

Aug. 1, 2008

To: Dr. Timothy Greene, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs  
Dr. Eileen Evans, Vice Provost for Institutional Effectiveness

From: Dr. Thomas Kent, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences  
Dr. Alex Enyedi, Associate Dean, College of Arts and Sciences  
Dr. Susan Stapleton, Associate Dean, College of Arts and Sciences

Re: 2006-07 Assessment Report

The College of Arts and Sciences comprises 25 departments or units through which programs are currently offered. This document consists of **1) a discussion summary, which is based on the evidence provided by the department/unit on the implementation and use of assessment data, and which indicates how assessment data is being utilized to improve programs; 2) the identification of exemplars of best practices; 3) an indication of which departments/units may be reviewing/revising their assessment plans in 2008-09, 2009-10 and 2010-11; 4) a summary of ways the college has addressed challenges cited in the Jan. 10, 2008 letter from the provost; 5) the evidence to show that during 2007-08 resource allocation supported the work of faculty in assessing student learning and fostering of a culture of assessment; and 6) an outline of the goals of the college for supporting departments/units in implementing their assessment plans in 2008-09.** The chair's memorandum to Dean Kent as well as the full assessment impact reports for the departments/units can be found in separate documents.

### **1) Implementation and Use of Assessment Data**

The College of Arts and Sciences had a total of 143 curriculum changes during the 2007-2008 academic year. Of these, 97 were at the undergraduate level (35.2 % driven by assessment data) and 46 were at the graduate level (30.4 % driven by assessment data). If one carries out the calculations on assessment driven curriculum changes discounting those that were simple course deletions or title changes, then 80% of the college's curriculum changes at the undergraduate level and 52% of the changes at the graduate level were based on assessment. We are proud of the way the departments/units within the college of Arts and Sciences have embraced the use of assessment and have made outcomes based decisions regarding curriculum.

### **Africana Studies:**

While Africana Studies Program has had an approved assessment plan since 2004 this is the first assessment report for the program. In 2007-2008 academic year, two major areas were evaluated, content knowledge and course pre-requisites.

To assess content knowledge, survey questionnaires were utilized and administered to all students in the classes as numbers of majors are too few to gather significant data. Results preliminarily indicate that expectations for content knowledge are being reached, however, communication opportunities for students were limited. Focus groups were utilized to evaluate the impact of pre-requisites on enrollment in

courses taught in Africana Studies and it was found that the pre-requisites, in particular those pre-requisites not taught in Africana Studies, limited enrollment. Discussion regarding this will take place this fall.

### **Anthropology:**

The faculty implemented the use of assessment with students obtaining the B.A. degree by addressing a number of specific outcomes. Feedback from the assessment is provided to the chair and the departmental curriculum committee. As indicated in the 06-07 assessment report, senior surveys were implemented in 07-08, however, sufficient data has not been obtained yet to be able to draw any conclusions.

To date, the department has taken no specific actions as a result of their assessment data. They are, however, in the process of revising curriculum, in part due to assessment data, by reviewing course sequencing and through grouping courses into cognate areas or foci. Additionally, the current assessment outcomes continue to indicate that they need to look carefully at the teaching of ethical issues in anthropology and to what degree the students have command of analytical methods. Tracking of this will continue during 2008-09.

### **Biological Sciences:**

In the department's original assessment plan, all programs (undergraduate and graduate) were proposed to be evaluated through a number of different assessment measures of specific outcomes. While they have not specifically deviated from their assessment plan, it is proving to be too complicated and cumbersome for efficient implementation and to obtain full faculty participation, thus they are planning to revise during the next academic year.

The department has however utilized the outcomes of the assessment plan to begin to revise the departmental majors, particularly with the goal of creating greater flexibility and diversity of offerings for our Biology majors. Specifically, to put greater emphasis on evolution and provide more animal biology offerings at the intermediate course level. Additionally, two curriculum changes at the graduate level were assessment based.

### **Chemistry:**

The department has an American Chemical Society (ACS) approved program at the undergraduate level which ensures high standards and quality education in the discipline. Assessment data is collected and evaluated not only for the ACS approved program but for all programs within the department. The data averages that have been collected for the past three years indicate that students at the undergraduate level are meeting or exceeding most measures. One area needing attention at the undergraduate level as noted in the assessment data is in problem solving where the students consistently fall below the 70% success rate. Alumni surveys have also indicated that graduating students don't feel they can effectively communicate orally in the chemical sciences.

The main issue at the graduate level appears to be with the Masters program. The students fall below the established 70% success rate in critical thinking, writing ability, and the ability to summarize results. The difference between Master's and Doctoral

students may be due to the time they are in the program but more data is needed to fully evaluate. Outcomes of the seminar class will be re-evaluated to address these issues.

### **School of Communication:**

This year represents the fourth year in which the school has participated in programmatic assessment. For the 2007-2008 academic year, the following were assessed: all majors for knowledge outcomes; in the organizational communication, public relations, and interpersonal communication programs, competence in oral communication (COM 1040 only) was measured; in the media production and journalism programs, professional and written communication was assessed. This fall, the third full assessment of our non-professionally-oriented programs (organizational communication, public relations, and interpersonal communication) will occur. With several years of assessment data now collected, a report to the faculty in the School of Communication will be presented in September 2008 and a strategy for utilization of the data will be developed. This feedback is also used to help drive mission and set long-term goals for the school.

In general, the data have indicated strong student learning relative to the outcomes identified. Two issues remain from previous years to resolve: in assessing students' knowledge of communication theory in COM 2000, the pre-test scores on some items are still above 50%, indicating additional revision is necessary and an additional item addressing freedom of expression is still needed.

This past year the school reviewed the current assessment plan and considered potential improvements. In the area of professional communication competence, which is evaluated for all majors on an every-other-year basis, it was decided to phase out 'pre' and 'post' data collection that takes place in one semester in the same course, as a longer period of time is needed to assess the development of students' professional skills in our program(s). A commitment to reworking the rubrics employed to evaluate writing, professional communication competence, and oral communication competence is in place to provide more detailed information about students' strengths and weaknesses.

### **Comparative Religion:**

Faculty members in the Department of Comparative Religion have recently renewed their commitment to implementing their assessment plan to ensure the success of their students. Faculty have participated on the College Assessment Committee and have met with assessment experts on campus. This year represents the first year where data was collected and an assessment report prepared. Although this effort is in its infancy and a couple more years of data collection will be needed to drive programmatic improvements, the department has already realized that the original plan did not include measures to assess the progression of skill development from the freshman to the more advanced student and this information is desired to be able to understand the student's mastery of the subject matter. The department will be working with the College and University Assessment Committees, and Karen Stokes to revise the plan to meet their current needs and to begin to implement the use of TracDat.

### **Economics:**

The Department of Economics began a new three- year cycle of assessment in the Spring 08 semester. In this new cycle, the number of criteria assessed were reduced to ensure that a complete meaningful data set is generated upon which to base future curriculum changes. Assessment data will be collected from the period of spring 2008 to spring 2010. Based on the analysis of the previous three years as indicated last year, a second writing-intensive class for undergraduates was created. Discussions are underway to create two new tracks in the MA program designed to enhance the department's ability to recruit students and to enhance their employability. Compact planning resources have been provided to move in this direction. These two concentrations are in the areas of statistics/econometrics and economic development, both of which are existing strengths of the department.

### **English:**

The English Department is continuing to follow its commitment to self-assessment with a focus on majors and minors in English. The three primary outcomes for all English majors include a) students demonstrating critical knowledge of the history of the English language and its literature and to discourse critically b) students demonstrating the ability to write effectively and c) students demonstrating the ability to do effective research. Exit surveys and self-assessments of graduating students along with analysis of writing at entry level and exit level courses are used to measure the outcomes.

The department has found that its methods for gathering the data are only currently partially satisfactory in assessing the minimal expectations of the department and that drawing conclusions from the data regarding the three stated outcomes are not forthcoming. Thus, the work of the assessment committee in 2008-2009 will be to strategize on how to revise the assessment procedures to make them meaningful and appropriate, seeking better validity and reliability than previously available.

### **Environmental Studies:**

The program has been following the approved assessment plan, collecting data for four of the original 10 learning outcomes. Instruments are being developed for the remaining outcomes. Data collected to date contrasts students in their introductory courses with students finishing capstone courses and results indicate substantial growth by the students during their course of study in the program.

### **Foreign Languages:**

The department's assessment plan was implemented in 2005 and contained rubrics established according to the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) proficiency guidelines. Gathering of assessment data on graduating seniors in its three majors, French, German and Latin continues. Results indicate that graduating students perform well according to the measurements used, however there is interest in updating the plan in several ways:

- expand the French and German assessment to more precisely evaluate cultural as well as linguistic knowledge;
- incorporate oral proficiency (pronunciation) in the Latin assessment plan;
- formalize the use of student focus group input.

Discussion this year will revolve around ways to move forward with expanding the plan.

**Gender and Women's Studies:**

Assessment has been in place for a number of years and in general based on the outcomes measured the program is successful in meeting its objectives for student learning and generates a high level of student and alumni satisfaction. One area noted for improvement is in increasing the student's research abilities and an advanced session in library and archival skills has been added in the 3000 level courses. Additionally, given that the courses are primarily staffed with part-time instructors or graduate students, efforts in the last year have been placed on discussions with instructors on standardization of the expectations for the learning outcomes within a given course to ensure the ability to compare data sets.

**Geography:**

Departmental learning outcomes were assessed in eight courses, three at the graduate and five at the undergraduate level. Assessment methods included multiple choice questions, essays, and term projects at the graduate level; and multiple choice, true-false, term projects, and oral presentations at the undergraduate level. A very high or high level of proficiency with regard to content and methodology was obtained at the graduate level for all outcomes measured.

At the undergraduate level, most students achieved a high proficiency, although in Geography 3830 there was disparity between the proficiencies measured by exams and those by term projects suggesting a need to review assessment objectives and course objectives to ensure alignment. Also at the undergraduate level, the Travel and Tourism major was revised based on assessment. The revisions included adding a course in tourism planning and development that builds on core knowledge and expands into theories of tourism as an economic activity. Based on assessment results, other courses within this major have also been revised through the curriculum process.

**Geosciences:**

The department began the assessment process in 2006 primarily with courses that satisfied the general education requirement and has extended into relevant courses in the majors programs in the last year. Primary methods used are course embedded measures, exams and student surveys. The department is still in the collection phase but preliminary findings suggest that prerequisites may need to be expanded in some entry level courses to ensure student success and in some advanced offerings, students need a more guided approach to understanding and critiquing current research.

**History:**

The History Department began several years ago, as part of a regular assessment, a review of its curricular offerings and requirements for each of its majors and minors: Liberal Education, Public History, and Secondary Education. The assessment process revealed numerous problems which included delays in timely completion of the degree, inadequate historical skills development, and incomplete content knowledge. To remedy the problems identified, the faculty undertook a complete revamping of the curriculum to enhance the academic rigor of its programs, offer a more coherent progression of courses to help students develop necessary skills and knowledge, and eliminate roadblocks to

timely graduation by enhancing the choice of courses to meet requirements. To accomplish this, changes to the major and minor tracks and in the content of required courses were initiated in 2007-08 and are scheduled to be complete by 2009. During last academic year, 21 curriculum changes based on assessment were approved. Highlights of the changes include the combining of entry level courses to help majors learn to think like historians, introducing 3000-level writing-intensive courses covering relatively broad geographic or chronological topics, and developing 4000-level topical courses that not only meet the university's baccalaureate writing requirement but also build and expand the students' ability to communicate in the field.

Assessment at the graduate level has revealed graduate students making "Inadequate/Adequate" progress toward completion of their degrees. The graduate curriculum will be reviewed with an eye to enhancing the academic rigor of our program, offering a more coherent progression of courses to help students develop necessary skills and knowledge, and eliminating roadblocks to timely graduation by enhancing the choice of courses to meet requirements. The assessment tools to evaluate graduate education will be reviewed in 2008/09 to ensure the appropriate data is being collected.

### **Mathematics:**

An Assessment Plan for the Department of Mathematics was only fully developed in the 2006-2007 academic year, and approved at the university level in the fall semester of 2007. The department has spent the year developing instruments and rubrics for assessment and has begun collecting data for its majors. Additional rubrics still need to be developed and their reliability tested. The use of NCATE assessments in the secondary teaching major continues. The department is confident that several procedures are now in place to ensure the beginning of the regular use of course imbedded instruments and the collection of data.

### **Medieval Institute:**

The Medieval Institute has an assessment document dated 10/06/2006 that sets out seven objectives of its MA degree program in Medieval Studies as well as seven desired student learning outcomes. Fully developed instruments and rubrics for the collection of data have not been completed however results from a student survey indicate that for the most part, Institute MA students are satisfied with the quality and availability of courses and extra curricular activities that contribute to their successfully attaining the MA degree. Two areas noted for improvement included the development of an additional core course to introduce the history of the Middle Ages and the restructuring of a core course to allow for more and rigorous discussion. With changes in leadership of the program over the past couple of years, the Institute will be holding a Fall retreat funded by the College to address curricular reform. Part of this retreat will also be to review the outcomes and objectives to ensure they are still appropriate for the program and if so put into place a means to implement the plan.

### **Mallinson Institute for Science Education:**

The faculty in MISE are still in the process of developing assessment tools for the MA program and plan to have end of course evaluations that measure specific course outcomes such as enhancing student understanding in four professional areas: models of

teaching and learning, the history and philosophy of science, the history and philosophy of science education, and science education curriculum. Student surveys for measuring how the program meets expectations will also be employed. Development of outcomes for the doctoral program has yet to begin. They anticipate doing so during the academic year of 2008/2009.

Program review at both the masters and doctoral level has been ongoing. Results from last year's review indicate that the MA program is not sustainable in its traditional delivery format. Students are looking for more online offerings and the Institute has begun working with ATIS and EUP to move in this direction. For the doctoral program, there is reason to believe that the omnibus "science education" degree title does not adequately represent the variations within the doctoral program and that this is a potential detriment for students on the job market.

### **Philosophy:**

The department's assessment plan as written has not been implemented for sometime as outcomes of courses and programs as well as expectations have changed. This year the department will be reviewing and revising the plan to more closely align with goals. This will include the development of a plan to assess the undergraduate major.

Outcomes that have been measured include rigor of program at the graduate level to ensure the quality production of M.A. level students as well as timely completion of degree. Results indicate that placement of M.A. students into high quality Ph.D. program continues attesting to the quality and rigor of their degree. Timely completion is reasonable although recently the number of incoming students has been slightly reduced to ensure program completion within a two year period.

### **Physics:**

The department continues to assess five outcomes with regard to the LEC Physics major, and four relevant to the Secondary Education Physics major. The results, in general, show the outcomes are being met, however sample size is relatively small to draw accurate conclusions. Weaknesses in our secondary education program continue to appear. Last year, the revamping of both SED major and minor programs was approved but will only take effect this year, with an entirely new hands-on course being taught for the first time this coming Fall. A minimum of two to three years of assessment data collection will be needed to understand the impact of this change.

### **Political Science:**

The department continues to embrace the process of assessment for programmatic improvement and utilization of the data collection tools such as TRACDAT. The department has completed four rounds of surveys of graduating seniors and eleven of the fourteen assessment findings indicate progress and performance that exceeds the baseline objectives outlined in the original assessment plan. Although the sample size is still somewhat small, there appear to be only three areas where student responses suggest a need for improvement: political participation, communication skills, and library research skills. Course cap sizes on a few upper level courses have been changed through the

curriculum process to address some of these issues. Learning objectives will be revisited when the assessment plan is reviewed during the year.

**Psychology:**

The faculty fully participate in and embrace the process of assessment for programmatic improvement and utilization of the data collection tools such as TRACDAT. In the Fall of 2007 and Spring of 2008, a fourth round of assessment data were collected in six of the seven core required courses at the undergraduate level. Evaluation of performance on areas such as student intellectual foundations, application of principles, use of technology and communication skills, and development of research skills was conducted. Additionally, a fourth round of data was collected to evaluate the performance of students in practicum courses in three areas: assessment and analysis of important problems, ethical behavior, and effective intervention practices. In general, the measures indicate excellent success for our undergraduate program with most of our measures achieving or exceeding expectations. A couple of areas have been identified as not meeting standards including language/cognition competency and the faculty hope to be addressing this through the curriculum process this fall.

**Sociology:**

Assessment activities were carried out according to the department plan. The major finding is that students are doing well across the indicators and goals we assess including students having a solid working knowledge of current social issues and sociological theories. Data indicate that some problems exist for students in research methods, particularly in the utilization of methods in original research. The faculty committees responsible for theory and methods are reviewing these results to address these issues. This fall a faculty meeting will be led by the assessment committee to undertake a next steps discussion with regard to assessment.

**School of Public Affairs and Administration:**

During the past several years, PADM has worked to revise the masters and Ph.D. curriculum, including the curriculum for three of the MPA concentrations and for the Graduate Certificate in Non-Profit Leadership. These changes were driven by assessments conducted as part of our NASPAA accreditation self-study and subsequent site visit. The Ph.D. revisions were driven by the Graduate Program Review assessment process. All of these curricular changes, ten in total, have been approved and take effect in Fall 2008. The assessment plan will be reimplemented to begin to evaluate the new programming.

**Spanish:**

Previous assessment results had indicated that students were not meeting expectations in written and oral expression. Assessment rubrics utilized were adapted from the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) proficiency guidelines. These rubrics were re-evaluated and changes in delivery of assessment instruments were made to ensure that Spanish majors were being reached. Measurement of student performance in the past two years is now satisfactory, although sample size is somewhat small. Data will need to be collected for a couple more years to fully evaluate.

## **Statistics:**

Outcomes for both the undergraduate and graduate program will continue to be measured to increase sample size to be able to interpret findings. Findings are reported to faculty for discussion. No changes are anticipated to the assessment plan.

## **2) Exemplars of Best Practices**

The College of Arts and Sciences encompasses a wide variety of programs and majors that span the disciplines of humanities, social and natural sciences. This breadth and diversity of programming presents us with a variety of challenges to ensure high quality delivery as well as to appropriately assess this multitude. Last year the College Assessment Committee was reactivated. In addition to being a venue for departments and programs to evaluate their assessment plans and share ideas on implementation and enhancement of those plans, the committee was charged to begin to assemble a best practices/lessons learned document that would be distributed college wide. Initial discussions centered on practices utilized to best inform, i.e. what measures produced the most meaningful data. Independent of discipline the following appeared to surface as the most widely used and most informative.

1. Course embedded measures that assess course specific and cumulative knowledge leading to significant expertise in the field:
  - a. Pre-test/post-test questions to assure knowledge retention.
  - b. Knowledge embedded questions that assess outcomes of a particular course as well as integrated material within and across the subject matter.
2. Use of incremental approaches to build effective communication skills (writing and speaking) and research approaches in the discipline.
3. Generation of student portfolios to demonstrate accumulated expertise.
4. Student surveys that address most meaningful/helpful aspects of education for placement.

The History Department this year, based on several years of assessment data that was derived in part by utilization of some of the best practice measures described above, undertook a complete revamping of the curriculum to enhance the academic rigor of its programs, offer a more coherent progression of courses to help students develop necessary skills and knowledge, and eliminate roadblocks to timely graduation by enhancing the choice of courses to meet requirements. Highlights of the changes include the combining of entry level courses to help majors learn to think like historians and develop a grounding in the field, introducing 3000-level writing-intensive courses covering relatively broad geographic or chronological topics, and developing 4000-level topical courses that meet not only the university's baccalaureate writing requirement but also build and expand upon the students ability to communicate in the field.

## **3) Departments/units that maybe Reviewing/revising their Assessment Plans 2008-09**

Biological Sciences  
Comparative Religion

English  
History  
Philosophy

**2009-10**

Communication  
Medieval Institute  
Political Science  
Psychology

**2010-11**

Chemistry  
Geosciences

**4) Challenges Addressed**

In the Jan. 10, 2008 letter from the Provost to the Dean regarding the College of Arts and Sciences 2006-2007 annual report on the measurement of student learning outcomes for ongoing program improvement, the three challenges for the College, listed below, were identified. The ways in which the College is addressing each challenge is indicated in italic.

1. Monitoring of departments in nascent stages of implementing assessment plan.  
*Although by 2007, all departments within the college had University approved assessment plans, several of the departments had not begun to implement those plans during the 06-07 academic year. Others as indicated in the 06-07 report were just beginning to develop and implement assessment rubrics. During the 07-08 academic year, newly appointed Associate Dean Stapleton began holding individual meetings with chairs or directors whose departments had not been carrying out assessment activities or were in these nascent stages. Strategies were developed and University and College expertise was identified to mentor and work with these departments. Dr. Stapleton will continue to hold meetings with departments and units at these nascent stages to monitor progress.*

2. The integration of assessment into the compact planning process.  
*In the Jan. 28, 2008 email to department chair's Dean Kent provided the 2008 compact plan guidelines that departments should follow. The following text is copied from those guidelines demonstrating the integration of assessment into the compact planning process. As a result of this, resource allocation for initiatives in the college will begin to be tied to assessment.*

*“Previously, you were asked to provide the following for each of your Compact Plan initiatives:*

- a short title, so we can easily refer to it.*
- a very specific description of the initiative and what the initiative will achieve in programmatic terms (not in resource terms), and how and why it is important to the unit and/or to the university.*

- a description of the impact or outcomes to be enjoyed by students, faculty, staff, external client, or other user. State outcomes in specific, measurable terms.
- a short discussion and itemized budget for the initiative, if funding is required
- a schedule for the completion of the initiative

***For this year, please include—only for your new initiatives—a short assessment statement that supports “how and why [the initiative] is important to the unit and/or to the university” (see bullet #2 above). By “assessment statement,” I mean only a few sentences in the description of each new initiative that provide support for the need of the initiative, and this statement should make clear why the initiative is needed. More simply, we need concrete evidence based on some sort of assessment that the initiative is truly “important to the unit and/or to the university.” ”***

3. Attention to the assessment of graduate programs where there has been none. *The Departments or units within the college are all at varying stages with regard to implementation of assessment plans. For some, graduate programs have been assessed along with undergraduate programs (ex. Biological Sciences and Geography). For others only the undergraduate programs (ex. History) or graduate programs (ex. Philosophy) have been assessed. This year the College Assessment Committee will begin to work with those departments (ex. History) that have completed several years of data collection and understand the use of assessment rubrics for programmatic revision to begin to develop and implement their assessment plan of their graduate programs.*

## **5) Resource Allocation Supporting a Culture of Assessment**

The College of Arts and Sciences embraces the opportunity to work with departments/units to foster a culture of assessment. The use of assessment data can have a substantial impact on improving the programs and majors offered within the college and across the University, and are linked to our core values. Resources supporting a culture of assessment within the college include both personnel time and monetary allocations.

Associate Dean Stapleton will continue to work with faculty and department chairs on the implementation of their assessment plans as well as coordinate the College Assessment Committee and other activities in support of assessment. For example, a workshop is already planned in Oct. for all department chairs and key faculty involved in assessment to better understand the value of assessment. Additional activities are planned to familiarize departments with TRACDAT.

Monetary resources have been committed to departments or units either struggling with implementation of assessment or with the adaption of new assessment methods. For example, with changes in leadership of the Medieval program over the past couple of years, the Institute will be holding a Fall retreat funded by the College to address curricular reform. Part of this retreat will also be to review the outcomes and objectives to ensure they are still appropriate for the program and if so put into place a means to implement the plan. Additionally, support has been provided to Chemistry to initiate a

new program with innovative teaching methods (use of clickers) and have joined C2R (Colleagues Committed to Redesign) and NCAT (National Center for Academic Transformation) two nationally accredited programs that will assist in the assessment process for this new technology. And in Political Science resources have been allocated in support of initiatives that support the experiential learning outcomes of their students such as the mock trial program.

#### **6) Goals for Supporting Departments/units Assessment Plans in 2008-09**

Many of the goals for supporting departments/units assessment plans in 2008-09 are similar to previously established goals of the college. Assessment planning and implementation requires a great deal of faculty and staff time and effort and we continue to applaud the work of our colleagues throughout this process.

In 2008-09, the goals of the College of Arts and Sciences will be:

- To provide a more visible presence on the College webpage for the College Assessment Committee and the activities related to assessment.
- To continue meetings between the College of Arts and Sciences dean and associate deans with departments/units during 2008-09 year to discuss the importance of assessment in compact planning, not only with regard to justifying curriculum improvements and changes but staffing/hiring requests and recommendations.
- To continue the College of Arts and Sciences Dean's Award to recognize faculty/departments contributions toward assessment. During this past year, the Departments of Political Science, Psychology and Sociology received this award.
- To continue through its Advising Office, college wide assessments. These assessments will gauge effectiveness of advising overall in the college as well as specifically the experiences of freshman and transfer students within the college. These data will be invaluable in helping the college understand and make adjustments to offer the best student experience at WMU, and in turn serve as an effective retention tool.
- To develop assessment measures for planned college activities. For example, the College of Arts and Sciences will be hosting for the first time a new faculty orientation. An assessment tool will be developed and implemented to gauge the success of the orientation. Use of assessment/evaluation instruments at College activities will help to demonstrate the College's commitment to the process.