actual documents; however, one plan or report may address multiple courses—and multiple sections (and instructors) of a course (e.g., Math used 8 courses in its assessment of student learning and 33 instructors, assessing 1013 students).

**The number of students assessed is an approximate total (and the Writing Intensive final report is in process and the final numbers will be calculated and added); however, the number is much greater than the number assessed in 2015-16. Below are a few highlights—see the chart for more information.

Quantitative Highlights
- For Quantitative Reasoning, the number of students assessed is much more accurate (1,013, excluding the PLSC 210 class) because all of the Math courses and COT 224 assessments were entered into Canvas. As Stephanie Casey alludes to in the QR report, the total number for 2016-17 is 35% higher than the previous year.
- Similarly, WRTG 121 and MUSC 220 used electronic systems, so the number of students assessed is accurately presented.
- The five Natural Science programs (BIO, CHEM, G&G, PHY, and PSY) also charted number of students assessed through internal electronic systems.
- Some reports describe new assessments, or pilots (e.g., CTAC 275 & 260), and students were assessed through a random sample; others (e.g., CHL 208) reported using assessments from one course.
- Writing Intensive assessments are being processed, as mentioned, and the exact number of courses and students assessed will be available in June/July 2017; therefore, as of this draft, the number of students assessed is not reflected in the totals.

Qualitative Highlights
GESA showed an increase in participation among instructional staff, departments, and colleges; as importantly, the reports and assessment practices improved in 2016-17. Below are representative examples of improvements.

- *"Closing the Loop" Over Time.* As Maria Milletti points out in her report on the category of Natural Sciences, all courses demonstrated improvements in how students were assessed and how "closing the loop" reflected the past two years. Coordinating with assessment representatives from all five departments (BIO, CHEM, G&G, PSY, PHY), Maria stressed the importance of closing the loop from year to year and the value of departments creating assessment committees, which all Natural Sciences contributors have.

- *Training on Assessment and Canvas; and Professional Development.* As Stephanie Casey described in her report on the category of Quantitative Reasoning, more instructors were trained this past academic year and more contributed to the assessment. Most importantly, qualitatively, more professional development was included to assist instructors to prepare students to meet the third and fourth learning outcomes.

- *Increase in Instructional Participants and Improvement in Assessment Practices.* As Sunny Jang shows in her report for the category Learning Beyond the Classroom (#5), the number of instructors participating expanded by nearly 75% (11 in 2016 vs. 42 in 2017), as well as the number of students assessed from a programmatic perspective.

- *Inclusion of Students in Assessing Progress.* WRTG 121 (Derek Mueller and Steve Krause) added a student response component to its assessment system, and students' responses to the learning outcomes (before the term and after the term) reflect an important practice.

- *Creating a Foundation for Longitudinal Assessment of Writing.* Derek Mueller, Steve Krause, Ann Blakeslee, and Doug Baker, among others have begun to explore how to chart student progress over time, from WRTG 121, selected 200-level courses, and Writing Intensive courses.

- *Two categories of the Program grew substantially*:
    - The Knowledge of the Disciplines in Art grew with representatives from the Art department (Cam McComb and Leah Korth, who is a lecturer) and the Music and Dance department (Phil Simmons, Willard Zirk, and Heather Shouldice) contributing reports and improving on how they assess students from the General Education Program perspective.

    - The category of Perspectives on a Diverse World grew the most this past year: in 2017 faculty representing four different course assessed student learning, and the US Diversity subcategory supplied three of them. Furthermore, an internal survey of students, part of a larger study of students' knowledge of the learning outcomes of the category, was completed by John Koolage, John McCurdy, Ana Ferriera, among others. Ramona Caponegro, Bradley Ensor, Doris Fields, Dennis O'Grady, and their colleagues also greatly contributed to the category.

Chart of Assessment Plans and Reports that GESA Received and Responded to 2016-17

Assessment Plans	Assessment Reports

Note: The number of students assessed are included, if available.

Category	Course	Submitted by	Plans/ Reports	Returned	Reviewers
GEEC	CTAC 124	Doris Fields (dfields1)	X	X	Baker & Milletti
			X	X	Baker & Milletti
Multiple sections and instructors: 187 students participated in assessment.					
	WRTG 121	Steve Krause (skrause) & Derek Mueller (derek.mueller)	X	X	Baker & Milletti
			X	X	Baker
Multiple sections and instructors: 1118 students surveyed in F2016; 692 surveyed end of term.					
GEQR	Math 105, 110, 110e, 112, 118, 120, 140; STAT 170	Stephanie Casey (scasey1)	X	X	Baker & Casey
			X	X	Baker & Casey
	COT 224	Sema Kalaian (SKalaian)	X	X	Casey & Baker
			X	X	Casey & Baker
Multiple sections and instructors (Math courses & COT 224): 1013 students assessed (compared to 658 in W2016).					
	PLSC 210	David Klein (dklein2)	X	X	Casey & Baker
			X	X	Casey & Baker

	COSC 106*	Gus Ikeji (aikeji)	X	X	Casey & Baker
	Cancelled: Low enrollment		-		
GEKA	ARTE 220	Leah Korth Cam McComb	X	X	Baker
			X	X	Baker & Milletti
	DANC 100	Phil Simmons (psimmon2)	X	X	Baker & Casey
			X	X	Baker & Milletti
	MUSC 107	Willard Zirk (wzirk)	X	X	Baker & Casey
			X	X	Baker & Milletti
Multiple sections (6) and instructors: 167 students assessed.					
	MUSC 220	Heather Shouldice (hshouldi)	X	X	Baker & Casey
			X	X	Baker & Milletti
Multiple sections: 158 students assessed.					
GEKH	FRNH 100, 121, 122, 200, 221, 222, 233, 234	Genevieve Peden	X	X	Baker
			X	X	Baker & Milletti
Multiple courses and instructors: Students from all assessed.					
	SPNH 121, 122; 233, 234	Mónica Millán mmillan@emich.edu	X	X	Baker
GEKN	BIO 110/111	Bob Winning (rwinning)	X	X	Milletti & Baker
			X	X	Milletti & Baker
Multiple sections: 209 assessed; 173 used for analysis (the students who completed all parts).					
	CHEM 121/122	Heather Holmes (hholmes1)	X	X	Milletti & Baker
			X	X	Milletti & Baker
Multiple sections: between 222 & 485 students assessed on respective assessments.					
	ESSC 110	Katherine Ryker (kryker)	X	X	Milletti & Baker
			X	X	Milletti & Baker
Multiple sections and instructors: 103 students assessed.					

11

	PHY 100	Marshall Thomsen (jthomsen)	X	X	Milletti & Baker
			X	X	Milletti & Baker
35 students assessed					
	PSY 101/103	Tamara Loverich (tpenix)	X	X	Milletti & Baker
			X	X	Milletti & Baker
Multiple sections and instructors: 272 students assessed.					
GEKS	ECON 202	James Saunoris (jsaunori)	X	X	Baker
			X	X	Baker & Milletti
	JRNL 213	You Li (you.li)			
		(Plans and report combined)	X	X	Baker & Milletti
GEGA	ANTH 135	Bradley Ensor (bensor)	X	X	
		(NOTE: send CASAC's response for 14-15)	X	X	Baker & Milletti
Double section: 93 students assessed.					
GEUS*	CHL 208	Ramona Caponegro	X	X	Baker
			X	X	Baker & Milletti
	AFC 244 (GEGA or GEUS?)	Ana Ferreira (aferreir@)	X	X	Baker
		(NOTE: AFS 244 is listed in GEGA but Ana responded with GEUS)	X	X	Baker & Milletti
Two sections: 48 students assessed.					
	CTAC 260 & 275	Doris Fields (dfields1) & Patrick O'Grady (dennis.grady)	X	X	
			X	X	Baker
GEL 5	PEGN & PEGN 210	Sunny Jang (sjang3) Chris Herman (cherman2)	X	X	Baker & Jang
			X	X	Baker & Jang
Multiple sections (42) and instructors: 1744 students assessed.					
	PEGN	Sandra Pernecky (spernecky1)	X	X	Baker & Jang

GEWI		Ann Blakeslee	X	X	Baker & Blakeslee
			X	X	Baker
Multiple instructors across disciplines: xxx students assessed. (NOTE: This information is forthcoming.)					

*GEUS: John Koolage organized a questionnaire on US Diversity and how well students believe they are addressing the learning outcomes, among other questions. The data became available on May 15. A follow-up meeting to discuss analysis and next steps is scheduled for June 5.

Archive of Assessment Plans/Reports
Right now, the final plans are archived on four computers (Stephanie's, Maria's, Sunny's, and Doug's). Doug will talk with Bin Ning about housing the plans/reports and meeting minutes on the GE website or through IRIM.

WRTG 121 – Proposal for Revision of SLOs
GESA, GEAC, Faculty Senate, and Michael Tew have approved the proposal; Rhonda Longworth and her approval is the final part of the process.

Training
On February 3 training for GEQR; on March 3 the other categories; and March for WI.

GESA Membership
Interim Director of Undergraduate Education: Michael Tew <mtew@emich.edu>
Interim Director of Gen Ed: W. John Koolage <wkoolage@emich.edu>

GESA
CAS Rep: W. Douglas Baker, ENGL <douglas.baker@emich.edu>,
CAS Rep: Ramona Caponegro, ENGL <rcapneg@emich.edu>,
CAS Rep: Stephanie Casey, MATH <scasey1@emich.edu>,
CAS Rep: You Li, CMTA <you.li@emich.edu>
CAS Rep: John G. McCurdy, HIST&PHIL <jmccurdy@emich.edu>,
CAS Rep: Laura McMahon, HIST&PHIL <lmcmaho1@emich.edu>
CAS Rep: Maria Milletti, CHEM < mmilletti@emich.edu>
CHHS Rep: Sun Hae Jang, HHS-Orthotics (Rackham 245B) <sjang3@emich.edu>
COE Rep: TBA
COT Rep: TBA
COB Rep: Jean McEnery <jmcenery@emich.edu>
Library: Sara Memmott, Social Work & Emerging Technologies Librarian <smemmott@emich.edu>

Note: Keon Pettiway and Greg Plagens may become members in Fall 2017.

General Education Program
Template for Assessment Plans & Reports
2016-17

Note: If you have already submitted assessment plans to GESA for 2016-17, please copy and paste the plans in Part I and add the findings to Part II (p. 5).

The General Education Subcommittee on Assessment (GESA) is currently completing its third year of coordinating efforts to assess student learning across the General Education Program. Part of offering a General Education Program course is deciding on how you will assess student performance toward meeting the General Education learning outcomes (cf. https://www.emich.edu/gened/learningoutcomes.php).

There are **FOUR MAIN PURPOSES** for assessing students in terms of the learning outcomes: (1) to observe what students have learned, and (2) to use that information to make improvements to the course, or instructional approach, etc. (3) The assessment process also provides us the opportunity to examine the learning outcomes. Finally, (4) the General Education Program will meet a key goal university accreditation goal: assessing students from programmatic perspectives (i.e., the General Education Program).

GESA is led by faculty and supported by Interim Director John Koolage and Interim Director of Undergraduate Studies Michael Tew. GESA is available to support your efforts to plan how you will assess students on the learning outcomes. Assessment plans were DUE October 31. **An assessment report is due in May 5, 2017**.

GESA encourages faculty and department heads to work with full-time and part-time lecturers as makes sense and given the latters' circumstances or agreements with the college, department, or program.

Finally, the General Education Program is building an assessment system, so GESA encourages you to **BEGIN SMALL** (e.g., you do not need to assess all learning outcomes). Assessment of student learning should be **HUMANE AND DOABLE AND USEFUL** to you and your colleagues. If you have questions, please contact one of the members of the committee.

Thank you.

Members of General Education Subcommittee on Assessment:
Doug Baker (CAS-English), Faculty Chair
Ramona Caponegro (CAS-Children's Literature)
Stephanie Casey (CAS-Math), Faculty
Sunny Jang (CHHS-Orthotics & Prosthetics), Faculty
You Li (CAS-Journalism), Faculty
John McCurdy (CAS-History), Faculty
Jean McEnery (COB), Faculty
Laura McMahon (CAS-Philosophy), Faculty

Sara Memmott (University Library), Faculty
Maria Milletti (CAS-Chemistry), Faculty
John Koolage, Ex-Officio, Interim Director of General Education Program
Michael Tew, Ex-Officio, Interim Director of Undergraduate Studies

PART I
Planning to Assess Student Performance on Learning Outcomes

GESA recognizes the complexity of the General Education Program and the range of instructors, including Part- and Full-Time Lecturers and Faculty. Therefore, we encourage you to *start small*, contribute to *humane and doable* process, and make the assessment plans and actions *useful to your program or department*, particularly for enhancing opportunities for students to learn and for you to gather information that will help plan the course in the future.

Below are the following:
- A cover sheet
- Part I: Template for describing plans to assess student learning (DUE Oct. 31)
- Part II: Template for describing how you assessed student learning, what you found, and what you will do with the information (DUE May 5, 2017)

Your department's participation and contributions are critical to the effectiveness of the General Education Program and its efforts to assess how well students are meeting the learning outcomes. Furthermore, you will contribute to EMU's goal of meeting expectations from its accrediting body, the Higher Learning Commission (HLC). For more information, see HLC Criteria (especially 4B), https://www.hlcommission.org/Criteria-Eligibility-and-Candidacy/criteria-and-core-components.html. HLC's official campus visit will take place October 23-24, 2017, so faculty and administrators across campus are striving to compile and write a final report that is due in August 2017.

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

Thank you,

Members of General Education Subcommittee on Assessment
Doug Baker (douglas.baker@emich.edu)
Ramona Caponegro (rcapneg@emich.edu)
Stephanie Casey (scasey1@emich.edu)
Sunny Jang (sjang3@emich.edu)
You Li (you.li@emich.edu)
John McCurdy (jmccurdy@emich.edu)
Jean McEnery (jmcenery@emich.edu)
Laura McMahon (lmcmaho1@emich.edu)
Sara Memmott (smemmott@emich.edu)
Maria Milletti (mmilletti@emich.edu)
John Koolage (wkoolage@emich.edu)
Michael Tew (mtew@emich.edu)

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│   General Education Program Assessment of Student Learning │
│                      COVER SHEET                      │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

Note: Your department's plans to assess a General Education Program course may begin with one course section, or it may include multiple sections of the course. Remember, *it is ok to start small.*

For a complete list of General Education Program courses (and categories), see:
https://www.emich.edu/gened/genedmasterf15.pdf.

For a complete of Student Learning Outcomes for General Education Program courses, see:
https://www.emich.edu/gened/learningoutcomes.php.

Course	Please the course prefix and number (e.g., CHEM 105).
General Education Category*	(see link above)
Department	
Submitted by	
Phone/email	
Date Submitted	

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│  Based on the category of your course, please submit completed cover sheet and │
│              assessment plans to the following people:              │
│                                                                     │
│   GE Effective Communication: Doug Baker (douglas.baker@emich.edu)  │
│   GE Quantitative Reasoning: Stephanie Casey (scasey1@emich.edu)    │
│   GE Knowledge of the Disciplines:                                  │
│           GE Arts: Doug Baker (douglas.baker@emich.edu)             │
│           GE Humanities: Laura McMahon (lmcmaho1@emich.edu)         │
│           GE Natural Sciences: Maria Milletti (mmilleti@emich.edu)  │
│           GE Social Sciences: Doug Baker (douglas.baker@emich.edu)  │
│   GE Global Awareness: John McCurdy (jmccurdy@emich.edu)            │
│   LBC: Sunny Jang (sjang3@emich.edu)                                │
│   WI: Ann Blakeslee (ann.blakeslee@emich.edu)                       │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

PART I
Planning to Assess Student Performance
on General Education Learning Outcomes

Note: If you have already submitted plans for 2016-17, copy and paste the plans in the boxes below and move to Part II.

List (or copy and paste) the General Education Program's Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for the course. (For list, https://www.emich.edu/gened/learningoutcomes.php.**)**
List the Student Learning Outcomes the course will focus on for 2016-17. (Select *at least two* outcomes from the list above.) Students will be able to…
Describe the student artifacts or performances that the instructor(s) will use to assess how well students met each SLO, and how the artifacts will be collected.
Describe the methods or processes that will be used to analyze the artifacts or performances in order to determine how well students met the selected SLOs.

PART II
Analyzing Student Performance
on General Education Learning Outcomes
and "Closing the Loop"

DUE: May 5, 2017

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 that instructors plan in order to "close the loop" (i.e., close the assessment cycle: how the program will use assessment findings to make improvements).

GESA Response

GESA will respond to your assessment plans and reports. The purpose of the response is to provide constructive and supportive feedback. The process also provides members of GESA an opportunity to review reports and to observe how well courses have designed systematic ways of assessing student learning, including how the findings are used to improve opportunities for students to learn (i.e., how well programs "close the loop"). Each year, GESA submits a report to the Director of the General Education Program, to the Provost's Office, and to the University Assessment Committee (UAC) summarizing the Program's efforts in assessing student learning, and the UAC provide feedback for purposes of continuous improvement.

The main purposes for programmatic assessments of student learning are:
- 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

Rev. April 25, 2017

General Education Program
General Education Subcommittee on Assessment (GESA)
Response to Assessment Report 2016-17
(Rev. April 12, 2017)

Course:

General Education Program Category:

Department:

Contact Person/Email:

Purpose of GESA's Response
In Fall 2016, you submitted plans to assess student learning in terms of the outcomes for your General Education course(s), and GESA provided response to those plans. Below is GESA's response to the assessment report that you submitted in April/May 2017. The main goals of the response are to provide feedback and help you to reflect on your report and to prepare to assess students in 2017-18.

GESA's RESPONSE TO ASSESSMENT REPORT

The results of analyzing student performances on the selected learning outcomes were described.

____ The results show students' performances on the selected learning outcomes, demonstrate an alignment with the assessment plans, and appear to provide useful information to improve the course or opportunities for students to learn.

____ The results provide limited information on students' performances on the selected learning outcomes, demonstrate some alignment with the assessment plans, and appear to provide information that may lead to improvement of the course or opportunities for students to learn.

Observations, Commendations, or Suggestions:

The "so what" of the results for the program in terms of student learning were described.

___ The "so what" is described in enough detail to demonstrate the effectiveness of the assessments.

___ The "so what" is described, although lacks details that would better demonstrate the effectiveness of the assessments.

Observations, Commendations, or Suggestions:

Based on analysis of the findings, actions that instructor(s) plan in order to "close the loop" (i.e., close the assessment cycle: how the program will use assessment findings to make improvements) is presented.

___ The description of how the instructor(s) will "close the loop" demonstrates the effectiveness of the assessment cycle.

___ The description of how the instructor(s) will "close the loop" only partially demonstrates the effectiveness of the assessment cycle.

Observations, Commendations, or Suggestions:

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.

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 report 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 submits a report describing assessment efforts across the program, and the report is sent to Interim Director of Undergraduate Education, Michael Tew, Interim Director of the General Education Program, John Koolage, to the CAS Dean's office, and to the University Assessment Committee.

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

Members of General Education Subcommittee on Assessment
Doug Baker (douglas.baker@emich.edu), CAS-English, Faculty Chair
Ramona Caponegro (rcaponeg@emich.edu), CAS-English
Stephanie Casey (scasey1@emich.edu), CAS-Math
Sunny Jang (sjang3@emich.edu), CHHS-Orthotics & Prosthetics
You Li (you.li@emich.edu), CAS-CMTA
Jean McEnery(jmcenery@emich.edu), COB
John McCurdy (jmccurdy@emich.edu), CAS-History
Laura McMahon (lmcmaho1@emich.edu), CAS-Philosophy
Sara Memmott (smemmott@emich.edu), University Library
Maria Milletti (mmilletti@emich.edu), CAS-Chemistry
John Koolage (wkoolage@emich.edu), Ex-Officio, Interim Director of GE Program
Michael Tew (mtew@emich.edu), Ex-Officio, Interim Director of Undergraduate Studies