Plan for the Assessment of Student Learning

Eastern Illinois University

Approved Fall 2000
Revised Fall 2002
Revised Spring 2006
Revised Spring 2008
Revised Spring 2010
Revised Spring 2014

Plan for the Assessment of Student Learning

Overview of the Plan

The Plan for Assessment of Student Learning provides Eastern Illinois University with the framework for assessing student learning outcomes at the graduate and undergraduate levels. Assessment is conducted at the university level to evaluate students' achievement of university-wide student learning goals at the graduate and undergraduate level. Assessment is conducted at the department/academic unit level to evaluate students' achievement of the learning goals of the academic programs. This plan outlines EIU's program for assessment of general education, states the student learning goals for graduate education, and discusses academic assessment within the programs.

The foundation of the plan for undergraduate student learning assessment is the undergraduate mission statement:

> Eastern Illinois University is a public comprehensive university that offers superior, accessible undergraduate and graduate education. Students learn the methods and results of free and rigorous inquiry in the arts, humanities, sciences, and professions, guided by a faculty known for its excellence in teaching, research, creative activity, and service. The University community is committed to diversity and inclusion and fosters opportunities for student-faculty scholarship and applied learning experiences within a student-centered campus culture. Throughout their education, students refine their abilities to reason and to communicate clearly so as to become responsible citizens and leaders.

The foundation for assessment of graduate learning goals is the graduate mission:

> The mission of graduate education at Eastern Illinois University is to provide superior graduate degree, certificate, and post-baccalaureate options designed for career specialization and advancement, certification and credentialing, professional and leadership development, and preparation for advanced scholarship. The mission includes: strengthening the quality, diversity, and internationalization of the University's student body by attracting candidates who have the potential for academic and professional achievement; fostering advanced scholarship through critical thinking, problem solving, oral and written communication, application of technology, research/creative activity, and commitment to professional ethics; expanding the curriculum with rigorous advanced courses, curriculum, and options offered through lectures, laboratories, seminars, forums, practicum field experiences, internships, and partnerships with education, business, and industry; building and enhancing the excellence of the University's undergraduate majors and options through mutual and reciprocal research/creative activity with graduate students and faculty; and developing opportunities for the discovery and application of knowledge with graduate faculty members who reflect the University's

teaching and mentoring priority and who have a record of research/creative activity and professional service.

What is Assessment of Student Learning?

Assessment of student learning is a process to improve the knowledge, skills, and attitudes acquired through study and practice. Through the assessment process, academic programs compare student learning objectives (desired learning) to learning outcomes (what actually was learned) and use the information generated by these comparisons to make programmatic changes.

In the academic setting, the term "assessment" generally is used to mean the evaluation of learning at the program level as distinguished from evaluation of individual students. Faculty members rightfully assert that they assess individual students through grading and testing. These evaluations, however, are restricted to learning that occurs within only one course. The curricula of academic programs encompass numerous courses as well as other learning experiences such as internships and practica. Students are expected, therefore, to develop knowledge, skills, and attitudes from the combination of experiences in the entire curriculum. Assessment of student learning focuses on this "macro" level rather than on the "micro" level of individual students.

Assessment of student learning is an integral part of curriculum development and revision. It documents that learning has occurred and provides a rational basis for making purposeful changes to curricula. While the goal of assessment is improvement of student learning, it also can be used for other purposes. Assessment information, for example, might indicate other changes needed in the academic program. Assessment data can be useful in recruiting students and faculty and in highlighting students' strengths for potential employers. Moreover, assessment results may document how the program supports the missions of graduate and undergraduate educations, the goals of the Illinois Board of Higher Education, and the expectations of other external bodies.

This plan for assessment of student learning at Eastern Illinois University is based on the principle of shared governance. Faculty, students, and administrators have been involved in the development of the plan and will continue to be involved in academic assessment. Because assessment of student learning is so closely linked to curricula, however, faculty must play a principal role in the assessment process:

- The faculty, in consultation with stakeholders, establish student learning objectives;
- The faculty select the methods and measures for evaluating achievement of the objectives;
- The faculty determine appropriate performance standards; and
- The faculty develop and implement curricular and program changes based on assessment data.

Participants in the Assessment of Student Learning at EIU

The University Committee for the Assessment of Student Learning (CASL) is "responsible for the development and oversight of policies and plans related to the assessment of student learning" (Article II, Bylaws of the Committee for the Assessment of Student Learning).

Included among the numerous units, committees, and individuals who participate in the assessment process are the following:

- Council for Academic Affairs (CAA)
- Council for Graduate Studies (CGS)
- Department assessment and curriculum committees
- Faculty
- Students
- Office of Academic Affairs
- Center for Academic Support and Assessment (CASA)
- Office for Testing and Evaluation (OTE)

Their specific functions and responsibilities with respect to assessment of student learning are addressed in the appropriate sections of this plan.

Assessment of EIU's Undergraduate Learning Goals

Assessment of the undergraduate learning goals at EIU is based on the mission statement adopted by the University Council for Academic Affairs (CAA):

The mission of the general education program at EIU is threefold:
- to enhance student literacy and oral communication;
- to encourage students to think critically and reflectively; and
- to introduce students to knowledge central to responsible global citizenship.

Using the assessment process described above, CASL has developed a program to assess five learning goals:

1. Critical Thinking
2. Writing and Critical Reading
3. Speaking and Listening
4. Quantitative Reasoning
5. Responsible Citizenship

The assessment of each of these learning goals is outlined in the pages that follow. Information for each goal includes objectives, measures, results, and the feedback loop. Changes to the assessment of the above learning goals will be the responsibility of CASL with the approval of CAA. Changes to how this assessment plan is carried out will be the responsibility of CASL and CASA.

Student Learning Goal: Critical Thinking

Critical Thinking
EIU graduates question, examine, evaluate, and respond to problems or arguments by:
1. Asking essential questions and engaging diverse perspectives.
2. Seeking and gathering data, information, and knowledge from experience, texts, graphics, and media.
3. Understanding, interpreting, and critiquing relevant data, information, and knowledge.
4. Synthesizing and integrating data, information, and knowledge to infer and create new insights
5. Anticipating, reflecting upon, and evaluating implications of assumptions, arguments, hypotheses, and conclusions.
6. Creating and presenting defensible expressions, arguments, positions, hypotheses, and proposals.

Assessment Measures and Methods
Students' critical thinking skills are assessed using the Watson-Glaser Thinking Appraisal, which is administered by faculty in the senior seminar courses. All students enrolled in a Senior Seminar complete the Watson-Glaser Critical Thinking Appraisal as part of the required course work for the Senior Seminar. Students taking on-line courses will have the option of taking appraisal on-line if they live at least 200 miles from Eastern's campus. The on-line version of the test will incur an additional fee.

Each semester the Watson-Glaser Critical Thinking Appraisal will be administered in Senior Seminars in the 12th week of the regular semester. On the second Friday of the weekend seminars, or on the corresponding class periods for summer sessions. Faculty return tests and forms to the Office of Academic Assessment and Testing.

Results
According to Psych Corp, owner of the Watson-Glaser Critical Thinking Appraisal, subtest scores are not statistically valid; therefore, total composite scores should be the only scores analyzed. As norming data are not available, comparisons of scores among majors or over time are recommended.

Data from the Watson-Glaser Critical Thinking Appraisal has been collected since Spring 2002. A complete report is prepared by CASA each year containing the Watson-Glaser Composite Scores by semester across years and subtest raw scores across fall, spring, and summer terms.

CASL and CASA develop a 1-page Critical Thinking Assessment Executive Summary showing Watson-Glaser composite scores for senior cohorts each semester across several years. Additionally mean composite Watson-Glaser scores by departments and college compared to the university as a whole are summarized as part of a 1-page CASL Executive Summary of Assessment Measures for Undergraduate Programs within each College.

Expectations

The mean score for the university on the Watson-Glaser will minimally be 25 (out of 40).

Feedback Loop

OTE provides results for individual students and for each section which are given to the course instructors.

CASA distributes copies of the entire critical thinking report to:
- Committee for the Assessment of Student Learning
- Vice President for Academic Affairs
- Deans and Department Chairs
- EIU's Assessment website – www.eiu.edu/~assess

CASA and CASL distribute yearly 1-page executive summary of the critical thinking measure for the university and a 1-page summary of assessment measures by programs within colleges. The following constituents will receive verbal and/or written explanations from members of CASL regarding the executive summary reports and well as a reminder about the website containing the full reports.
- Council on Academic Affairs (CASL chair, CASL CAA rep, CASA executive director)
- Senior Seminar instructors
- Writing Across the Curriculum Committee (WAC CASL rep)
- Director of Composition (WAC CASL rep)
- Faculty senate (CASL chair, CASA executive director)
- College Curriculum Committees (CASL college representatives)
- College Assessment Committees/Faculty from each college involved in assessment (CASL college representatives)
- Academic Council of Chairs meetings for each college (CASL college representatives, CASL chair or CASA executive director)
- Council of Deans (CASL chair and CASA executive director)

Student Learning Goal: Writing and Critical Reading

EIU graduates write critically and evaluate varied sources by:
1. Creating documents appropriate for specific audiences, purposes, genres, disciplines, and professions.
2. Crafting cogent and defensible applications, analyses, evaluations, and arguments about problems, ideas, and issues.
3. Producing documents that are well-organized, focused, and cohesive.
4. Using appropriate vocabulary, mechanics, grammar, diction, and sentence structure.
5. Understanding, questioning, analyzing, and synthesizing complex textual, numeric, and graphical sources.
6. Evaluating evidence, issues, ideas, and problems from multiple perspectives.
7. Collecting and employing source materials ethically and understanding their strengths and limitations.

Assessment Measures and Methods

EIU has committed its resources to foster effective writing across the undergraduate curriculum, and to that end, it has identified effective writing as one of its general education goals. Thus, writing is assessed departmentally as appropriate and university-wide through the Electronic Writing Portfolio (EWP).

The mission of the EWP is three-fold:

1. To ensure that students write across the curriculum, within and outside of their disciplines. Having students submit a piece of writing to the EWP in consultation with the instructor of the course is an important step.
2. To encourage students to discuss writing and revision with their instructors.
3. To assess writing to ascertain whether students exhibit effective writing across the curriculum; feedback will be provided to faculty concerning strengths and weaknesses as well as general trends and patterns. Reading a sampling of completed portfolios offers summative data concerning focus, organization, development, and mechanics.

As a graduation requirement, all EIU undergraduates will submit to the EWP. Documents submitted to this portfolio will be self-selected by the students based on criteria related to assessment goals. Writing data from the EWP will include on a) the course instructor's holistic rating of the student's submitted paper and b) ten percent of completed portfolios will be read by trained faculty for data concerning students' writing skills.

Submissions to the EWP

All students will submit three documents to the EWP. Each student is responsible for preparing and selecting appropriate course assignments for the EWP, consulting as needed with the course instructor, and submitting those assignments to his/her EWP in accordance with procedures established by the Center for Academic Support and Achievement (CASA).

Students may submit documents from any course in which they have written an appropriate document. Students may submit only one document from each course. Students who submit from ENG 1001G/1091G may not submit from ENG 1002G/1092G. Two documents must be submitted by the time a student has earned 60 hours; a registration hold will be placed at 75 hours. The last document should be submitted by the time a student has earned 105 hours at which time a hold will be placed on the student's record if he/she has failed to complete the portfolio. Papers must meet the following criteria to be submitted to the EWP:

- The paper must be at least 750 words in length (approximately 3 pages).
- It must be written in standard English.
- It must be developed in a manner consistent with the demands of the discipline for which it was written.
- It must contain a coherent writing sample that connects ideas within and between paragraphs. (Therefore, lists, lesson plans, and other such documents may not be submitted.)
- Submissions may not be creative pieces, such as poems, short stories, or plays.

Students submit an electronic version of their document through the web site created by the Center for Academic Technology Services (CATS) specifically for the EWP.

Instructor Holistic Rating of Individual Papers from Courses
An email is sent to faculty members each Friday advising him/her that one or more submissions to the EWP from their current courses awaits rating in the EWP website. The faculty member rates the submission on a scale of 1 to 4 from unsatisfactory to superior based on the rubric created by CASL (see rubric at end of writing section).

Portfolio Evaluation by Trained Readers
Annually, ten percent of the completed portfolios are read by trained evaluators—faculty from across the curriculum—for a summative assessment of student writing. Faculty readers read the portfolios and complete an evaluation form for each. The form rates the quality of the overall portfolio as strong, adequate, weak or poor and rates the portfolio for each writing objective (focus/purpose, organization, development, style, audience, mechanics, sources). Readers attend a focus group to discuss their impressions of the student writing and give suggestions for how curriculum development or pedagogy change may improve writing.

Responsibility for Data Collection
CASA is responsible for collecting and maintaining students' electronic writing portfolios in accordance with procedures established by CASA as approved by CAA, CASL, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. CASA places registration holds on student records when EWP papers are not submitted by semester hour guidelines listed above.

CASA is responsible for monitoring completion of ratings by instructors. When ratings are not complete at the end of the semester, the instructor is emailed, called and/or sent a letter requesting the ratings. When ratings are not completed within two weeks into the next semester, the instructor's department chair is notified and asked to complete the ratings.

CASA is responsible for recruiting and training readers to evaluate completed portfolios. CASA collects quantitative data from portfolio evaluation forms and conducts focus groups to obtain qualitative information from the evaluators.

Results
CASA generates an EWP Submission Report each semester containing information such as the total number of EWP submissions, the number of semester hours completed by students when submissions are made, and the level and types of courses submissions are from.

CASA generates two reports each semester based on the instructor ratings of individual papers submitted to the EWP. The general EWP Submissions Report presents the number and percentage of EWP submissions rated from 1-4 (unsatisfactory, needs improvement, satisfactory, superior). Ratings are reported by student characteristics such as gender, native/transfer status, race/ethnicity, and year in college. The number of submissions and mean ratings of student papers by majors and college are also reported. The second report each semester based on instructor ratings of individual papers is labeled the At-Risk EWP Submissions Report. It contains detailed information about submitted papers rated as 2 or less. The total number of students with low ratings and the courses from which the papers were submitted are included. Additionally, student characteristics such as major, gender, ethnicity, year in school/semester hours completed are contained in the report.

CASA also generates two reports from trained evaluators' ratings of 10% of completed portfolios each semester. The Electronic Writing Portfolio Reading Report lists the names of the trained faculty readers and presents quantitative information about the percentage of

portfolios rated as strong, adequate and weak overall and in relation to each writing objective (focus/purpose, organization, development, style, audience, mechanics, sources). Qualitative information from readers written and verbal focus group comments is included for each objective. Trends across time are highlighted and readers' insights into implications of the data for curriculum development and pedagogy improvement are also included.

The <u>Electronic Writing Portfolio Readings Report Executive Summary</u> is developed by CASA and contains the qualitative data in graph form about the percentage of portfolios rated as strong, adequate or weak, for the portfolio overall and for each of the writing objectives.

CASL and CASA develop a yearly 1-page <u>Electronic Writing Portfolio Executive Summary</u> containing the percentage of individual papers rated by instructors using holistic scores as superior, satisfactory, needs improvement, and unsatisfactory each year. The 1-page executive summary also contains the percentage of holistic ratings of strong, adequate, and weak of the 10% of completed portfolios rated by trained EWP readers. Additionally mean instructor writing scores on papers submitted to the EWP by departments and college are summarized and compared to the university average as part of a 1-page <u>CASL Executive Summary of Assessment Measures for Undergraduate Programs within each College</u>.

Expectations

At least 90% of student papers submitted to the EWP will be rated as satisfactory or above (3 out of 4) by their course instructors. At least 80% of completed portfolios will be rated as adequate or strong as measured by trained evaluators.

Feedback Loop

Reports based on EWP submissions will be shared with administration, faculty and staff to foster discussion about possible changes to curriculum and resources that could improve students' writing skills. Results are to be used for the continual improvement of writing, for modifications to the process and as base-line data for writing assessment.

CASL, in consultation with these groups, will recommend changes that will improve the collection of data, interpretation of data and adjustments to curriculum and resources based on the assessment results. Policy-making and administrative bodies, particularly CAA, college and departmental curriculum committees, WAC, CASA, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs are responsible for acting on the recommendations.

1) Complete Reports.

Each semester, CASA prepares reports listed in the Results section above summarizing data on the EWPs including, for example, number of submissions, and summary statistics from instructors' holistic scores from papers submitted from courses. Annually, EWP portfolio readers provide quantitative and qualitative evaluations of completed portfolios; these evaluations are summarized by CASA.

CASA distributes copies of the entire reports to:
- Committee for the Assessment of Student Learning
- Vice President for Academic Affairs
- Deans and Department Chairs
- EIU's Assessment website – www.eiu.edu/~assess

2) Executive Summary.

CASA and CASL develop a yearly one-page executive summary of writing measures. The following constituents will receive verbal and/or written explanations from members of CASL regarding the executive summary reports and well as a reminder about the website containing the full reports.

- Council on Academic Affairs (CASL chair, CASL CAA rep, CASA executive director)
- Writing Across the Curriculum Committee (WAC CASL rep)
- Director of Composition (WAC CASL rep)
- Faculty senate (CASL chair, CASA executive director)
- College Curriculum Committees (CASL college representatives)
- College Assessment Committees/Faculty from each college involved in assessment (CASL college representatives)
- Academic Council of Chairs meetings for each college (CASL college representatives, CASL chair or CASA executive director)
- Council of Deans (CASL chair and CASA executive director)

3) Individual Student Performance.

- Submission of each of the 3 papers to the EWP are noted as "complete" on the students transcript and can be viewed in PAWs by advisors, students, and faculty. Students can view ratings from each of their submissions from the EWP website. Advisors can view the rating for each paper submitted to the EWP in the test scores section of Banner.
- A departmental report is sent to department chairs and faculty involved with assessment in the department with submission information from their individual majors following the spring and fall terms. Individual student's names, advisors, instructors and EWP submission rating are included with the EWP submission mean for the department, college and university.
- Students who receive ratings of 2 or lower on an individual paper submitted to the EWP are notified in an email from CASA. The email informs the student that their writing needs improvement. Because Eastern Illinois University is committed to the undergraduate goal of effective writing as well as the individual student's success, the student is referred to the Student Success Center (SSC), given information about workshops provided by the Writing Center, and encouraged to consult faculty members and advisors on ways to improve writing. The student's advisor also receives an email informing them of the low rating.
- Students who receive a superior rating on all three EWP submissions have "writes with distinction on the EWP requirement" on their transcript and receive a congratulatory letter from the university. Students whose three documents earn a 3.87 average holistic score or higher receive the "write with distinction" designation.

Electronic Writing Portfolio Assessment Rubric

	Superior	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	Unsatisfactory
Content	▪ Fully responds to all criteria of the assignment ▪ Clearly identifies and fully develops all ideas/themes ▪ Provides logical, valid and specific details and support ▪ Effectively uses all relevant information, including outside sources ▪ Draws clear and appropriate conclusions	▪ Sufficiently responds to most criteria of the assignment ▪ Identifies and develops main ideas/themes, but some may lack clarity or depth ▪ Generally provides logical and valid details and support ▪ Effectively uses most relevant information, including outside sources ▪ For the most part, draws clear and appropriate conclusions	▪ Does not respond or incompletely responds to some criteria of the assignment ▪ Does not identify or develop some main ideas/themes ▪ Provides support but may not be logical or valid; some details may be missing ▪ Frequently omits relevant information; outside sources may be inappropriate or missing ▪ Draws mostly unclear or inappropriate conclusions	▪ Does not respond to most criteria of the assignment ▪ Does not identify or develop most ideas/themes ▪ Provides few details and little support or support that is illogical or invalid ▪ Omits relevant information; outside sources inappropriate or missing ▪ Draws unclear/inappropriate conclusions or omits conclusions entirely
Organization	▪ Clearly and consistently organizes ideas ▪ Maintains consistent focus and sense of purpose ▪ Effectively structures and orders paragraphs ▪ Links ideas with smooth and effective transitions	▪ Consistently organizes ideas, but structure may be formulaic or unsophisticated ▪ Generally maintains focus ▪ For the most part, effectively structures and orders paragraphs ▪ For the most part, effectively links ideas, but transitions may be unclear or ineffective	▪ Frequently does not organizes ideas; structure is formulaic or unsophisticated ▪ Sometimes lacks focus or sense of purpose ▪ Often does not structure or order paragraphs ▪ Links some ideas, but transitions are missing or unclear	▪ Does not organize ideas ▪ Conveys little or no focus or sense of purpose ▪ For the most part, does not structure or order paragraphs ▪ Does not link ideas
Style	▪ Shows clear awareness of purpose and audience ▪ Uses sophisticated and varied sentence structure ▪ Uses vocabulary and style that are appropriate to the audience	▪ For the most part, shows awareness of purpose and audience ▪ Uses effective and varied sentence structure ▪ Uses vocabulary and style that are mostly appropriate to the audience; some words may be used incorrectly	▪ Is inconsistent in showing awareness of purpose and audience ▪ Uses little variety in sentence structure; some syntax errors may be present ▪ Uses vocabulary or style that are frequently inappropriate to the audience; words are often used incorrectly	▪ Shows little awareness of purpose and audience ▪ Uses no variety in sentence structure; syntax errors frequently present ▪ Uses vocabulary or style that are inappropriate to the audience; words are consistently used incorrectly
Mechanics	▪ Makes virtually no grammar, punctuation, or spelling errors ▪ Uses correct citation format to document references and sources	▪ Makes few grammar, punctuation, or spelling errors; these are not distracting to the reader ▪ Identifies and documents most sources appropriately	▪ Makes occasional grammar, punctuation, or spelling errors; these may be distracting to the reader ▪ Sometimes uses correct citation format to document references and sources	▪ Makes frequent grammar, punctuation, or spelling errors; these are distracting to the reader ▪ Uses incorrect or no citation format to document references and sources

Adopted Spring 2008

Student Learning Goal: Speaking and Listening

Speaking and Listening
EIU graduates prepare, deliver, and critically evaluate presentations and other formal speaking activities by:
1. Collecting, comprehending, analyzing, synthesizing and ethically incorporating source material.
2. Adapting formal and impromptu presentations, debates, and discussions to their audience and purpose.
3. Developing and organizing ideas and supporting them with appropriate details and evidence.
4. Using effective language skills adapted for oral delivery, including appropriate vocabulary, grammar, and sentence structure.
5. Using effective vocal delivery skills, including volume, pitch, rate of speech, articulation, pronunciation, and fluency.
6. Employing effective physical delivery skills, including eye contact, gestures, and movement.
7. Using active and critical listening skills to understand and evaluate oral communication.

Cognitive objectives: Quality speaking naturally exhibits content. Assessment of the content of the oral presentations will be the responsibility of the instructors.

Assessment Measures and Methods
EIU students' oral presentation skills will be assessed at the beginning and end of their general education program:

- Students' oral presentation skills will be assessed in one or more required course assignments in Introduction of Communication Studies (CMN 1310G or CMN 1390G).
- Students' oral presentation skills will be assessed in one or more required course assignments in the Senior Seminar.

Students' oral presentation skills will be evaluated by course instructors using Primary Trait Analysis for Speaking Matrix (Speaking Matrix). Instructors submit to CASA the speaking assessment form the semester in which the student takes to course. The OTE enters holistic scores for each subsection of the evaluation form and for the speech as a whole.

Results
Data collected from students in CMN 1310G or its honors equivalent and the Senior Seminars will be analyzed by CASA each year to identify students' level of achievement according to the holistic score on the speaking rubric. The percentage of speeches rated with holistic scores of highly competent, competent, minimally competent and not competent for freshman and senior cohorts will be compared for each senior class. Trends across semesters and summarized by years in holistic measures are also tracked in the complete report prepared by CASA.

CASL and CASA develop a 1-page Speaking Assessment Report Executive Summary showing holistic speaking score skills for freshman and senior cohorts each year. Additionally mean speaking scores by departments and college compared to the university as a whole will be summarized beginning in 2010 as part of a 1-page CASL Executive Summary of Assessment Measures for Undergraduate Programs within each College.

Expectations
At least 90% of student presentations will be rated as competent or above (at least 3 out of 4) by their course instructors.

Feedback Loop
Students enrolled in CMN 1310G, CMN 1390G, and Senior Seminars will have the opportunity to consult with instructors regarding improvement of oral presentation skills. CASA distributes copies of the entire speaking report to:
- Committee for the Assessment of Student Learning
- Vice President for Academic Affairs
- EIU's Assessment website – www.eiu.edu/~assess

2) Executive Summary.
CASA and CASL develop a yearly 1-page executive summary of speaking measures for the university and a 1-page summary of assessment measures by programs within colleges. The following constituents will receive verbal and/or written explanations from members of CASL regarding the executive summary reports and well as a reminder about the website containing the full reports.
- Council on Academic Affairs (CASL chair, CASL CAA rep, CASA exectutive director)
- CMN 1310G and Senior Seminar instructors (Speaking rep)
- Faculty senate (CASL chair, CASA executive director)
- College Curriculum Committees (CASL college representatives)
- College Assessment Committees/Faculty from each college involved in assessment (CASL college representatives)
- Academic Council of Chairs meetings for each college (CASL college representatives, CASL chair or CASA executive director)
- Council of Deans (CASL chair and CASA executive director)

Primary Trait Analysis for Speaking Matrix
for Assessment of Oral Presentations

	4 Highly Competent	3 Competent	2 Minimally Competent	1 Not Competent
Organization	Arrangement of ideas clearly related to topic; well organized with introduction, body, conclusion; good transitions; introduction includes attention-getter, statement of thesis, credibility information; conclusion includes summary and closure.	Conveyed a central idea or topic; most information presented in logical structure; adequate introduction, body, conclusion; adequate transitions.	Attempted to focus on an idea or topic; ideas were loosely connected to topic; structure unclear; introduction, body, conclusion detectable but not comprehensive; transitions unclear.	Had little or no focus on central idea or topic; no apparent logical structure; introduction, body, or conclusion absent; lacked transitions.
Language	Appropriate standards of usage for situation and audience; consistently used varied sentence structure and word choice; evidence of precise and vivid language; unfamiliar terms defined.	Used some varied sentence structure and word choice; unfamiliar terms easily interpreted; adequate standards of usage employed.	Unfamiliar terms not easily interpreted; little varied sentence structure and word choice; minimal evidence of appropriate standards of usage.	Inadequate standards of usage; no varied sentence structure and word choice; unfamiliar terms not defined.
Material	Content highly specific, credible, relevant, sufficient, interesting; evidence supported topic; connection between support and main points is clear; content was appropriate to situation and audience; information source accurately cited.	Content adequately specific, credible, relevant, sufficient, interesting; lacked support for some points; partial audience adaptation of content; some information sources cited.	Content minimally specific, credible, relevant, sufficient, interesting; minimal support; few information sources cited; little audience adaptation of content.	Content not specific, credible, relevant, sufficient, interesting; ideas not supported; information sources not cited; lacks audience adaptation of content.
Analysis	Presentation clearly adapted to the audience and situation; approach and structure highly consistent with overall purpose; strong evidence of critical thinking.	Some evidence of adaptation to the audience and situation; approach and structure consistent with overall purpose; some evidence of critical thinking.	Inconsistent adaptation to audience and situation; approach and structure inconsistent with overall purpose; inconsistent evidence of critical thinking.	Limited adaptation to audience and situation; approach and structure not appropriate for the overall purpose; lacks evidence of critical thinking.
Nonverbal Delivery	Did not read from notes and/or audio visual materials; clearly engaged audience through consistent eye contact and gestures; responsive to audience reaction.	Referred occasionally to notes and/or audio visual materials; engaged audience through eye contact and gestures; aware of audience reaction.	Relied heavily on notes and/or audio visual materials; exhibited minimal awareness of audience; infrequent eye contact or gestures; some distracting mannerisms.	Read directly from notes and/or audio visual materials; exhibited little or no audience awareness, gestures, or eye contact; frequent, distracting mannerisms.
Verbal Delivery	Voice varied in pitch, volume, rate, and emphasis; appropriate enthusiasm; free of fillers (ahs, uhms, ers); highly effective articulation and pronunciation.	Some variation in pitch, volume, rate, and emphasis; some fillers (ahs, uhms, ers); effective articulation and pronunciation.	Limited variation in pitch, volume, rate, and emphasis; some distracting fillers (ahs, uhms, ers); minimally effective articulation and pronunciation.	No variation in pitch, volume, rate, or emphasis; fillers (ahs, uhms, ers) detract from the presentation; lack of clear articulation and pronunciation.

Accommodations will be made for persons with communication disabilities and / or differences.

Student Learning Goal: Quantitative Reasoning

EIU graduates produce, analyze, interpret, and evaluate quantitative material by:
1. Performing basic calculations and measurements.
2. Applying quantitative methods and using the resulting evidence to solve problems.
3. Reading, interpreting, and constructing tables, graphs, charts, and other representations of quantitative material.
4. Critically evaluating quantitative methodologies and data.
5. Constructing cogent arguments utilizing quantitative material.
6. Using appropriate technology to collect, analyze, and produce quantitative materials

Assessment Measures and Methods

Results

Expectations

Feedback Loop

Student Learning Goal: Responsible Citizenship

EIU graduates make informed decisions based on knowledge of the physical and natural world and human history and culture by:
1. Engaging with diverse ideas, individuals, groups, and cultures.
2. Applying ethical reasoning and standards in personal, professional, disciplinary, and civic contexts.
3. Participating formally and informally in civic life to better the public good.
4. Applying knowledge and skills to new and changing contexts within and beyond the classroom.

Assessment Measures and Methods
A faculty-developed survey is given to incoming freshman students as part of the student orientation program; a similar survey for seniors is given as part of the requirements for the senior seminars. Surveys are taken on-line and results are stored in an excel spreadsheet. Student answers are tabulated once a year.

Results
Freshman cohort data are compared with senior data four years following that cohort's Debut program. CASA prepares a complete Responsible Citizenship Survey Report with item results within each learning objective. Graphs are included with comparison of trends for freshman and seniors for the cohort. CASL also provides trends for freshman over time and trends for seniors over time.

CASL and CASA develop a 1-page <u>Responsible Citizenship Survey Executive Summary</u> showing freshman-senior cohort scores by the percentage of individual responses to items within each learning objectives.

Expectations
The expectation is that growth or maturity in attitudes towards being a responsible global citizen would be reflected between the freshman and senior administration of the survey.

Feedback Loop
CASA distributes copies of the entire Global Citizenship Survey report to:
- Committee for the Assessment of Student Learning
- Vice President for Academic Affairs
- EIU's Assessment website: www.eiu.edu/~assess

CASA and CASL distribute yearly a 1-page executive summary of the Global Citizenship Survey for the university. The following constituents will receive verbal and/or written explanations from members of CASL regarding the executive summary report and well as a reminder about the website containing the full reports.
- Council on Academic Affairs (CASL chair, CASL CAA rep, CASA executive director)
- Faculty teaching General Education courses that identify global citizenship as learning objectives and Senior Seminar instructors
- Faculty senate (CASL chair, CASA executive director)
- College Curriculum Committees (CASL college representatives)
- College Assessment Committees/Faculty from each college involved in assessment (CASL college representatives)
- Academic Council of Chairs meetings for each college (CASL college representatives, CASL chair or CASA executive director)
- Council of Deans (CASL chair and CASA executive director)

Assessment of Student Learning Requirements for Graduate Degree Programs at Eastern Illinois University

Each graduate degree program will complete objective(s) appropriate to assess all four of the graduate learning goals as defined within the discipline. Upon completion of a graduate degree program at Eastern Illinois University, students will display:
- A depth of content knowledge including effective technology skills and ethical behaviors
- Critical thinking and problem solving skills
- Effective oral and written communication skills
- Evidence of advanced scholarship through research and/or creative activity

Clarification of Learning Goals

The **depth of content knowledge** can include program learning objective related specifically to the knowledge base as defined by the discipline but can also include learning objectives related to ethical behaviors and professional responsibility; specific skill sets in the areas of technology, leadership, management, or laboratory procedures; application of theory into practice, and/or competency as a performer, educator, or conductor.

Critical thinking and problem solving can be assessed through various class assignments including laboratory procedures and reports; application of case studies and other simulated situations; and evaluations of health/medical status as well as by performance on the program's comprehensive knowledge component.

Oral and written communication skills typically are assessed throughout the students' degree program. Regular course assignments, including position papers, lab reports, research reviews, technical presentations, debates, and facilitated discussions as well as performance as a graduate assistant, if appropriate, can be utilized.

Advanced scholarship through research and creative activity is a critical component of all graduate degree programs. Evidence of scholarly activity might include formulating, conducting, and presenting original research, critically reviewing and synthesizing existing research, designing artwork or other creative works and composing a musical piece.

Assessment Measure and Methods

Assessment measures, methods, expectations, results, and the feedback loop will be determined by constituents of the program. Although the organizational structure may differ among departments, every graduate program has an assessment plan designed to improve student learning. The plan should include the following elements:

- Student learning goals and objectives;
- Assessment measures;
- Assessment procedures;
- Analysis and reporting of assessment data; and
- Use of the assessment data to improve student learning.

Programs submit an annual assessment summary in June to the Executive Director of the CASA.

Results

In addition to the annual summaries, departments must also complete a program review at least every 8 years. In support of the Board of Higher Education's statutory responsibility to "review periodically all existing programs of instruction, research, and public service at state universities and to advise the appropriate board of control if the contribution of each program is not educationally and economically justified," EIU is required to review each of the review process is to improve the quality and productivity of individual academic programs and units of research and public service. Results of the review are expected to provide the basis for planning and budgeting decisions. (Additional information about program reviews is available at www.eiu.edu/~acaffair.) Assessment measures and processes are part of the review process when considering if a graduate program receives "First Choice" status.

The feedback from the Executive Director of CASA's review of the assessment plan is shared with the Dean of the Graduate School. The Dean of the Graduate School also reviews all graduate assessment plans and provides feedback to the programs.

CASA develops a graduate assessment report which contains information about the types of measures made by graduate programs (papers, oral presentations, labs, surveys, etc), percentage of graduate program primary trait level ratings for each section of the assessment report, and the percentage of programs adopting undergraduate learning goals.

CASA and CASL develop a 1-page Executive Summary of Assessment by Graduate Programs within each College. The executive summary shows the number of graduate learning goals adopted by each program, and the primary trait analysis level rating for each section of the graduate program's assessment report. The average for the college and the university are summarized within the executive summary.

Expectations
Regardless of the structuring of assessment within the graduate program, faculty must play a central role. At minimum, faculty must be involved in establishing learning goals and objectives, developing assessment measures, and using the assessment data to improve student learning. Specific expectations for each program will be addressed.

Feedback Loop
Feedback about program assessment results should occur systematically within the department. Feedback of the CASA and CASL reports include:
CASA distributes copies of the entire Graduate Assessment report to:
- Committee for the Assessment of Student Learning
- Vice President for Academic Affairs
- Deans
- Department chairs and assessment coordinators receive a link to electronic feedback
- EIU's Assessment website – www.eiu.edu/~assess

CASA and CASL distribute yearly a 1-page executive summary of Assessment by Graduate Programs within each College. The following constituents will receive verbal and/or written explanations from members of CASL regarding the executive summary report and well as a reminder about the website containing the full reports.
- Council on Academic Affairs (CASL chair, CASL CAA rep, CASA executive director)
- Faculty senate (CASL chair, CASA executive director)
- Council of Graduate Programs (CGS CASL representative)
- College Assessment Committees/Faculty from each college involved in assessment (CASL college representatives)
- Academic Council of Chairs meetings for each college (CASL college representatives, CASL chair or CASA executive director)
- Council of Deans (CASL chair and CASA executive director)

Assessment of EIU's Undergraduate Academic Programs

Student Learning Objectives

Responsibility for assessment of academic programs (majors and minors) at Eastern Illinois University is decentralized. Based on feedback from the Higher Learning Commission, CASL has set a goal that each undergraduate program will assess at least three of the four undergraduate learning goals at the departmental level. Academic departments/units are responsible for assessment of student learning at the program level under the oversight of the academic deans. The departments/units and colleges may organize their assessment programs in the manner that they determine will best improve student learning. Some departments, for example, may have a special committee for assessment of student learning while others may include assessment as part of the responsibilities of the curriculum committee.

Assessment Measure and Methods

Although the organizational structure may differ among departments, every department/unit/program should have an assessment plan designed to improve student learning. The plan should include the following elements:
- Student learning goals and objectives;
- Assessment measures;
- Assessment procedures;
- Analysis and reporting of assessment data; and
- Use of the assessment data to improve student learning.

Programs submit an annual assessment summary in June to the Director of the CASA. When programs reach a mature level of assessment for several years, they may move to a 2-year reporting cycle.

Results

In addition to the annual summaries, departments must also complete a program review at least every 8 years. In support of the Board of Higher Education's statutory responsibility to "review periodically all existing programs of instruction, research, and public service at state universities and to advise the appropriate board of control if the contribution of each program is not educationally and economically justified," EIU is required to review each of the review process is to improve the quality and productivity of individual academic programs and units of research and public service. Results of the review are expected to provide the basis for planning and budgeting decisions. (Additional information about program reviews is available at www.eiu.edu/~acaffair.)

CASA develops an undergraduate assessment report which contains information about the types of measures made by undergraduate programs (papers, oral presentations, labs, surveys, etc), percentage of undergraduate program primary trait level ratings for each section of the assessment report, and the percentage of programs adopting and measuring undergraduate learning goals (writing, speaking, critical thinking, global citizenship).

CASA and CASL develop a 1-page Executive Summary of Assessment by Undergraduate Programs within each College. The executive summary shows mean scores from the EWP

instructor ratings, Watson-Glaser critical thinking composite score, instructor ratings from the speaking rubric, as well as the number of graduate learning goals adopted by each program, and the primary trait analysis level rating for each section of the undergraduate program's assessment report. The average for the college and the university are summarized within the executive summary.

Expectations
Regardless of the structuring of assessment within the academic departments/units, faculty must play a central role. At minimum, faculty must be involved in establishing learning goals and objectives, developing assessment measures, and using the assessment data to improve student learning. Specific expectations for each program will be addressed.

Feedback Loop
Feedback about program assessment results should occur systematically within the department.

The Executive Director of CASA gives feedback to the program and provides complete reports to the VPAA and deans concerning progress, measures, and adoption of undergraduate and graduate goals. Progress is determined based on the University-devised primary trait analysis found on the assessment website (www.eiu.edu/~assess). Past assessment summaries and the latest year's written feedback are also available at this website.

Feedback of the CASA and CASL reports include:
CASA distributes copies of the entire Undergraduate Program Assessment report to:
- Committee for the Assessment of Student Learning
- Vice President for Academic Affairs
- Deans
- Department chairs and assessment coordinators receive a link to electronic feedback
- EIU's Assessment website – www.eiu.edu/~assess

CASA and CASL distribute yearly a 1-page executive summary of Assessment by Undergraduate Programs within each College. The following constituents will receive verbal and/or written explanations from members of CASL regarding the executive summary report and well as a reminder about the website containing the full reports.
- Council on Academic Affairs (CASL chair, CASL CAA rep, CASA director)
- Faculty senate (CASL chair, CASA director)
- College Curriculum Committees (CASL college representatives)
- College Assessment Committees/Faculty from each college involved in assessment (CASL college representatives)
- Academic Council of Chairs meetings for each college (CASL college representatives, CASL chair or CASA director)
- Council of Deans (CASL chair and CASA director)