

**COLLEGE OF LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND THE ARTS
REPORT FOR NCA REACCREDITATION:
ASSESSMENT OF LEARNING IN GENERAL EDUCATION**

DECEMBER 1999

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|-------------|---|-----------|
| I. | Introduction: Assessment in the College of Literature, Science and the Arts | 3 |
| II. | Current Activities and Plans: College-level Learning Objectives and their Assessment | 4 |
| III. | Best Practices in Learning Assessment: Department and Course Profiles..... | 11 |
| IV. | Undergraduate and Graduate Program Assessment Plans..... | 19 |

COLLEGE OF LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND THE ARTS
REPORT FOR NCA REACCREDITATION:
ASSESSMENT OF LEARNING IN GENERAL EDUCATION

DECEMBER 1999

I. Introduction: *Assessment in the College of Literature, Science and the Arts*

The learning objectives for general education in the College are embodied in the requirements for the BA and BS degree and in the various special programs that the College supports to assist students in meeting those requirements and completing their degrees. Similarly, the learning objectives for graduate education are embodied in the degree requirements for advanced degrees. The College makes assessment of these objectives and programs an integral part of its work in two ways. First, all faculty and graduate student instructors in the College take as a central part of their mission the ongoing evaluation of student work and the improvement of curriculum and pedagogy to insure effective student learning. Faculty perform these functions in every course they teach, whether through classroom assessment methods, student course evaluations, conferral with students and with other faculty in related courses, or consultation with assessment specialists in the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching (CRLT) or elsewhere in the university. Our faculty's commitment to excellence means that they regularly strive to know whether students are achieving their educational goals, and use information gathered about student learning and curricular performance to enhance instruction and programs.

Second, the College supplements the efforts of the faculty by regularly assessing program performance and student learning with regard to particular learning objectives. This is accomplished through special committees and task forces that look at broader sources of data such as student surveys and focus groups, grade and testing data from targeted courses and programs, graduate admissions performance and testing data, program reviews, course syllabi and instructional portfolios, and focus groups of student advisors, student services staff and program staff. College committees and task forces regularly use data from all of these sources to work with faculty and programs in order to respond to the needs of students, drive curricular change and improvement, and monitor the effectiveness of those changes.

The tone of these specialized and focused assessment efforts was set in large part by the broad-based, sweeping review of undergraduate education in the College completed in 1990 by the Planning Committee on the Undergraduate Experience (PCUE) and the follow-up reports from 1991 conducted by the Central Committee on the Undergraduate Experience (CCUE) and its various subcommittees. These subcommittees looked at assessment data from a wide variety of sources, focusing on four areas: Pedagogy, the Preconcentration Years, Academic Advising, and Graduation and Distribution Requirements.

More recent examples of LS&A's use of assessment as it relates to several of the major learning objectives of the College's general education requirements are given in the following section. They represent the pattern of regular and ongoing assessment that results from the College's deep commitment to improvement of instructional programs and student learning in all areas of general education and at all levels of student work. They also illustrate the many ways in which the results of the College's assessment efforts are acted upon with new and enhanced curricular and program initiatives, and how those initiatives increasingly have future assessment mechanisms built in at their inception.

Following this overview, profiles of several College departments provide in-depth views of particularly rigorous and comprehensive approaches to learning assessment linked to curricular and pedagogical innovation. The final section of the report includes the individual contributions from College departments and programs providing overviews of their learning assessment plans.

II. Current Activities and Plans: *College-level Learning Objectives and their Assessment*

1. *Area Distribution and Academic Minors*

The College places a strong emphasis on curricular breadth as an essential component of every student's liberal arts education, and has long used an area distribution requirement to ensure that students attain this breadth. Assessment of student attainment of this objective and the effectiveness of the requirement centers, in an ongoing mode, on the informal data collection of the general academic advisors. Advisors work closely with first and second year students as they choose and reflect upon the courses that they use to fulfill the requirement, providing a built-in form of one-on-one assessment of the quality of instruction and curricular breadth provided in each course. Advisors regularly provide feedback of this information to the College Curriculum Committee through the Director of the Advising Center, who serves as their representative member of the Committee. Since the Committee has responsibility for certifying the individual courses that meet the requirement it thus, in turn, provides feedback to faculty and is in a position to use the information learned from advisors to suggest curricular improvements to individual faculty members.

The College has also conducted more intensive assessment of the Area Distribution requirement in recent years. Recommendations from the Planning Committee on the Undergraduate Experience (1990) led to a Subcommittee on Graduation and Distribution Requirements, whose report in 1991 utilized data from student focus groups and transcript analysis to suggest that the existing patterns of distribution courses needed to be modified. This information was employed by the College Curriculum Committee in 1995 to redesign the Area Distribution requirement, consolidating three different plans into a single, simplified plan to make the educational goals of the requirement more transparent to students. The Committee also reassessed each of the courses certified to meet the requirement, resulting in a renewed faculty focus on, as well as an increased student awareness of, the objectives of the requirement itself and the ways in which individual courses contributed to it.

A further outcome of the assessment performed by the Subcommittee on Graduation and Distribution Requirements was its recommendation that the College explore the possibility of introducing Academic Minors into the curriculum. In 1998 a task force on academic minors was convened for this purpose. This group collected data from more detailed and targeted student focus groups, transcript analysis and faculty and academic advisor focus groups to determine that two of the learning objectives of the Area Distribution requirement were not being met by students. These were the objectives of attaining some measure of subject matter coherence within breadth of study, and of gaining interdisciplinary learning experiences. The task force found that students would benefit from an incentive to create coherent groupings of distribution courses along thematic and interdisciplinary lines, and thus recommended that academic minors be created as a mechanism to provide this incentive. The faculty immediately acted on these recommendations by approving, in the Winter of 1999, the introduction of optional academic minors into the curriculum. The College Dean's office has made an additional commitment to build ongoing assessment mechanisms into the academic minors program. These mechanisms will include, initially, the gathering of data on the numbers and types of students who choose to complete minors and the curricular "distance," or breadth, of those minors from the students' concentrations.

2. *Concentration*

The concentration, or learning in depth about a recognized body of knowledge within the structure of a department or area studies program, lies at the heart of the liberal arts education in the College. Assessment of this learning objective rests with the individual departments and concentration programs,

and is accomplished through their own internal curricular assessment mechanisms (discussed elsewhere) and through regular departmental reviews conducted by the Dean's Office. These reviews consist of an internal self-study, a visit from an external review committee whose charge specifically includes inquiring into undergraduate education, and finally the provision of feedback to the department of the findings of the external review committee and the related input of the College Executive Committee.

3. *Quantitative Reasoning*

This degree requirement was created as a direct result of an assessment effort and students' quantitative learning has been continually assessed since then. The CCUE initially recommended the establishment of a quantitative reasoning requirement, and a follow-up task force on Quantitative Reasoning corroborated that recommendation and suggested a structure for the new requirement. The CCUE had conducted a survey in 1990 of over 700 students in the College, in which nearly half of the upper-class students self-assessed their mathematical knowledge and skills as either "poor" or "fair." The task force then analyzed data from the Registrar on student course elections in the College and found that only 75% of students had completed at least one course containing significant quantitative methods content during their undergraduate careers. The Quantitative Reasoning (QR) Requirement was created to address these student learning issues.

Since the creation of the QR requirement, the College Curriculum Committee has conducted regular reviews of courses designed to satisfy the requirement. These reviews, which look at course syllabi as well as examples of student exams and assignments, represent the primary form of ongoing assessment of the requirement. More detailed assessment of student learning has been conducted as part of the effort to evaluate the reform of the first-year Calculus sequence. Calculus is one of the most common courses elected by students to meet the QR requirement, and the pedagogy of Michigan Calculus has undergone a significant transformation beginning in 1991. Since then, the Calculus Reform assessment effort has produced three reports (1993, 1994 and 1996). The results of these assessments have been regularly reported to the mathematics faculty who, in turn, have used the information not only to further improve teaching and learning in the Calculus sequence, but in many other introductory-level mathematics courses as well. Finally, the Math Lab, a self-help mathematics tutoring center, also performs a continuing learning assessment function by conducting gateway testing for students in introductory mathematics courses. The data from student performance on gateway tests are provided in aggregate form to course instructors for better articulation of learning expectations and instructional effectiveness. Details on these assessments are presented later in this report, in the "best practice" profile of the Mathematics Department.

4. *Race and Ethnicity*

In 1990 the College introduced a race and ethnicity (R&E) requirement for students, with the stated educational goal of providing for students, as part of their liberal arts education, opportunities to gain an intellectual understanding of the meaning of race, racism and ethnicity and racial and ethnic intolerance and resulting inequality in the U.S. or elsewhere, and comparisons of discrimination based on race, ethnicity, religion, social class or gender. The content of the requirement called for courses on race, ethnicity, racism and discrimination, which could facilitate students gaining this understanding.

From the time this requirement was first approved by the faculty, it was mandated that the Dean regularly appoint committees to review all aspects of the requirement. In 1995 the review committee produced a comprehensive report for which assessment data were gathered from a number of sources, including course enrollment and student grade data, student course evaluations, a written survey of students (conducted by Student Government), student focus groups, and interviews with faculty, graduate student instructors and student academic advisors. Among its findings and recommendations, this committee

determined that a systematic outcome assessment of the R&E requirement involving pre-post testing should not be undertaken, due to the prohibitive costs and the clear indications from existing data that the requirement was working very well.

Thus, ongoing assessment of the R&E requirement consists primarily of regular reviews of individual courses by the Curriculum Committee. These reviews entail scrutiny of course syllabi and student writing assignments, with feedback provided to instructors to insure that the course pedagogy is appropriate to the requirement.

5. Foreign Language

The College has traditionally placed a strong emphasis on language study as an essential component of a liberal arts education, and requires all students to attain proficiency in a second language at the level of a fourth-semester LS&A course. Courses approved to meet this requirement are regularly evaluated both by the College Curriculum Committee and by faculty in the language departments to assure that student learning in the courses meets the minimum level of proficiency intended by the College.

In addition, three special committees have recently addressed the effectiveness of language instruction in the College. The First Year Experience Project (1995) used student focus group data to evaluate, and recommend the improvement of, teaching in the introductory language courses. This preliminary finding was reinforced in the following year by a more intensive assessment effort that focused exclusively on foreign language study, conducted by the Joint Faculty-Student Policy Committee. This group convened for two semesters in 1996, collecting data from focus groups with students and faculty in foreign language courses, academic advisors, and from a general survey administered to a sample of students throughout the College. The findings and recommendations stemming from this assessment were reported back to the College Executive Committee and Curriculum Committee, as well as to chairs, faculty members and instructors in language departments.

Resulting improvements from this feedback have included: better coordination among faculty regarding course curricula at different levels of instruction, particularly in the Romance languages; expansion of services offered at the Language Resource Center to assist student learning; enhancement of efforts by advisors and by instructional staff to convey the value of foreign languages in order to improve students' motivation for learning; increased support for faculty involvement in introductory language instruction; development of community service learning opportunities in language instruction; expansion of opportunities and rewards for foreign language study across the curriculum (LAC), particularly in the German and Romance Languages departments; development of separate language instruction tracks that offer specialized courses in subject areas of student interest, particularly in Arabic and German. Most recently, a College task force on language learners and language teachers (1998) has addressed the strengths and needs of language instruction at the University through informal assessments and a panel of faculty and students, and is currently developing a set of proposals to enhance language learning.

The Language Resource Center (LRC) also regularly conducts assessment of students, both with regard to their utilization of and satisfaction with the Center's services, and with regard to overall language learning in their courses. Data are gathered through usage statistics and student satisfaction surveys, as well as through first-hand contact of Center staff with students as they use the resources in the Center to work on their course assignments. Information thus gathered about student learning is fed back to language instructors for the improvement of classroom teaching and curricula through the Center's regular workshops for faculty, graduate student instructors and introductory language course coordinators. These workshops provide a mechanism for the Center's staff to discuss assessment results with instructional staff, allowing them to work on ways to improve both instruction in the classroom and resources and services provided in the Center.

Finally, since the Language Resource Center employs a wide range of instructional technology, it has begun planning for participation in the AAHE Flashlight Program, which has been licensed for use on campus by the University's Information Technology Division. LRC plans to use the Flashlight Current Student Inventory to further direct its own surveys, interviews, and focus groups for assessing teaching and learning in the foreign languages through technology.

6. *English Composition, Effective Writing/Presentation Skills*

The College views writing as playing a critical role in students' thinking and learning. The requirement for English Composition includes a first year introductory composition component and an upper-level writing requirement designed to provide students with valuable instruction in advanced writing in the disciplines. The Sweetland Writing Center shares responsibility for assessment of student writing with the faculty throughout the curriculum.

The Center recently decided to discontinue the assessment of writing portfolios of incoming students (began in 1994), after evaluation of the program showed low outcomes in terms of student placements relative to the high resources demanded by the assessment process. Placement into an appropriate writing course is now based on student self-assessment, allowing students to select the course that will most appropriately challenge them. Through the Center, Writing Workshop instructors are available to help students make this choice. The Center also conducts regular assessment of student writing through writing workshops and peer tutors programs, and seeks feedback on students' satisfaction with, and utilization of services through surveys.

The Sweetland Fellows program is one mechanism for providing feedback to instructional staff in the departments. This program annually brings faculty and graduate student instructors from many different units in the College together for a semester to work with leading composition specialists on central issues bearing on writing in the curriculum. The fellows then return to their units where one of their teaching assignments is a writing course.

Advanced writing in the disciplines is currently the focus of a collaborative assessment project between the Sweetland Writing Center and the Center for Research in Teaching and Learning. Findings from focus groups with students, faculty and graduate student instructors, as well as analysis of course syllabi and student writing portfolios, will be used to determine how best to encourage effective teaching and learning of writing at the upper undergraduate level.

7. *Natural Sciences as an Area Distribution*

Through the Area Distribution Requirement the College seeks to instill an understanding and an appreciation of the major areas of learning in the liberal arts. Students are expected to develop a coherent view of essential concepts, structures, and intellectual methods, which typify each major discipline. The Natural Sciences comprise one of the area categories. Students are required to complete a minimum of 7 credits in the Natural Sciences, and have the option of completing 3 additional credits in this area, to apply towards the full 30-credit Distribution Requirement.

Courses approved to meet this requirement are evaluated by the College Curriculum Committee and by faculty within the science departments. Assessment of student learning and of advancement within each scientific discipline is addressed primarily through the departmental assessment mechanisms. (See Section 4 for summaries of these assessment approaches). The profile of the Biology Department's recent curricular assessment and reform of its introductory biology sequence, also included in this report, is illustrative of departmental approaches to learning assessment for major curricular reform.

The Science Learning Center also plays a significant role in learning assessment for students in the sciences. This center is an interdisciplinary resource center in LSA to support teaching and learning in

the five natural science departments: astronomy, biology, chemistry, geology, and physics. Center staff members collaborate closely with faculty to provide customized and commercially available resources such as computerized science labs, reference books and videos closely aligned with the course curricula and learning objectives. The center regularly gathers feedback from student users regarding the usefulness of these learning resources and the academic support services provided. Students in the large introductory science courses may also participate in study groups sponsored by the center. The study group program offers students the opportunity to work in small groups with peer group leaders, who in turn are directed by group coordinators working closely with course faculty. This structure ensures that the focus of the study groups is well coordinated with the course content, sequence and exams. The center regularly conducts focus groups with student participants and group leaders as a means of assessing how effective the groups are and what the impact of group participation is on students' learning, confidence with the material, and interest in continuing in science. This structure also has the potential, to be explored further, of learning assessment feedback directly to course faculty regarding the experiences of students in the study groups with the course material, allowing faculty to make adjustments in their teaching.

One additional mechanism for learning assessment via the center is through the graduate student instructors who regularly work with students at the center through office hours. Being at the center gives these instructors direct contact with the students' learning progress and challenges. The center is exploring ways to build in systematic feedback mechanisms for input to the course instructors and for more collaboration and communication regarding student learning across the graduate student instructors assigned to the same course.

8. Successful Transition, Academic Engagement and Retention

The College provides a rich set of programs, resources and academic support services dedicated to helping students successfully accomplish the transition from high school to the university, become academically engaged in their studies and thrive in pursuing their scholarly interests. These resources include writing-intensive seminars targeted specifically for first year students, sponsored undergraduate research opportunities, residential colleges and living learning programs to bridge academic and residential life, academic skills enrichment work and advising programs. Assessment of the effectiveness of these programs encompasses a diversity of methods and data sources, including the College's external review process, surveys of students and alumni, student focus groups, and measures of academic performance, retention, and graduation. The results of these evaluation efforts are incorporated into program refinements, expansions, and new initiatives, as the examples below illustrate.

First-Year Seminar Program

The First-Year Seminar program arose out of recommendations of the PCUE report as one means to provide a more intimate learning experience for first year students. The seminars, with a maximum enrollment of twenty students, are designed to foster close student-faculty interaction, engage students in intellectual inquiry, and provide students with opportunities to develop their critical thinking, academic writing and verbal expression. The seminar topics are wide-ranging and accessible to students without prior background in the subject matter, and represent all of the academic disciplines in the College as well as fields in other schools/colleges at the University.

Regular assessment of the program was built in from its inception. For example, data on enrollment patterns, instructor ranking, student course evaluations and matched control group comparisons of student grade point averages were used both in 1995 and 1997 program evaluation reports. On an ongoing basis, the program encourages faculty to use midterm evaluations as a form of assessment. Composite student course evaluation data and grading data are available to the departments and the First -Year Seminar

Program office. Faculty discussion groups also provide an informal means of assessing the seminars and making refinements during the semester.

Undergraduate Research Opportunity Program (UROP)

Open to first and second year students, this program creates research partnerships between faculty members and students, with the explicit goals of fostering retention, academic integration within the university, and academic success. Peer advisors, learning skills workshops, research symposia and guest lecturers are some of the features of the program which facilitate student involvement and learning in the university research environment. In light of its success to date, efforts to expand UROP opportunities to third- and fourth-year students are in the planning stage.

UROP employs a multi-faceted and comprehensive ongoing evaluation to student impact and to identify areas for program improvement. Through research funding from the U.S. Department of Education's Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, UROP is conducting an in-depth five year quantitative and qualitative evaluation of the program's effectiveness in improving undergraduate teaching, student retention, and academic achievement. This research is based in part on comparisons of student outcomes for UROP participants vs. carefully selected control groups of students. Survey instruments, student focus groups, a post-graduation study and a beeper study of student behaviors are among the approaches used in research aimed at determining what aspects of the program are critical to student success. The UROP research is also seeking to identify how the program influences faculty participants, especially as it relates to their understanding of diverse students, appreciation of multiculturalism, and attitudes toward involvement of first- and second-year students in research.

Residential Colleges and Learning Communities

These programs provide a small college atmosphere and coherence to students' curricular, co-curricular and social experiences, as students explore and become integrated into the life of the larger University. The University offers entering students a number of different innovative programs, each with unique themes and features, yet sharing the commitment to support students in their academic and social transition. Exposing students to meaningful interaction with faculty and upperclass students, intellectual and social diversity, civic engagement, the arts, and service learning are priorities for these programs.

Assessment of the impact of the learning communities, including the residential programs, on students' learning and their subsequent experiences at the University has taken many forms. The College's external review process applies to several of these programs, including the Residential College, the Lloyd Hall Scholars Program and the Honors Program, and includes in-depth self studies. A second form of assessment of student outcomes was conducted in a formal research study by Professor Claude Steele (now at Stanford University), who focused on the academic achievement, longitudinally, for black and white students, comparing participants and non-participants in one of the residential learning communities. The encouraging results of this early research, which showed positive impacts on retention rates, grades, and graduation rates, and a clear reduction or elimination of the achievement gap between black and white students, have been influential in the University's expansion of learning communities for students.

In its role as a leader in the development of learning communities, the University in 1996 sponsored the fourth annual National Conference on Residential Colleges and Living-Learning Communities. This forum provided the opportunity for informal assessment and learning through interaction with program directors, faculty and students from 50 colleges and universities. Campus-wide task forces and survey instruments have also been used to assess the impact of learning communities on students, and in particular, on academic achievement and retention rates. Most recently, an extensive research project

exploring the academic, intellectual, social, and environmental outcomes of student participants in eight living-learning programs at the University was completed. This project leveraged the assessment expertise of faculty at the School of Education and solicited the input from the entire 1998-99 undergraduate residence population, which allows comparisons of participating vs. non-participating students. Plans to continue this study on an annual basis will provide further insight into the influence of program participation over time, and the impact on new cohorts of living-learning students. As new programs are launched, they will include evaluation instruments in their program designs.

Comprehensive Studies Program (CSP)

Entering and continuing students can obtain several different types of academic support through the Comprehensive Studies Program, including skills enrichment, academic advising, mentoring, and a summer bridge experience. CSP regularly employs assessment of academic progress for CSP students, comparing their grades with those of students in other programs. Personal assessment focuses on students' adjustment to the University community and is based on CSP advisors' discussions and interviews with students about such matters as interpersonal relationships, external pressures, and developmental issues. CSP course instructors use data from student course evaluations in their course refinements. CSP also regularly tracks graduation rates for students in the program, using this data to monitor and improve program effectiveness.

Academic Advising

LS&A academic advising shares with teaching faculty and departments the task of facilitating the student's academic path through the College by encouraging intellectual curiosity, informed decision making, self-assessment and the assumption of self-responsibility. Students meet with their academic advisors initially during the orientation period, and are encouraged through outreach to continue to meet with the advising staff periodically. Advisors work proactively to maintain the contact and relationships with students throughout the academic year, anticipating their needs and questions, as they begin to define for themselves their own educational goals. Through such means as email, face-to-face appointments at the advising center and outreach sessions in the residence halls, advisors continue this support, informing students of the educational requirements and of campus programs and resources related to study skills, career explorations and study abroad opportunities, for example. Typically first- and second-year students most often see general academic advisors. Once they declare a concentration, they then consult with concentration advisors for assistance in shaping and focusing their academic goals.

Over the last several years the College has steadily increased the number of general academic advisors in relation to the size of the overall student population. In 1994, the ratio of academic advisors to first-year students was approximately 1 to 300. In 1998, the ratio was one academic advisor per 175 first-year students. During this time frame the profile of the advising staff has also shifted, from a mix of many

part-time advisors, comprised of graduate student instructors, faculty members and professional advisors to the current staff of primarily full-time, professional advisors.

Assessment of students' satisfaction with advising begins with their orientation experience. As students complete orientation they are asked to give feedback through an on-line survey about their sessions with advising, and this information is used for immediate follow-up, as needed, and for longer term planning for orientation and training activities for the following year. Focus groups of first year students, once they have been on campus for some time, provide additional input to the academic advising center about orientation, publications and advising activities. Building on the CCUE work in the early 90s, plans are currently in development to establish streamlined data collection and assessment as part of the advising center's operations.

9. Preparation for Social Participation and Citizenship

The College supports the University mission of developing leaders and citizens who will challenge the present and enrich the future. Hence, the College has a responsibility to prepare students for social participation, civic engagement and productive contribution in an increasingly diverse, multicultural society. One of the strengths of the University environment is the richness and diversity of curricular and co-curricular opportunities within and beyond the College for students to develop these leadership and collaborative skills. Experiential service learning, community outreach, and education, both theory and practice, in intergroup relations are each a strong example in the College of such opportunities. Through assessment of student learning through these offerings, the College can make better informed decisions about the contribution they each make to undergraduate learning and the relationship between experiential learning and the classroom.

Outreach experiences linked to academically accredited courses are available in several of the academic departments, including Psychology and Sociology, and through UROP, for community-based research. Assessment of how such experiences impact student learning and development is typically built into the student course evaluation process. Student input in journal and paper assignments also provides insight into learning outcomes. Periodically, formal evaluation research is conducted to assess the student, community, and institutional impacts of community service learning. One example is an assessment underway of the current outreach work funded by the Kellogg Foundation involving UROP and the Detroit Initiative, a program that provides opportunities for students and faculty to engage in further education, scholarship and service with community based organizations in Detroit. For example, for the Detroit Initiative program, the quasi-experimental design of the research allows comparisons to identify the impact on students' civic-mindedness of different types of multicultural education.

The Inter-group Relations, Conflict and Community Program (IGRCC) offers undergraduate courses in inter-group relations, inter-group dialogues, and conflict resolution, and training in these areas for undergraduate course facilitators and residence hall advisors. Faculty from eight LS&A departments and three other schools/colleges now teach in the program.

One of the earliest goals of the IGRCC program has been to evaluate the effects of the program on student learning, and since 1990, IGRCC has carried out evaluation studies for programmatic change and for contribution to the literature on inter-group relations. A quasi-experimental field study, in 1990-91 looked at the effects of the IGRCC over time through a campus-wide survey given initially to all incoming first-year students, and later at the end of their first semester, and during their senior year. Comparisons of participants and non-participants were done, with the groups matched on several dimensions including ethnicity/race, gender, and residence status. The research questions focused on the students' understanding of the social structural factors associated with racial inequalities and poverty, intellectual engagement, willingness to consider multiple perspectives, and political interest and engagement.

More recently, research has examined the effectiveness of dialogue groups and the processes by which dialogue groups achieve change. The external review committee, which recently evaluated the program, cited the evaluation efforts as a model for other departments and programs within the university. It also recommended the addition of graduate student research assistant positions to provide support for more systematic data collection, allowing IGRCC to do more of its own program evaluation and outcome assessment. In the following section, the profile of Project Community, an academically accredited service learning course, illustrates several additional ways in which student learning outcomes are assessed in experiential courses that have an outreach component.

III. Best Practices in Learning Assessment: *Department and Course Profiles*

Profiles of five departments and one course in service learning showcase how learning assessment is at the heart of improvements and innovation in pedagogy and curriculum in the College. We have selected examples from each division of the College to convey the range of approaches the faculty take in these assessments.

Department of Biology

The introductory biology course for students planning to concentrate in biology serves as the introduction to the discipline for 1100 students yearly. The department's recent assessment and restructuring of the teaching of introductory biology provides an excellent example of the multi-faceted and thorough assessments that College departments undertake in the process of curricular reform.

For several years the Department of Biology has been involved in making a series of major changes in the way its faculty members teach biology. Such modifications in the undergraduate curriculum are necessary to keep pace with the rapid changes in the field. The changes in the curriculum focus on the structure of the concentrations, upper division courses and undergraduate research opportunities. The most recent aspect of these changes addresses the major restructuring that Biology has launched for its 100-level and 200-level courses designed for concentrators.

A committee of faculty members charged with assessing the introductory course sequence met for over a year on this task. The scope of the committee's work included comparing the course sequence with the introductory sequences at other institutions, identifying the major objectives of an introductory biology sequence, evaluating the success of the existing sequence in meeting these objectives, identifying major problems with the sequence and presenting the faculty with a set of recommendations.

The committee explored the structure of the introductory biology programs at 17 different institutions, including large public research universities, private research universities and liberal arts colleges. To evaluate the success of the existing course sequence, course evaluation data and enrollment figures were considered. In addition, students in middle- and upper-level biology courses who had taken the course sequence under consideration completed a customized questionnaire about introductory biology. Faculty and graduate student instructors who had taught the relevant courses in previous years participated in a series of focus groups designed to get their input on the strengths and weaknesses of the course, the classroom atmosphere, and the role of the lab component. Separate focus groups were also held for undergraduate biology concentrators. The questions for the students inquired about their expectations for the course sequence, whether they found the courses interesting, their preparedness through this course for more advanced courses, and their perceptions of the role of the lab component of the course.

The final report of the committee provided different options to the faculty for the reform of introductory biology. The faculty adopted one of these plans with strong support. The major changes in the revised curriculum include using a more active learning model and shifting the focus of the course towards the nature of biological inquiry. Rather than have the introductory course be a thorough survey of all major

biological subject areas, the faculty decided that the course should focus intensely on key topics and the nature of inquiry in the discipline. The goal of the revised course is to develop students who understand how biological knowledge is generated. A one-semester course model integrating lecture, lab and discussion replaces the earlier two-semester course sequence. The discussion section is an addition, and the teaching model has also shifted from a team of faculty to a single lecturer model.

The goals of these changes are to strengthen the integration of the course topics for the students as well as to provide them with the opportunity to integrate material learned in lecture and lab with more general issues of how biological knowledge impacts on the rest of society. Learning assessment methods have also been revised, based in part on student input, to include more written work and to be less dependent on multiple choice exams, which the students viewed as impediments to their learning.

The changes in this first course for biology concentrators require a number of other changes to the biology curriculum. These have been studied thoroughly as well, with implementation underway, to ensure for the students both continuity and cohesiveness across the levels of the curriculum.

Department of Germanic Languages and Literature

Over the past few years, German has transformed itself from a traditional “language and literature” department into a radically interdisciplinary German Studies program. The department's recent appointments have been interdisciplinary in the strongest sense: most hold degrees in fields other than or in addition to German, and are jointly appointed with other units such as History, Comparative Literature, Architecture, Film, Political Science, and Sociology. One colleague holds a triple appointment in German, Film, and Architecture.

This fundamental transformation of the faculty has enabled the department to effect a thoroughgoing transformation of its language program over the past five years. Every course in the first six semesters of the sequence was redesigned from the ground up. Having watched enrollments in traditional German programs drop precipitously all across the country, faculty surveyed the department's own undergraduates extensively, and entered into an ongoing dialogue with the high school German teachers who send to the university the most students in order to learn how best to address the problem. The department quickly learned that reading “canonical” literature was only one of many reasons why students chose German. It also became clear that students were impatient with the “communicative” method, which trades intellectual content and grammatical precision for a kind of easy, low-level fluency. Students wanted to be able to use German in their studies and their careers, not just as tourists or literary scholars. Thus German replaced its single, generic “language and literature” concentration with a number of thematically coherent German Studies Sequences that allow students to acquire in-depth knowledge in the following areas: Business and Law, Conversational German, Film, Gender Study, History and Culture, Linguistics and Language Pedagogy, Literature, Mathematical and Scientific German, Music and the Visual Arts, Philosophy, and Politics and Society. Concentrators are encouraged to elect courses in at least three different sequences, and at least three courses within one of the following sequences as a way of attaining breadth without sacrificing depth.

The department has worked hard to maintain its contacts with both teachers and students at the high school level. It continues to host German Day, with competitions in many categories, as it has now for fifteen years. This ongoing opportunity is then supplemented by many visits to high school classrooms by members of the faculty, during which they promote the study of German, advertise the strengths of their program, and introduce students to a sample of collegiate German. The department is especially eager for high school students to see that it will be possible for them to study very specific kinds of German (math and science, business, music) that will provide them with valuable – even marketable – skills. German has also invited both teachers and students to campus regularly, and hopes to do more of this in the future. Over the past summer, German was able to create a permanent position for a colleague

who has done much of this outreach work over the past few years, and to make working with the high schools a major part of his job description.

The department was instrumental in creating the College's Language Across the Curriculum (LAC) Program, which was established to provide opportunities for students to use and enhance their language skills while studying in subject areas of interest to them outside of "language" departments, and to develop a heightened awareness of international issues in all fields through the use of primary and secondary sources studied in their original languages. These LAC courses do not focus on language instruction per se, but instead regard language as a tool of intellectual inquiry.

The introductory German language sequence likewise seeks to supplant the traditional, generic language curriculum with an array of offerings intended to create more specific competencies. To this end, the department attempts to provide a maximum in intellectual content as early in the language sequence as possible, and more generally to take taking advantage of the cognitive advantages adult language learners have over children more generally. Thus the first three semesters of German already feature a series of videotaped lectures by distinguished University of Michigan German studies faculty on culture, history, economics, philosophy, music, linguistics and literature, televised over MTV.

The keystone of the language sequence is German 232, in which students complete the four-term introductory language sequence by selecting one of several "special topics" courses intended as an introduction to the study of an academic discipline. In Winter 1999, the department offered the following array of German 232 sections:

Jacob and Wilhelm Grimm: Their Lives, Scholarship, and Collection of Fairy Tales

The German Conception of History

Contemporary German Society.

Mathematical and Scientific German.

Cultural Anthropology in German.

Topics in Music: Mozart and the Magic Flute

Classics of German Literature

German Art History: Visual Expressionism.

Students should emerge from the course prepared and motivated to do work (or read for pleasure) in German in this field throughout their academic career and beyond. The department receives direct feedback on the effectiveness of such courses in two forms. Students taking courses that are part of the Business German sequence, or who elect Mathematical and Scientific German, typically find internships the following summer(s). The department goes to great lengths helping its students help in finding internships in German-speaking countries. It attempts to find jobs that match students' abilities, interests, and career choices, ranging from auto companies to biotech firms to law offices and an art auction house. Engineers have found jobs at Porsche, BMW, Volkswagen, and Audi. Most internships are three-month, paid summer positions. German also works with the International Cooperative Education Program (ICEP), which has an excellent track record placing students. The department is in close contact with the various firms offering such internships, and hears in great detail about its students' level of linguistic preparation and ability to function effectively in a German-speaking country more generally. It takes these comments very seriously, and is constantly restructuring the language sequence in response. The other kind of immediate feedback German receives is from faculty teaching students in the various LAC options (independent study, add-on sections, etc.). Such courses provide very practical tests of students' abilities. Again, such feedback is taken very seriously, courses are modified accordingly. The percentage of applicants who succeed in landing the internship of their choice, and the rate at which business request

another intern from the department for the following summer, provide rough quantitative measures of effectiveness in an area that is otherwise difficult to quantify.

Department of History of Art

In 1998 the History of Art Department received an award from the College in recognition of its contribution to the Undergraduate Initiative. This recognition focused on the extensive, sustained efforts the department has undertaken since 1995 to fundamentally redesign the undergraduate curriculum and transform its approach to the undergraduate experience. In this redesign work, faculty members have reached out to include graduate students and undergraduates both in the departmental self-assessments and in the curriculum reform. A number of intensive surveys as well as a multi-day workshop have been part of the assessment approach.

The reform has three major, interrelated components. First, the faculty members have revised the fundamental aim of the undergraduate study of art history. This included developing a mission statement that defines the discipline in terms of teaching goals. Subsequent work on the articulation of the curriculum has attempted to keep it aligned with the mission. This work has also involved researching peer programs' curricular requirements and recent reforms.

Secondly, the department has thoroughly revised the goals, objectives and assessments of courses at each level in the undergraduate curriculum, from the introductory, 100-level survey courses through the 400- and 500-level courses. This scrutiny has also led the faculty to establish and record (1) the competencies and knowledge, (2) the format, topics, and skills of written work, and (3) the research skills each student is expected to achieve. One of the purposes of this revision has been to infuse more critical thinking into the curriculum at an early stage and to provide more substantive challenges to the undergraduates. This work has also included a close look at what courses are required to meet the needs of the students majoring in the History of Art vs. the needs of other students taking courses in the department.

The focus on the undergraduate curriculum and the 100 level survey course was facilitated in part by a pedagogy workshop that the department held for faculty members, graduate students and invited honors undergraduates. For the workshop, the department also sought outside expertise by including colleagues from peer institutions that have engaged in curricular change of comparable scope and complexity. A large group meeting and smaller sessions for exploratory discussions on particular curricular topics facilitated the in-depth assessment of the curriculum.

The third component of the curriculum change is the revision of the history of art concentration, including an articulation of the chief aims for the concentration. An intensive series of surveys was conducted, focused on competencies for the concentration. The scope of this inquiry included assessing student desires for new courses, getting input from faculty and graduate students on the levels of courses within the concentration and rethinking how the 100 level courses related to upper level offerings in the concentration. New courses that have been added to the concentration fit well with the new concept of the undergraduate program. At the core of this transformation is the department's commitment to excellence in its undergraduate program and to ensuring that the articulated student learning objectives for the program are achieved.

Department of Mathematics

The core undergraduate mathematics curriculum has been the focus of major innovation and reform coupled with extensive evaluation since the early '90s. This profile focuses on the mathematics program for first- and second-year students. The curriculum reform effort began with the transformation of the first and second year calculus sequence, known as Reformed Calculus. Historically the introductory calculus program had stressed the mechanics and problem-solving aspects of calculus. Reformed

Calculus offers students the opportunity to learn calculus through the exploration of mathematical topics from an integrated perspective, encompassing algebraic, numerical and graphical dimensions, and through interdisciplinary problems relating to real world situations. The new curriculum also provides a course environment promoting extensive cooperative learning and group assignments, verbal and written communication skills, and the use of technology (graphing calculators).

Evaluation of the program has been integral to the revised curriculum since its introduction. The program goals are well articulated and provide the foundation for the assessment of both student and instructor experiences. For the first several years of the program, the evaluation focused on program goals related to six themes: changing students' attitudes about math, improving general academic skills (e.g., critical thinking, collaborative work), improving quantitative reasoning skills, improving calculus learning, improving instruction and improving student retention in math and science disciplines. Extensive surveys, interviews, focus groups, admissions' data, enrollment and grade patterns, and student testing have been part of the evaluation process. Comparisons of faculty and student perspectives and performance in the reformed courses with those in the traditional setting were also conducted. Results of these evaluations have systematically been used to develop and refine teacher-training approaches, to adequately prepare the instructional staff for the demands of the new program.

More recent evaluations have also looked at the relation between class size and student performance, how our students compare in calculus achievement to students at other post-secondary institutions, students' prior calculus experience, entering attitudes and beliefs, students' input on new instructors, and students' career plans. The impact of the new program on students' ability to solve open-ended, less traditional, calculus problems is also addressed.

Systematic evaluation is also fundamental to the department's current redesign of the second-year mathematics sequence. This redesign is based in part on the need to tailor several course sequences to effectively serve students with different mathematical needs, including preparation for work in science and engineering disciplines. An independent evaluation team from the University's School of Education has collaborated with Mathematics faculty to design and conduct the assessments. As new course materials and teaching approaches are introduced in the classroom, input from students and the instructional staff is sought, through surveys, focused group interviews, and student-ratings of instructor effectiveness. One example that illustrates the role of assessment in the curriculum reform underway pertains to a series of presentations highlighting the connection between mathematical topics in the classroom and real-world applications. The presentations were developed primarily as a motivational technique. Results from surveys assessing the presentations' connection to the course and their effects on student learning and interest in mathematics have been used by the instructional team to refine the material. The assessment extends over several course semesters, allowing for longitudinal analyses as well.

The faculty feedback through the focus groups has covered all aspects of the revised sophomore course sequence. Additionally, the evaluation team has access to enrollment and progress information for students enrolled in engineering majors. These data allow student progress to be tracked from the mathematics curriculum into their engineering studies, which provides the opportunity to address areas of possible improvement in the interface between the mathematics and engineering courses.

A third example of learning assessment linked to curricular reform is reflected in gateway testing for the introductory course sequence. The gateway tests cover basic skills students must learn in class before advancing to the next level in the course sequence. The Math lab staff meets regularly with the course instructors about the gateway tests and to examine the types of problems students encounter. In this way, feedback from the Math lab staff is a form of "in-class" learning assessment. It allows instructors the opportunity to immediately review or re-address problems students are having with the material. These meetings also facilitate the articulation between instructors at different levels of math. For example, Math

Lab staff can inform Math 115 instructors that students are struggling with a particular concept in Math 116, so that the Math 115 staff can work on ways to improve how they teach the concept.

Project Community

Project Community is one of the longest running, academically accredited service-learning courses in the nation. Each year more than 600 students combine academic learning with meaningful service in the community. Most students elect Sociology 389: Practicum in Sociology, and choose to serve in education, health, prison, or chemical dependency programs, or with specific populations, such as women, elderly, or the developmentally disabled.

Project Community embraces several different, complementary approaches to learning assessment with the shared goals of enhancing student learning through service learning experiences and adding to the body of scholarly knowledge on best practices in service learning. Periodic intensive assessments through sponsored research allow the course directors to evaluate how well the course meets student expectations and what the impact of the course is on their thinking and sense of citizenship. For example, funding from the Provost enabled this kind of intensive inquiry in 1997, with strengthening of the program and expansion resulting from the evaluation.

Undergraduate student coordinators who have taken the Project Community course serve in an advisory, mentoring role for the currently enrolled students. Each student coordinator works with 10-20 students, leading discussion sections and monitoring the students' site attendance. Assessment of the coordinators' learning and work with the students is based in part on the coordinators' required papers, in which they are asked to reflect on alternative theories of university pedagogy and instruction and on their experiences as mentors and seminar leaders. Analysis of the coordinators' successes and difficulties is taken into consideration as the training program for new coordinators is evaluated and refined yearly. For example, concrete scenarios drawn from the coordinators' experiences are used as problem solving situations in the training.

An extensive data collection effort using focus groups, interviews, and questionnaires was also conducted in 1997 with Provost funding. The scope included student coordinators and their graduate student instructors who have a supervisory role. Several years of student term papers were also analyzed, to identify the kinds of "on the ground" dilemmas coordinators faced and the kinds of skills they felt they had at the outset of their placements relative to the skills they needed to be effective. This information was then used to further refine the training for the student coordinators and for the graduate student instructors, with the goal of improving instruction and students' capabilities through the training. A critical piece of this training is to enable the coordinators to provide a socio-analytic perspective to the students' field experiences, so that the students can reframe what they encounter in the broader sociological and political contexts (e.g., Homelessness is framed as a societal problem rather than as an individual issue).

Longitudinal assessment of the educational impact of service learning through Project Community has also been the focus of survey research with participants, conducted by an independent evaluation team from the School of Education. One brief example of how this research has been used to date pertains to the finding that the course enables students to learn about people who are different from themselves, yet the students are not prepared for this learning. This has resulted in the offering of an annual full day workshop for students, involving community agency representatives, facilitators and faculty members, to more fully prepare the students for working in their field placements. A documentary history looking at the impact of participation in service learning and Project Community on student lives is also in development and will provide yet another rich source of data for further course refinement and enhancement of student learning outcomes.

Department of Psychology

The Department of Psychology was the subject of an external review in 1997. In preparation for the review, the department conducted a self-study, which included a rigorous, intensive examination of its undergraduate program. This scrutiny and the follow-on actions to address programmatic needs are described in this profile as an example of how the academic departments of the College use the review process as a mechanism for curricular and program refinement. In a similar vein, the department's self-assessment of its handling of diversity issues and subsequent approaches to strengthening its capability in this arena are also described.

As part of its internal review, the department consulted its undergraduate student body during Winter 1997, asking students for descriptions and evaluations of their experiences in the department. The primary method of investigation was a survey administered to almost 1000 students enrolled in the department's gateway courses. These courses, required of majors, also include many non-majors. Because they provide entry to the more advanced courses, sophomores and juniors are predominant. In addition, focus groups were conducted with groups of majors and transcript analyses were performed on 150 May 1997 graduates.

Stemming from the self-study and the external review, the department has initiated three major projects to address issues raised and to develop further data sources for ongoing program enhancements. One effort addresses grading patterns, with an intensive analysis underway of five years of grading data across the entire undergraduate curriculum. This study is in response to concerns raised by the external reviewers that the department's grading patterns are higher relative to other College concentrations. A second effort involves the revision of the Honors program, with the goals of strengthening the program in general, increasing the number of students it reaches and improving the continuity of the program between the first two years of Honors and the second two years of Honors, for concentrators. A third project involves the design and implementation of an exit survey to be used with all seniors, and ultimately, with alumni at 1 and 5 years after graduation. The purpose of the survey is to collect feedback about the curriculum and about students' preparedness for employment and graduate educational pursuits.

Continuity within the undergraduate curriculum is also the focus of periodic dialogue among the instructional staff for introductory psychology and for the gateway courses that follow this first course. This internal scrutiny, which the department strives to conduct annually, emphasizes the articulation of learning outcomes for the foundation course and coordination with the gateway courses. The department's increased focus on this is also an outgrowth of the external review.

The Psychology Department has also been a leader on campus in its work to develop a more positive multicultural environment for both undergraduate and graduate students. This work came about in part from a departmental diversity self-analysis. This analysis revealed that both white students and students of color believe that the department's courses primarily followed the traditional universalist model in psychology and that course assignments, materials and lectures rarely covered cultural dimensions of psychological functioning. To address these concerns, the department developed a teaching institute on multicultural content and pedagogy for faculty and graduate student instructors. The institute was designed to engage the teaching staff in the issues of multicultural teaching, to encourage them to make the curricular and pedagogical changes needed to be more inclusive and effective, and to provide useful materials for curriculum infusion. Evaluations of the institute's effectiveness and impact have been very positive. The department is in the process of infusing multicultural work into the introductory psychology and gateway courses. This effort illustrates how the department's self study has resulted in fruitful internal dialogue among faculty and graduate students about the issues of multiculturalism and in the department's commitment to provide resources and work with faculty to improve the multicultural course content and classroom climate for students.

IV. Undergraduate and Graduate Program Assessment Plans

Each department and unit with the College has the responsibility for assessment of the learning objectives for its undergraduate and graduate programs. The plans below, submitted by the academic units, outline the approach, methods and feedback mechanisms each program utilizes in its assessment and curricular improvements to ensure effective student learning

Program in American Culture: *Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan*

Goals

The general goal of the undergraduate Program in American Culture is to enable students to pursue interdisciplinary studies in areas of U.S. society and culture. Our courses integrate a rich array of materials, themes, and approaches from many fields: not only historical and literary study, but also visual studies, musicology, film and media, anthropology, and others. The curriculum of the Program emphasizes the multicultural diversity of American society, paying particular attention to ethnic, gender, and other forms of social difference and inequality. At the same time, it stresses the importance of studying U.S. nationhood, including Americans' (sometimes conflicting) ideals and experiences of what it means to be American. Our courses are designed to explore these issues in both historical and contemporary settings.

Methods of Assessment

1. Evaluation of student work and abilities
 - Undergraduate concentrators in American Culture are required to take both a junior seminar [AC 350] and a senior seminar [AC 496 or 498]. These courses provide students with a shared common scholarly vocabulary for their interdisciplinary explorations and they provide faculty with an opportunity to evaluate the needs and strengths of American Culture students.
 - Honors students in the program are required to write a thesis, which is reviewed by his or her advisor and by another member of the American Culture faculty.
 - Small grants are occasionally given to undergraduate concentrators to celebrate and support particularly compelling and innovative projects.
2. Evaluation of concentration program and courses
 - The program's Undergraduate Committee is involved in a constant process of analyzing and evaluating individual courses and larger curricular issues.
 - All American Culture courses are evaluated with E&E, CRLT, or American Culture course evaluations all of which are studied by the program's Director.
 - All Graduate Student Instructors and junior faculty members are observed in the classroom by peer mentors and/or senior faculty members.
 - The program's Director is regularly involved in informal conversations with other American Studies programs around the country. These conversations produce useful survey information and information about departmental ranking.
3. Evaluation of preparedness for employment and graduate school:
 - The program regularly conducts surveys of our undergraduate population with regard to the job market and how well their studies here prepared them for it.

Feedback Mechanisms

- The program's feedback mechanisms are generally - with the exception of the regular review of faculty teaching evaluations - informal. The program's Budgeted Faculty meets regularly to discuss pedagogical and curricular issues.
- The program also has regularly participated in internal and external reviews.

Program in American Culture: Graduate Program Assessment Plan

Goals

The Program in American Culture's Ph.D. program is designed as a flexible, rigorous interdisciplinary doctoral program which enables students to develop a knowledge both of the field of American Studies and of contributing disciplinary fields. The perspective of the Program faculty and courses is to acknowledge the importance of both attention to specific populations, periods, disciplines, and to an integrative and intercultural perspective. The American Culture Program is a channel for interdisciplinary study and experimentation in the humanities and social sciences. It draws its faculty primarily from History and English, both departments with traditional strengths in the American area. Members of other humanities departments such as History of Art and Communication Studies have long been associated with the Program. Students in the Program also work with faculty in some of Michigan's excellent social science departments, especially Anthropology and Sociology. The Program encourages students who have well defined interests in fields such as law, religion, music, business, and social work to study with faculty from other schools in the University, not only with faculty from the College.

Methods of Assessment:

1. Evaluation of student work and abilities -

- Graduate student work is assessed often and with rigor. At the end of their second year all graduate students must pass their preliminary exams in order to move into candidacy, at the end of the following year they must pass another set of sealed exams in order to move into the dissertation stage. In the dissertation stage students must present a dissertation plan, make a public presentation of their work, and finally defend their dissertation.
- The program regularly acknowledges outstanding work with grants and awards.
- Students are strongly encouraged to publish, perform, and present their work at scholarly meetings.

2. Evaluation of concentration program and courses -

- The program's Graduate Committee is involved in a constant process of analyzing and evaluating individual courses and larger curricular issues.
- All American Culture courses are evaluated with E&E, CRLT, or American Culture course evaluations all of which are studied by the program's Director.
- All Graduate Student Instructors and junior faculty members are observed in the classroom by peer mentors and/or senior faculty members.
- The program's Director is regularly involved in informal conversations with other American Studies programs around the country. These conversations produce useful survey information and information about departmental ranking.

3. Evaluation of preparedness for employment -

- The program prepares graduate students for the job market through informal mentoring and more formal job workshops, mock interviews, and a required dissertation prospectus presentation.

Feedback Mechanisms

- The program's feedback mechanisms are generally - with the exception of the regular review of faculty teaching evaluations - informal. The program's Budgeted Faculty meets regularly to discuss pedagogical and curricular issues.
- The program also has regularly participated in internal and external reviews.

Department of Anthropology: Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan

Goals

The primary goal of the undergraduate program in Anthropology is to provide training in the four subfields of anthropology: biological, archaeological, linguistic, and sociocultural anthropology (ethnology). To accomplish this goal, all concentrators must take at least one course in each of the subfields. In addition, they must take courses exposing them to anthropological theory and research methods, to critical thinking and writing skills, and to lab techniques (in some subfields). A major goal of the undergraduate program is to train students to understand biological, cultural, social, and linguistic diversity through knowledge of specific geographic areas, including contemporary North America.

Objectives

1. Train concentrators in theory, method, and practice of anthropology; provide them with scholarly skills needed to engage in graduate study.
2. Prepare concentrators for a lifelong path of liberal learning, and understanding and appreciation of cultural and biological diversity.
3. Provide non-concentrators with a basic understanding of cultural and biological diversity in time and space, and anthropology's general approach to knowledge.

Methods of Assessment

1. Ongoing evaluation of student work and abilities by faculty, graduate student instructors, and undergraduate advisors:
 - Evaluation of work in seminars at various levels, including first- and second-year seminars, advanced undergraduate seminars, honors sections of introductory courses, and senior seminars for honors students.
 - Senior project (honors thesis) for honors concentrators.
 - Review of writing assignments in upper-level courses, especially in ECB (Sweetland) courses focused on developing writing and critical thinking skills, across the four subfields of anthropology.
 - Instructors' reports on preparedness of students in courses at various levels, in terms of basic knowledge, and thinking, writing, and communication skills.
2. Evaluation of concentration program and courses:
 - Two-year course planning for all faculty, to ensure course availability and sequencing.
 - Ongoing faculty discussion of curriculum in monthly subfield and general faculty meetings.
 - Ongoing analysis of course offerings and concentration requirements by curriculum committee.
 - Analysis of student transcripts by undergraduate advisors and review of course sequencing, offerings, and coverage by chair, associate chair, and curriculum committee.
 - Analysis of CRLT and departmental end-of-semester and midterm student course evaluations.
 - Consideration of programs at peer schools.
 - Use of concentration advisors, e-mail, and anthropology club meetings to question concentrators about opportunities for timely completion of course requirements, professional goals, interest in course offerings, program strengths and weaknesses, and adequacy of advising.
 - Exit interviews with students.
3. Evaluation of preparedness for graduate training and career placement:
 - E-mail surveys of alumni regarding how the program contributed to their preparation for graduate school and/or their current positions/activities.
 - Exit interviews with students.

Feedback Mechanisms

- Ongoing consideration of curricular and assessment issues by undergraduate advisors, chair, associate chair, and curriculum committee and in subfield faculty meetings and the monthly general faculty meeting. Reports by undergraduate advisors, curriculum committee, and subfield chairs to executive committee, subfield faculties, and general faculty.
- The curriculum committee, working with the undergraduate advisors, will conduct an annual review of assessment tools and issues.

* * *

Department of Anthropology: *Graduate Program Assessment Plan***Goals**

The graduate program in Anthropology aims at providing advanced training in, and competence to teach across, the four subfields of anthropology: biological, archaeological, linguistic, and sociocultural anthropology (ethnology), while also providing specialized knowledge of one (or more) subfield(s). All graduate students must take a minimum of five core courses, including at least one in each of the subfields, along with a series of advanced lecture courses and seminars in their particular subfield(s). Graduate courses expose students to anthropology as a career, anthropological theory, and research design and methods, including lab techniques in biological, archaeological, and linguistic anthropology. In addition, graduate students are required to develop research expertise, including language training, in one or more geographic area(s). The graduate program also aims at providing students with the scholarly skills needed to engage in independent advanced research and at preparing graduate students for careers in academic, museum, and applied settings.

Methods of Assessment

1. Annual review of trends in applications, admissions, enrollments, admissions scores, fellowships, and years-to-degree data.
2. Annual departmental meeting to review written and oral faculty comments on all students' progress in the program.
3. Continuous monitoring by advisors, department chair, graduate chair, graduate student services associate, and fellowships committee of student progress, including performance on qualifying exams and language exams, and funding of predissertation fieldwork, dissertation research, and dissertation writing.
4. Annual departmental review of teaching evaluations for GSIs.
5. Regular tracking of job placement of graduates.

Feedback Mechanism

1. Annual departmental review of indicators, and annual reports to Rackham about various aspects of the program.

Department of Asian Languages and Cultures: *Undergraduate Programs Assessment Plan***Goals**

The department seeks to provide undergraduates with a solid training in the languages of Asia at both elementary and advanced levels. Students may study the following languages with departmental faculty: Chinese, Hindi, Indonesian, Japanese, Javanese, Korean, Punjabi, Sanskrit, Tagalog, Tamil, Thai, Tibetan, Urdu, and Vietnamese. The department provides a range of undergraduate courses on the cultures of Asia, both for students who may take only one or two such courses, and for students who wish to concentrate on the study of Asia. Students may choose to concentrate in Asian Studies, Chinese Language and Literature, and/or Japanese Language and Literature. These courses provide students with the skills to pursue advanced study about Asia, as well as with critical thinking tools that they will find valuable in any field they choose to pursue.

Methods of Assessment

- Evaluation of student work and abilities
- All of our concentrators are required to complete a series of seminars that focus on analyzing and synthesizing material. (Asian Studies 381, Japanese 400/401/402, Chinese 471/472/476)
- Our language programs have a strong emphasis on student proficiency. High standards are placed on exact pronunciation, writing style, and extemporaneous conversation.
- In 1998 we administered, for the first time, the Hanyu Shuiping Kaoshi (HSK). HSK is a standardized Chinese Proficiency Test for the assessment of language proficiency of non-native Chinese speakers. It is designed and developed by the HSK center of Beijing Language and Culture University and administered under the auspices of the educational authorities of the People's Republic of China. Offered at three levels – Basic, Elementary-Intermediate and Advanced – HSK is required for admission into PRC institutions of higher learning and serves as a reference for academic requirement waiver or hiring decisions given by the Chinese government. The University of Michigan was the first test site in the United States. Out of the 72 students who took the exam, 65 students took the Elementary-Intermediate exam and 7 took the Basic exam. All of the participants achieved excellent scores and were awarded certificates. The department plans to continue offering this exam to our students for the foreseeable future.
- Annually, the faculty award the Charles and Myrl Hucker Prize for the best essay written by an undergraduate or graduate student in a department seminar. This is an annual chance for the department collectively to examine students' work and evaluate their comparative quality and success.
- Evaluation of concentration program and courses.
- Analysis of student course evaluations.
- Survey of programs at peer institutions.

Feedback Mechanisms

As a result of a recent self-study, the department is currently in the process of designing a committee mechanism that will regularly assess curriculum content and success, and make recommendations to the faculty with plans for improvement.

* * *

Department of Asian Languages and Cultures: *Graduate Programs Assessment Plan***Goals**

The department seeks to provide graduate training at both the master's and doctoral levels in the areas of Buddhist Studies, Chinese Language and Literature, and Japanese Language and Literature. The graduate programs provide students specialized training in their areas, but also require exploration into related areas of Asian Studies. Graduates have the scholarly skills needed to engage in independent advanced research, and are prepared to seek careers in academia.

Methods of Assessment

- Annual review of trends in applications, admissions, enrollments, admissions scores, and years-to-degree data provided by Rackham
- Annual departmental review of teaching evaluations for Graduate Student Instructors
- Annual tracking of job placements of graduates

Feedback mechanisms

- Annual meeting between Department Chair and graduate students, where students' questions and concerns are addressed.
- Annual report to Rackham on the status of program and students.

Department of Astronomy: *Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan*

Goals

To educate students about the nature of objects in the universe and the techniques (both theoretical and observational) used to advance our knowledge of the physical universe. This education includes a descriptive knowledge of astronomical objects: the sun, planets, our galaxy and external galaxies, the techniques used to obtain modern astronomical data and a solid grounding in undergraduate level physics and mathematics.

Objectives

Students completing a major in Astronomy and Astrophysics should have attained the following:

- The ability to present clear written and oral explanations of the physical properties of major classes of astronomical objects and of selected astrophysical concepts and theories.
- A knowledge of the basic operation of astronomical instrumentation including both ground based and space borne telescopes and detectors plus the techniques used to acquire and analyze the data obtained from these instruments.
- A knowledge of the key concepts needed to interpret and analyze observational data to derive the astrophysical properties of astronomical objects.
- A solid knowledge of fundamental concepts in physics, mathematics and related fields.

Methods of Assessment

- Performance in (required) senior level research projects and in a senior level seminar/writing class.
- Exit interviews by the faculty
- Interviews of alumni and alumnae
- Tracking of success in graduate student applications and the employment of former undergraduate students.

Feedback Mechanism

Discussions are held among the astronomy faculty on at least an annual basis concerning the performance of past and present students (using the methods listed above) and perceived changes in the discipline. A standing curriculum committee makes recommendations to the faculty concerning needed modifications to our curriculum. Suggested changes usually concern the content or scope of specific courses; but, as occurred several years ago, can result in a complete redesign of our undergraduate course offerings.

* * *

Department of Astronomy: *Graduate Program Assessment Plan*

Goals

Students completing a doctoral program in Astronomy and Astrophysics should have achieved the following:

- A high level of competency in general astronomy and astrophysics that is sufficient to permit people who complete the program to be able to teach any major topic at an undergraduate level or higher.
- Demonstrated knowledge and skills to carry out independent research in one or more sub-fields of astronomy and astrophysics.
- A demonstrated ability to make oral and written presentations at a professional level and to be an effective teacher at the undergraduate level.

Methods of Assessment

- Performance of students in comprehensive oral and written preliminary examinations.
- Critiques by current graduate students concerning the effectiveness of graduate courses.

Department of Astronomy Assessment Plan, cont..

- Evaluation of (required) teaching and research assistantship work.
- Evaluation of the number and quality of research papers written as graduate students plus those resulting from their doctoral thesis work.
- Tracking of job placement of graduates plus (if applicable) their subsequent professional appointments.
- Exit interviews with departing students and interviews with former students several years after they obtained their degrees.

Feedback Mechanisms

The annual report of the standing preliminary examination committee on the performance of recent candidates is used as a focal point for discussions among the faculty about the quality and effectiveness of both our formal courses plus informal activities such as colloquia. This plus the other sources of information are used to develop new course curricula. Usually, these changes to our program are incremental in nature, although last year an extensive review resulted in the development of a complete new set of graduate courses which are being offered for the first time this year.

U-M Biological Station: *Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan*

Goals

- Provide educational opportunities for undergraduates to learn about living organisms and their inter-relations with the environment.
- Pre-professional training is provided for students interested in careers in the environmental sciences.
- Provide students with intensive experiences studying the performance of organisms in their natural habitats.
- Provide students with experience conducting research in field biology.

Methods of Assessment

Evaluation of student work and abilities:

- Evaluation of common questions on exams
- Evaluation of written papers based on class projects
- Evaluation of oral presentations based on class projects

Evaluation of courses:

- Evaluation of all courses on an annual basis
- Evaluation of all faculty on an annual basis
- Evaluation of all graduate student instructors on an annual basis
- Evaluation of student perceptions, satisfaction and attitudes on an annual basis

Evaluation of preparedness for employment and graduate school:

- Evaluation of the graduate school admissions of all students in programs that are preparing them for graduate study.

Feedback Mechanisms

Regular reports of assessment results to all faculty and all graduate student instructors, with discussion of plans for improvement.

* * *

U-M Biological Station: *Graduate Program Assessment Plan*

The U-M Biological Station does not offer graduate degrees. However, graduate students occasionally enroll in the undergraduate courses and these are evaluated as described in the section on U-M Biological Station undergraduate programs.

Department of Biology: *Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan*

Goals

1. To develop in students an appreciation of the levels of organization of life, its diversity, and the processes by which life has achieved its present form.
2. To provide broad training in the theory and modern research practices in the biological sciences.
3. To prepare concentrators for a career in the health professions, in the field of biology education, or for graduate work in the biological sciences.
4. To provide non-concentrators with an appreciation of the diversity, common themes, and general approaches employed in the biological sciences.
5. To offer research training opportunities in the biological sciences.

Methods of Assessment

1. Annual Department-wide review of CRLT course evaluations.
2. Periodic in-depth evaluation of targeted courses. Most recently, assessment of the introductory biology sequence was conducted using focus groups, surveys, and exit interviews.
3. Periodic in-depth evaluation of concentration requirements.
4. Periodic surveys of Department alumni.
5. Evaluation of work in a capstone seminar course for senior concentrators.
6. Annual in-depth review of biological research conducted by Honors concentrators.

Feedback Mechanisms

1. Annual reviews by the Curriculum Committee with reports and suggestions to the Department at faculty meetings.
2. Periodically, in-depth reviews of specific concentrations or critical courses are conducted by ad hoc committees, which report to the faculty for discussion at departmental meetings.

* * *

Department of Biology: *Graduate Program Assessment Plan*

Goals

1. To provide training in the modern theory and methods in the biological sciences for persons capable of carrying out distinguished scholarly activities and contributing to specialized fields in biology.
2. To prepare students for a career as biological educators or independent research scientists in academia, government, or the private sector.
3. To provide a broad, yet integrated, research experience that trains students to employ a multidisciplinary approach to biological research.

Assessment Methods

1. Annual Departmental review by the Admissions Committees of the applicants, admissions, and trends provided by Rackham.
2. Annual Department review of the students by the graduate training programs (EEOB and MCDB).
3. Annual Departmental review of teaching evaluations of the GSIs.
4. Annual review of candidates by thesis committees.
5. Periodic surveys of the placement of graduates.

Feedback Mechanisms

1. Results from the annual review of students by the graduate training programs (EEOB and MCDB) are reported to the Department and individual faculty.

2. Annual review of applicants and trends in the graduate program by the Admissions Committee are reported to the Department faculty and Rackham.
 3. Annual review of GSI performance is reported to the Graduate Affairs Committee, Department faculty, and individual students and faculty.
 4. Improvements to the graduate program are recommended by the GAC or graduate training programs and discussed in Department faculty meetings and reported to Rackham.
-

Department of Chemistry: Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan

Goals

The undergraduate program in chemistry serves four different populations with different needs. These are (a) concentrators who are going to pursue a graduate degree in the chemical sciences, (b) concentrators who are going to be employed at the B.S. level in the chemical sciences, (c) concentrators who are seeking to pursue another professional goal (Engineering, M.D., D.D.S., education, J.D., D.V.M., etc.), and (d) concentrators seeking to satisfy a general education requirement. This means that three levels of goals must be achieved for students in chemistry courses, with a greater emphasis on general intellectual goals at the beginning of the program gradually shifting to more professional technical goals in the upper level coursework and requirements.

Professional Technical Goals: Students will understand the basic assumptions and facts about how the chemical scientists use nanoscopic particulate and mathematical models to construct explanations and make predictions for observable, macroscopic phenomena. Through some form of independent laboratory work, students will participate in the generation of new knowledge through collaboration, library work, and experimental design, implementation, and assessment, and report that work in written and oral formats.

Professional Intellectual Goals: Students will understand the place of the chemical sciences in the larger picture of the intellectual landscape of inquiry, including connections between science and history, philosophy, semiotics, and ethics.

General Intellectual Goals: Through their study of the subject matter, students will also understand larger epistemological lessons that impact their learning and explanation skills. Through structured group work, students will also develop their psycho-social skills for interpersonal professional relationships, both as leaders and as team members.

Methods of Assessment

- A. Student work and preparation
 - Compilation of peer reviewed work resulting from research activity.
 - Compilation of local and national awards.
 - Compilation of employment or graduate school acceptances.
 - Exit interviews, surveys, and comprehensive examination (2000).
 - Course and teaching portfolios, reflective memos on student work.
 - Capstone course for concentrators: Professional Development in the Chemical Sciences.
 - Requirement for independent discovery work (projects lab or independent research).
 - Participation in Peer Review of Teaching and Learning (2000).
- B. Program and courses
 - CRLT mid-term evaluations.
 - On-going large scale research collaborations with faculty in higher education learning sciences.
 - Faculty retreats.
 - American Chemical Society Committee on Professional Training certification.
 - American Chemical Society national ranking of certified degree recipients.
 - External review committee.

- Alumni Advisory Board.

Feedback Mechanisms

The Associate Chair for the undergraduate program also chairs the Curriculum Committee. This Committee is charged with regularly reviewing and reporting curriculum and student learning issues to the faculty, and for helping faculty develop and refine ideas about the teaching program. Faculty in education and psychology who regularly collaborate with some faculty members in chemistry also rigorously document and analyze experimental data on teaching and student learning and provide formative evaluation for faculty use.

* * *

Department of Chemistry: *Graduate Program Assessment Plan*

Goals

The graduate program in chemistry provides training in theory, method, and practice of chemistry, and specialized knowledge of one or more subfields which include analytical, organic, inorganic, physical, and material chemistry, chemical biology, and chemical education. The graduate program in chemistry serves two complementary goals, the education of future chemical scientists and the education of future chemistry educators. Since over 85% of chemistry Ph.D.s end up employed by chemical industry or government laboratories, the chemistry Ph.D. degree must result in the professional training of this country's chemical scientists. Of the remaining 15%, about half of these are employed in higher education as faculty members (about 8% of chemistry Ph.D.s overall). This group is responsible for all future chemists, chemistry faculty, chemistry teachers, and the general chemical education of all citizens, so a well-educated future faculty is also a paramount concern for graduate chemistry programs. Upon completion of the Ph.D., chemistry doctoral students are expected to be able to design, implement, and assess a program of scholarly or professional inquiry in a fashion consistent with contemporary scientific practice and understanding. They should also understand the epistemological, philosophical, historical, and ethical origins, practices, and consequences of work in the chemical sciences.

Methods of Assessment

- A. Student work and preparation
 - Annual departmental review of trends in graduate applications, admissions, and enrollments.
 - Compilation of GRE and GPA data for new graduate students and review of their proficiency in five areas (analytical, organic, inorganic, and physical chemistry, and biochemistry) of chemistry upon their arrival.
 - Biannual review of graduate students' performance in courses in chemistry and cognate disciplines, seminar, research proposal, and candidacy examinations.
 - Biannual review of teaching evaluations for graduate student instructors.
 - Annual review of graduate students' performance in research.
 - Research presentations by faculty and graduate students at scientific meetings and other universities and colleges.
 - Compilation of local and national awards and selection of fellowship and training grant awardees.
 - Data meetings 3-4 months prior to Ph.D. defense examinations.
 - Public seminars on dissertation research and oral defense on the completed thesis.
 - Compilation of outstanding thesis awards.
 - Compilation of job placement of graduate students.
- B. Program and courses-
 - CRLT mid-term and end-of-the-term evaluations.
 - Annual review of graduate courses by departmental graduate committee and faculty.
 - External review committee.
 - Alumni Advisory Board.

Feedback Mechanisms

- Annual departmental review of indications and report to Rackham about improvements to the program.
 - Review of graduate student training programs by the NIH and NSF.
 - National rankings of graduate chemistry programs.
-

Interdepartmental Program in Classical Art and Archaeology: *Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan***Goals**

1. To train promising students in the history, theory, current practice, and subject-matter of the discipline of Classical Art and Archaeology, and to provide specialized instruction and research opportunities in one (or more) of a range of subfields (currently including the archaeologies of the Prehistoric Aegean, Greece, Rome, Egypt and the Near East, Late Antiquity, etc.)
2. To provide graduate students with the necessary intellectual training and research skills to engage successfully in independent advanced research
3. Prepare students for careers as teachers and researchers in universities, museums and/or other scholarly institutions, as well as for a variety of career tracks (in governmental or private agencies) emphasizing archaeological fieldwork.

Methods of Assessment

1. Evaluation of Student Work and Progress, which includes:
 - An Ancient History exam taken upon entering the Program, to assess current knowledge and to guide future coursework recommendations;
 - Satisfying requirements in four languages (Latin, Greek, French, and German);
 - A thorough and comprehensive review of all aspects of a student's performance and prospects, conducted after completion of three terms, and evaluated by IPCAA's Executive Committee and with input from all faculty who have taught the student;
 - A wide-ranging set of Qualifying Exams (spread over 10 days, usually at the end of the second year);
 - Preliminary Exams in two specialized fields, as a final prerequisite for Candidacy, followed by a detailed dissertation proposal no more than one term later;
 - Annual dissertation progress reports submitted to IPCAA Executive Committee for review, suggestions, and approval.
2. Annual evaluation of Program policies and course offerings, via discussion in IPCAA Executive Committee (which has representation from six contributing departments or units).
3. Annual Program review of trends in applications, admissions, admission scores, and enrollment; the current effectiveness of the Program is summarized in an Annual Report, written by the Director, for the Deans of LSA and Rackham.
4. Annual review of years-to-degree statistics for Program.
5. On-going tracking of job placement of graduates.

Feedback Mechanisms

1. Appointment of student representatives (elected by peers) to represent student issues to the IPCAA Executive Committee and to liaise effectively with staff and curators in the Kelsey Museum of Archaeology (where IPCAA is based).
2. Annual Program review of indicators and report to Rackham on status and future goals and concerns.
3. Ongoing communication between IPCAA Director and the Deans of LSA and Rackham.
4. Reviews of the Program, both internal (Rackham, 1994-95) and external (1996)

Department of Classical Studies: *Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan***Goals**

The Department of Classical Studies covers as its field of study the peoples of ancient Greece and Rome, their languages, literatures, history and monuments. The Department offers undergraduate courses and concentrations in three major areas: 1). Greek and Latin language and literature, 2). Classical Archaeology, and 3). Classical Civilization. In all three of these areas the Department seeks to introduce students to the cultures of ancient Greece and Rome in an integrated manner, placing the literature and monuments in their wider cultural and historical contexts. We seek to offer a range of courses that can serve students who have only a peripheral interest in the ancient world as well as fielding concentration programs that prepare students who wish to pursue Classics as a profession for entrance to the best graduate programs.

Naturally our specific goals vary in the three areas, with greater emphasis placed on the mastery of the languages in our language and literature track, while a correspondingly higher emphasis is placed on historical and cross-cultural contexts in our archaeology and civilization courses. Our goals also vary in relation to those of our students. We have different targets of accomplishment in mind for those concentrators who plan to pursue Classical Studies as a profession and those who do not.

Methods of Assessment

Evaluation of student work and abilities

- Evaluation of work in a required capstone seminar
- Evaluation of language skills in an annual set of competitive examinations
- Evaluation of common integrative questions on midterm and final exams
- Weekly meetings with GSIs in sectioned courses
- Review of theses for honors concentrators

Evaluation of concentration program and courses

- Analysis of course offerings and concentration requirements by UG curriculum committee
- Analysis of student course evaluations
- CRLT mid-term evaluations
- Analysis of enrollment trends
- Investigation of departmental ranking, regionally and nationally
- Survey of programs at peer schools (primarily within the CIC)
- Meetings and exit interviews with concentrators

Evaluation of preparedness for employment and graduate school

- Review of concentrators' graduate school admissions and/or graduate school success
- Survey of alumni on how well the program prepared them for their current positions
- Exit interviews with students

Feedback Mechanisms

- Regular reports to the Department by the undergraduate curriculum committee.
- Regular reports of assessment results to individual faculty, with discussion of plans for improvement.

* * *

Department of Classical Studies: *Graduate Program Assessment Plan***Goals**

On the graduate level we train Ph.D.'s in Classical Studies with the objective of providing them the skills to pursue a scholarly career in Classics and teach in a College or University setting. We also support a Masters in Latin with Teachers Certification (in conjunction with the School of Education) with the goal of providing teachers of Latin for secondary schools throughout the country. We provide 4 of the 7 core faculty of the Interdepartmental Program in Classical Art and Archaeology.

The aims of a professional classicist are the understanding and interpretation of the ancient texts in their original language and the analysis and synthesis of the Greek and Roman cultures on the basis of original texts as well as associated monuments and artifacts. Consequently our primary goals in training our Ph.D's in Classical Studies are:

- to pass on to new generations of students the highly technical language skills necessary to deal with the texts and add to our understanding of the ancient world
- to train these students to interpret the texts in the light of analogies from other cultures as well as in their own historical contexts
- to acquaint the students with recent developments in critical theory in our field and related fields
- to prepare them to teach undergraduates and graduates

Methods of Assessment

- Annual departmental review of trends in applications, admissions, enrollments, admission scores and years-to-degree data provided by Rackham
- Annual departmental review of faculty reports on progress in the program and performances on language, qualifying and preliminary exams as well as progress on dissertations, where appropriate
- Annual review of teaching evaluations for GSIs as well as class visitations by the faculty members supervising the classes in which the GSIs teach
- Annual tracking of job placement of graduates

Feedback Mechanisms

- Annual departmental review of indicators and report to Rackham about changes and improvements in program.

Department of Communication Studies: *Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan***Goals**

The Department of Communication Studies went through a redesign of its curriculum in 1995 that was implemented in Fall 1996. The purpose of this effort was to rationalize and restructure all of our course offerings. In their current form, the department now offers a broad range of courses organized around the concept that mass communication is a powerful and complex set of processes whose forms both shape and are shaped by the social and cultural contexts

Department of Communication Studies Assessment Plan, cont.

in which they occur. Mass communication involves the creation, dissemination, and reception of many kinds of messages. Their meanings structure the ways people and societies understand themselves and their world, as well as their politics, social relations, and identities. In our version of a mass communication curriculum, the study is divided into four broad areas emphasizing scholarship that focuses upon communication structures, processes, contexts and effects.

Several scholarly approaches to media research are represented in the curriculum, including historical, legal, cultural, institutional and effects orientations. The bachelor's degree in communication studies forms an excellent base of knowledge and analytical training for students considering graduate study or professional work involving media relations, journalism, public relations, advertising, or other media-related activities. However, the undergraduate concentration is not intended as specific preparation for professional careers in the media; thus, pre-professional training in journalism, television and film production, and the like are not included among department offerings.

Instructional Goals and Learning Objectives:

In revising the concentration, a careful structure of prerequisites was developed, and a course that satisfied the College's quantitative reasoning requirement was included. A course to introduce students to the university's computing environment and to research opportunities on the World Wide Web was also added.

Undergraduate coursework is designed to help students develop a theoretical understanding of the structure, function, processes and effects of mass communication as a social phenomenon. Through exposure to cutting edge research, teaching, and scholarship, students are equipped with:

- 1) an understanding of central issues in communication studies
- 2) basic knowledge of current research and theory
- 3) a familiarity with major analytical approaches to studying mass communication
- 4) an appreciation of the particular role of the media in shaping mass communication messages.

Methods of Assessment/Feedback Mechanisms

The faculty has been collectively undertaking periodic reviews of how the new curriculum is working and considering adjustments to it. One goal of the changes, outside of intellectual restructuring, was to reduce the number of concentrators. There was an initial sharp decline from approximately 350 concentrators that has risen again and leveled off at about 250. This seems manageable for our current and expected faculty size. We are currently reviewing the two large introductory courses (Communication Studies 101 and 102), and revisions are expected there. The next step will be to look at the four 300-level courses for compatibility and overlap. We will be conducting a survey of recent graduates (under the new curriculum) this fall to assess its impact on their initial employment and career development.

* * *

Department of Communication Studies: *Graduate Program Assessment Plan* (Interdepartmental Ph.D. in Mass Communication)

Goals

The main goal is to provide students with a broad training in mass communication theory and the necessary methodological skills to be able to conduct independent research in the field. Because the area is interdisciplinary, this is an Interdepartmental Ph.D. program (IDP). Students take core courses in the Department of Communication Studies and then develop an individualized curriculum in an area like political communication or social influences of the media from offerings across the graduate curriculum in other departments and programs. The IDP prepares students for careers in academia and as professional researchers in government, private, and not-for-profit research centers.

Methods of Assessment

Student progress is reviewed at several points. The program recently instituted a first-year research project that culminates in a paper and an oral presentation to a seminar. In addition, there is an annual review of progress in conjunction with appointments as Graduate Student Instructors (GSI) and fellowships and research grants; this is the point at which GSI evaluations are reviewed. Students take three preliminary examinations and have their records reviewed in order to achieve candidacy. There is a prospectus defense before dissertation research begins, and a final oral defense of the dissertation.

From a programmatic perspective, there is a Program Committee appointed by Rackham that serves as an executive committee. They review longitudinal data on admissions, retention, progress toward degree, and the like. They also advise on curricular matters. The departmental faculty undertake periodic reviews of the curriculum. For the past two years, we have been reviewing and revising the courses in mass communication theory, increasing the number from 2 to 4 courses. This past summer, a similar review was initiated of the research methods sequence, and a revised pair of courses will be taught for the first time this year.

Feedback Mechanisms

The IDP provides periodic reports to Rackham through the Program Committee, as well as in response to requests from Rackham for specific sets of data. Last fall, the Director of the IDP and Chair of Communication Studies met with the Dean of the Graduate School to discuss the program and the proposed curriculum changes.

Program in Comparative Literature: *Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan*

Goals

A. General goals of the undergraduate program:

The undergraduate concentration in Comparative Literature aims to develop students'

1. familiarity with literatures across national, historical and linguistic boundaries
2. understanding of the centrality of literary theory and cultural studies in different national literatures
3. contact with the greatest range of literary works in the ancient and modern languages and an appreciation of the diversity of literary traditions in a changing world
4. an appreciation of the relationship between literature and the other arts and disciplines in the humanities
5. critical reading and thinking, cultural analysis, and interpretation across the disciplines

B. Desired Learning Outcomes:

1. Base of Knowledge: the concentration in Comparative Literature aims to increase students' familiarity with:
 - major literary theories, forms, and methodologies
 - the history of comparative literature
 - new trends in literary and cultural studies
 - the study of literature in a global context
2. Intellectual skills and abilities:
 - increased skills in analytical reading and argumentation
 - understanding of the interrelationships among several literary traditions and cultures
 - the acquisition of one or more foreign languages

Program in Comparative Literature Assessment Plan, cont..

- the reading of literary texts in their historical and cultural contexts
- the writing of clear and coherent essays
- the use of established methods of literary scholarship including:
 - the use of electronic media
 - the self-conscious understanding of how literature and culture are produced in diverse contexts
 - an awareness of the diversity of the literary experience

Method of Assessment

- end of term examinations
- essays and writing portfolios
- evaluation of language skills
- senior thesis

Feedback Mechanism

- end of term course evaluations
- review of concentrators' admissions to graduate and professional schools
- postgraduate survey of concentrators

* * *

Program in Comparative Literature: *Graduate Program Assessment Plan***Goals**

1. Provide advanced training in the international and interdisciplinary nature of comparative literature
2. Provide students expertise in both areas of traditional comparative literary studies as well as in new areas such as cultural studies, gay and lesbian studies, post-colonialism, and women's studies
3. Provide students with an avenue for the advance study of ancient and modern languages by focusing on the literatures and cultures with which they are associated.

Methods of Assessment

1. Regular review of students' papers, reports, and evaluations
2. Regular review of faculty reports on student performances in all courses
3. Regular review of faculty report on student performances on qualifying and topic examinations and dissertation prospectors
4. Occasional tracking of job placements for graduates
5. Annual departmental review of trends in applications, admission scores, and year-to-degree data

Feedback Mechanism

- Annual departmental review and report to the Dean of LSA and Rackham.

Department of Economics: *Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan*

Goals

- Provide concentrators with the theoretical and empirical skills that will prepare them to pursue graduate study in economics.
- Provide concentrators who do not wish to continue to graduate study in economics with the skills and the capacity for critical thinking that will enable them to pursue careers as economists in business or government or to enter professional schools in fields such as law or business.
- Provide non-concentrators with a basic understanding of economic problems, market and non-market solutions, and economic theories and tools, including their advantages and limitations.

Departmental Organization:

The Department offers undergraduate courses in principles of economics, intermediate theory, econometrics, and 5-10 standard field areas. The Department has an Associate Chair in charge of staffing and scheduling classes, a Director of Undergraduate Studies in charge of processing student complaints and chairing the Undergraduate Program Committee, and three Undergraduate Counselors. Each year the Associate Chair designates a faculty member in each course area to specify the classes that should be offered and to coordinate their coverage. Substantive changes are normally debated first in the Undergraduate Program Committee, with the proposals initiated by Committee members, the Department Executive Committee, or individual faculty members.

Methods of Assessment and Feedback

- Evaluation of student work
- Course instructors are responsible for evaluating student work. The Department has a brochure of grading standards for coursework at each level that it distributes to all faculty members, with the understanding that uniformity of standards is important for fairness and clarity.
- Concentrators wishing to graduate with honors enroll in an honors seminar and submit a substantial paper. The faculty member running the seminar, in consultation with other faculty advising the student, determines whether a degree with honors is merited.
- Course and program evaluation and feedback
- The Department expects all course instructors to provide class time for students to fill out the College's CRLT course evaluations. Both the Director of Undergraduate Studies and the Department Chair review the evaluations for each course at the end of each semester. Problems are dealt with promptly by the Director of Undergraduate Studies, Chair, and Associate Chair. When necessary, future class assignments are adjusted.
- The Director of Undergraduate Studies serves on a continuous basis as ombudsman for student complaints.
- The Undergraduate Program Committee (whose membership includes faculty, counselors, and students) receives student and faculty suggestions and complaints, considers proposals for new courses, and evaluates different aspects of the undergraduate program on a rotating basis. The latter evaluations include recurring reviews of whether the theory and econometrics classes are properly preparing students for the field courses and whether the Department's course offerings meet current student needs.
- The Department conducts a survey of graduating concentrators, asking about future plans, jobs, and retrospective assessments of courses and instruction.
- The Department's hiring procedures stimulate, on virtually a yearly basis, wide-ranging, broadly inclusive discussions of departmental needs and possible new directions.

* * *

Department of Economics: *Graduate Program Assessment Plan*

Goals

The graduate program in economics offers preparation for the wide range of careers now open to professional economists in academic, business, and government sectors. The Ph.D. program is designed primarily to train professional economists. Its emphasis is on the theoretical core of the discipline, its applications, and essential research skills. The sequence of core courses provides an intensive basic preparation in the discipline, while advanced courses, seminars, and research opportunities are offered in a wide variety of specialized fields. The Master's program is a policy-oriented program with emphasis on the application of economic tools and concepts to practical problems arising in a variety of fields. The Department also participates in a rich variety of inter-departmental programs, including population studies, health economics, law and economics, and social work and economics. Both the Ph.D. and Master's programs naturally endeavor to develop high skills in analysis, research, and expression. They also aim to encourage the student's originality and independence of mind in seeking and contributing to economic issues of genuine significance.

Methods of Assessment

- The Department collects annual data on applications, admissions, enrollment, and admission criteria markers, and it distributes this information to the faculty for their review.
- The Department annually collects and reviews information about the progress of doctoral students by entering class. This information includes preliminary examination performance and progress rates to candidacy, proposal defense, job market readiness, and completion of the Ph.D.
- Faculty holding administrative posts in the Department review each term's GSIs' teaching evaluations as well as previous terms' evaluations to help assess present performance.
- The Department collects annual data on job placement statistics for Ph.D. students, enrollment in graduate-level courses, fellowship awards, GSI assignments, and preliminary examination success statistics.

Feedback Mechanism

The Department prepares an annual report to Rackham outlining the success of our graduate programs and discussing strategies for continuing to produce outstanding scholars in economics.

The Department of English Language and Literature: *Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan*

The Department of English Language and Literature provides instruction in literatures in English, Literary Theory, Criticism, and History, the English Language, expository and creative writing, cultural studies, and related fields. Students who concentrate in English combine required and elective courses to design their own field of study, but all students work to broaden their understanding of literature, language, and culture, to enhance their abilities in written and spoken English in creative and professional ways, and to discover the importance of literature, language, and culture to the world in which we live.

Goals

Undergraduate concentrators in English work to acquire:

1. A broad understanding of literatures written in English, especially the British and American traditions, including representative authors, major literary periods, and the history of the language
2. An appreciation of the aesthetic qualities of works of literature, including knowledge of literary forms and genres and the ability to recognize and to produce good writing
3. The ability to relate individual texts to their historical and cultural contexts
4. Knowledge of critical approaches and methods of interpretation, including literary vocabulary and terminology
5. Advanced skills in oral and written communication, including the ability to use principles of composition, style, rhetoric, and bibliographic reference

Department of English Language and Literature Assessment Plan, cont.

Methods of Assessment

English evaluates the undergraduate program in the following ways:

1. Review of oral and written work in individual courses
2. Scholarly or creative work that is presented, performed, or exhibited in public
3. Senior projects
4. Review of CRLT evaluations by the director of undergraduate studies and chair of the department
5. Yearly review of the curriculum by the undergraduate committee
6. Discussion of the curriculum in department meetings

Feedback Mechanisms

English receives feedback on its undergraduate program through:

1. Interviews with concentrators by concentration advisors
2. Annual talk-back luncheons on the curriculum
3. Feedback by the Undergraduate English Association to the director of undergraduate studies and the undergraduate committee

* * *

The Department of English Language and Literature: *Graduate Program Assessment Plan*

The Department of English Language and Literature provides graduate instruction in literatures in English, Literary Theory, Criticism, and History, the English Language, creative writing, educational theory, cultural studies, women's studies, and related fields. It offers a Ph.D. in English, a joint Ph.D. in English and Education, another in English and Women's Studies as well as a Master of Fine Arts in Creative Writing. Students who do graduate work in English combine required and elective courses to design their own areas of expertise, take preparatory examinations, complete training in pedagogy, and write MFA theses or Ph.D. dissertations. They also work to acquire a professional understanding of literature, language, and culture, to advance their abilities in written and spoken English to the highest levels, and to prepare themselves to contribute to college teaching and related professional fields.

Goals

Graduate students in English work to acquire:

1. The ability to do independent and advanced research on literatures written in English, especially the British and American traditions, including specialized knowledge of authors, major literary periods, and the history of the language
2. A sophisticated appreciation of the aesthetic qualities of works of literature and the history of aesthetic response, including knowledge of literary forms and genres and the ability to recognize and to produce good writing
3. A professional knowledge of research methods, critical approaches, and models of interpretation, including literary vocabulary and terminology
4. A preparation for careers in academia or equivalent professional work in related fields, including a variety of different pedagogical and research experiences

Department of English Language and Literature Assessment Plan, cont.

Methods of Assessment

English evaluates the graduate program in the following ways:

1. Review of oral and written work in individual seminars
2. A third-term review of each Ph.D. student, involving discussion of written work, first-year evaluations, and extensive interviews
3. Written and oral examinations preliminary to dissertation work conducted in the third year
4. Oral dissertation defense
5. Annual awards for the best dissertation in the program and Hopwood Awards in creative writing
6. Annual departmental reviews of teaching evaluations for graduate student instructors
7. Annual tracking of job placement of graduates

Feedback Mechanisms

English receives feedback on the graduate program through:

1. Third-term reviews of each Ph.D. graduate student
2. Annual reports on the graduate program to the Executive Committee and at department meetings
3. Annual reports on job placement to the Executive Committee and at department meetings
4. Annual reports to Rackham about the state of the program, including use of fellowship funding

Program in Film and Video Studies: *Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan*

Goals

The Program in Film and Video Studies is organized to provide an integrated program of courses in the history, aesthetics, theory, and creative techniques of all moving image media, including film, single-camera video, multi-camera studio television, and digitally-based imaging such as computer animation.

OBJECTIVES:

1. Students complete advanced study in the history and aesthetics of film and related media that gives them a broad knowledge of their aesthetic traditions and rebellions, technological developments and cultural impact.
2. Concentrators are expected to become knowledgeable in how moving image technology has been used in different cultures as a medium of communication and artistic expression, and to become familiar with how various kinds of institutional and stylistic practice have characterized its use across historical and national boundaries.
3. Majors should be able to write about moving image media clearly, coherently, and from a theoretically and historically informed perspective exhibiting analytical sensitivity to the visually-based nature of these forms.
4. Majors are expected to acquire the technical skills and understanding of narrative development that will allow them to effectively tell a story in one or more moving-image media. On the technical side, it is expected that they master the following: linear and non-linear editing, basic camera work for continuity style shooting, three-point lighting set-ups, and synch-sound.
5. Majors should demonstrate an understanding of the complex, multi-layered creative and technical process required to make a film, video, or studio-television “text” as a collaborative venture incorporating both sound and image from the conceptual beginnings in pre-production, through production, and into post-production. The Film and Video Studies concentration prepares students for careers in a broad array of media-related fields as it also provides them with the tools in critical and creative thinking for lifelong learning in the liberal arts.

Methods of Assessment

1. Evaluation of student work and abilities
 - a. Review of all student production work for the end-of-term screenings by a consortium of all production faculty and the director
 - b. Report of instructors on preparedness of students in targeted upper division courses, and their abilities as related to presumptions of basic film history knowledge, skills in technical aspects of filmmaking, and critical thinking about visual media (past courses included FV350: American Film History, FV414: Film Theory and Criticism (both core courses in the concentration), and FV400: Advanced Filmmaking (our most sought after production elective)).
 - c. Awards and grants received. These are reviewed every year, and faculty assessment of why we are faring as well or poorly as we are (especially in the case of Hopwoods for dramatic writing)
2. Evaluation of concentration program and courses
 - a. Analysis of course offerings and concentration requirements was undertaken broadly in 1994 and 1995, and the undergraduate curriculum was revised as a result. Another wholesale analysis is planned for a faculty retreat in 1999-2000. One concern regarding our current meeting of objectives: making our studies and production courses more fully integrated in the student's experience.
 - b. Survey of programs at peer schools undertaken in 1998-9. Particular attention was paid to screenwriting curriculum, one of our perceived areas of strength, and included visits to selected other schools.
 - c. Faculty advisors are encouraged to conduct "exit" interviews with students at their senior audits. We plan to regularize and formalize these interviews.
 - d. Production faculty periodically review course-sequencing and the effectiveness of beginning courses in preparing students for upper-level electives based on student creative work (end-of-term screenings).
 - e. Survey of concentrators will be instituted in either the form of surveys or focus groups.
3. Evaluation of preparedness for employment and graduate school
 - a. Currently, we informally survey alumnae in the Los Angeles area at an annual meeting with them. We will create an instrument and more formally survey all alumnae regarding the program's success in preparing them for their current positions.

Feedback Mechanisms

1. The Undergraduate Committee will provide regular reports and extend its current work with the undergraduate curriculum. Reasonable timetables for improvement will be established and shared with all faculty.
2. Discussion of plans for improving regular reports of assessment results to faculty will take place throughout the school year and also at the planned retreat.
3. The Undergraduate Committee will provide suggestions for changes in the curriculum if assessment measures indicate this is appropriate. F&V Executive Committee and faculty will discuss and provide mechanisms for opening this discussion to students.
4. Faculty and student input into creation of specific instruments for surveying exiting seniors and also alumnae. The Undergraduate Committee will coordinate this effort.

Department of Geological Sciences: *Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan***Goals**

To provide the concentrators with a broad understanding of nature of the Earth, its internal and external physical and chemical processes, and the geologic history of life and the environment. To provide non-concentrators with a basic

understanding of the Earth, the processes that form and change it, and its history. A key component of the education is to impart the fundamentals of the scientific method to all students.

Objectives:

Students completing a major in Geological Sciences should have attained the following:

1. An understanding of the nature and origin of the materials that compose the Earth.
2. An understanding of the physical and chemical processes that operate in the deep interior, outer shell, and at the surface of the Earth.
3. An understanding of geologic time and how it is determined.
4. An understanding of the geologic record of earth processes and of life.
5. The ability to apply concepts and methods learned in mathematics and the other natural sciences to geology.
6. Basic skills in reading comprehension of the scientific literature and in oral and written communication of scientific results.

Methods of Assessment

1. Evaluation of student work and abilities via some combination of the following:
 - Evaluation of work in the required capstone field class.
 - Review of papers submitted as part of course work in geology and for the junior-senior writing requirement.
 - Evaluation of common integrative questions, both written and oral, on final exams.
 - Scholarly or creative work that is presented in seminars, at scientific meetings, or published in the scientific literature.
 - Awards, honors, grants and other evidences of external recognition.
2. Evaluation of concentration program and courses:
 - Mid-term and class-end evaluation of all classes every time they are taught.
 - Faculty mentorship program for beginning teachers.
 - Biannual evaluation of course offerings and concentration requirements.
 - Investigation of departmental rankings, both regionally and nationally.
 - Survey of programs at peer institutions.
 - Interaction between the concentrators and undergraduate advisors regarding students' progress, adequacy of the course offerings with regard to the goals of the students and the faculty, and overall nature of the program.
 - Exit interviews.
3. Evaluation of preparedness for employment and graduate school:
 - Annual review of concentrator's graduate school admissions.
 - Annual review of concentrators employment opportunities.
 - Exit interviews.
 - Interaction with alumni regarding the value of their undergraduate education at Michigan.

Feedback Mechanisms

- Reports by the departmental curriculum committee to the department on the success of courses and other programmatic aspects, with recommendations for improvement as necessary.
- Individual evaluations of faculty by the chair and executive committee as to their teaching success, with recommendations for improvement as necessary.

Department of Geological Sciences: *Undergraduate Program in Environmental Geology Assessment Plan*

Goals

To provide the concentrators with a broad understanding of nature of the surface of the Earth, the physical, chemical and biological processes that form and modify it, and the geologic history of those processes. To provide non-concentrators with a basic understanding of the natural environment, the natural and anthropogenic processes that may affect it, and the geological history of these processes. A key component of the education is to impart the fundamentals of the scientific method to all students.

Objectives:

Students completing a major in Environmental Geology should have attained the following:

1. An understanding of the nature and origin of the materials that occur on the surface of the Earth
2. An understanding of the physical, chemical, biological and anthropogenic processes that operate in the crust and at the surface of the Earth.
3. An understanding of geologic time and how it is determined.
4. An understanding of the geologic record of environmental processes.
5. The ability to apply concepts and methods learned in mathematics, chemistry and the other natural sciences to environmental geology.
6. Basic skills in reading comprehension of the scientific literature and in oral and written communication of scientific results.

Methods of Assessment

1. Evaluation of student work and abilities via some combination of the following:
 - Evaluation of work in a recommended field class.
 - Review of papers submitted as part of course work in environmental geology and for the junior-senior writing requirement.
 - Evaluation of common integrative questions, both written and oral, on final exams.
 - Scholarly or creative work that is presented in seminars, at scientific meetings, or published in the scientific literature.
 - Awards, honors, grants and other evidences of external recognition.
2. Evaluation of concentration program and courses:
 - Mid-term and class-end evaluation of all classes every time they are taught.
 - Faculty mentorship program for beginning teachers.
 - Biannual evaluation of course offerings and concentration requirements.
 - Investigation of departmental rankings, both regionally and nationally.
 - Survey of programs at peer institutions.
 - Interaction between the concentrators and undergraduate advisors regarding students' progress, adequacy of the course offerings with regard to the goals of the students and the faculty, and overall nature of the program.
 - Exit interviews.
3. Evaluation of preparedness for employment and graduate school:
 - Annual review of concentrators' graduate school admissions.
 - Annual review of concentrators' employment opportunities.

- Exit interviews.
- Interaction with alumni regarding the value of their undergraduate education at Michigan.

Feedback Mechanisms

- Reports by the departmental curriculum committee to the department on the success of courses and other programmatic aspects, with recommendations for improvement as necessary.
- Individual evaluations of faculty by the chair and executive committee as to their teaching success, with recommendations for improvement as necessary.

* * *

Department of Geological Sciences: *Undergraduate Program in Oceanography Assessment Plan*

Goals

To provide the concentrators with a broad understanding of nature of the oceans of Planet Earth, the physical, chemical, geological and biological processes that occur within and beneath it, and the geologic history of those processes. To provide non-concentrators with a basic understanding of the oceans, their importance to the global climate system, the nature of marine life, and mankind's uses of the sea. A key component of the education is to impart the fundamentals of the scientific method to all students.

Objectives:

Students completing a major in Oceanography should have attained the following:

1. An understanding of the nature, circulation, chemistry and biology of the oceans.
2. An understanding of the physical, chemical, biological and geological processes that operate in the ocean.
3. An understanding of geologic time and how it is determined.
4. An understanding of the geologic record of oceans and the environment.
5. The ability to apply concepts and methods learned in physics, mathematics, chemistry, and biology to oceanography.
6. Basic skills in reading comprehension of the scientific literature and in oral and written communication of scientific results.

Methods of Assessment

1. Evaluation of student work and abilities via some combination of the following:
 - Review of papers submitted as part of course work in oceanography and for the junior-senior writing requirement.
 - Evaluation of common integrative questions, both written and oral, on final exams.
 - Scholarly or creative work that is presented in seminars, at scientific meetings, or published in the scientific literature.
 - Awards, honors, grants and other evidences of external recognition.
2. Evaluation of concentration program and courses:
 - Mid-term and class-end evaluation of all classes every time they are taught.
 - Faculty mentorship program for beginning teachers.
 - Biannual evaluation of course offerings and concentration requirements.
 - Investigation of departmental rankings, both regionally and nationally.
 - Survey of programs at peer institutions.

- Interaction between the concentrators and undergraduate advisors regarding students' progress, adequacy of the course offerings with regard to the goals of the students and the faculty, and overall nature of the program.
 - Exit interviews.
3. Evaluation of preparedness for employment and graduate school:
- Annual review of concentrators' graduate school admissions.
 - Annual review of concentrators' employment opportunities.
 - Exit interviews.
 - Interaction with alumni regarding the value of their undergraduate education at Michigan.

Feedback Mechanisms

- Reports by the departmental curriculum committee to the department on the success of courses and other programmatic aspects, with recommendations for improvement as necessary.
- Individual evaluations of faculty by the chair and executive committee as to their teaching success, with recommendations for improvement as necessary.

* * *

Department of Geological Sciences: *Graduate Programs Assessment Plan*

Goals

- To provide graduate students with advanced training leading to an in-depth understanding of nature of the Earth, its internal and external physical and chemical processes, and the geologic history of life and the environment.
- To provide a significant research experience to all graduate students, leading to the ability to conduct independent research investigations.
- To train students for careers in industry, government or academia.

Objectives:

Students completing a M.S. or Ph.D. degree in the graduate programs in the Department of Geological Sciences should have attained the following:

1. A sophisticated understanding of the nature and origin of the materials that compose the Earth.
2. A sophisticated understanding of the physical and chemical processes that operate in the deep interior, outer shell, and at the surface of the Earth.
3. A knowledge of the geologic record of earth processes, both terrestrial and oceanic, and of life.
4. The ability to use both quantitative and analytical techniques in the conduct of research investigations.
5. Significant skills in scientific communication, both written and oral, and the ability to read and comprehend the scientific literature.

Methods of Assessment

1. Evaluation of graduate student class work and research abilities via some combination of the following:
 - Evaluation of common integrative questions, both written and oral, on final exams.
 - Evaluation of performance on written and oral comprehensive and Ph.D. preliminary examinations.
 - Scholarly or creative work that is presented in seminars, and at scientific meetings.
 - Publication in the peer-reviewed scientific literature.

- Awards, honors, grants and other evidences of external recognition.
2. Regular ongoing evaluation of:
- Quality of incoming graduate students as evidenced by GRE scores, prior GPA, and letters of evaluation.
 - Teaching performance of GSIs conducted by all professors.
 - Research performance of all graduate students, conducted by thesis committees.
 - Tracking the job placement and eventual careers of graduate students.

Feedback Mechanisms

- Annual departmental review of entering graduate student quality and teaching and research performance of current graduate students.
- Interviews with alumni/ae regarding their experience at Michigan.

Department of Germanic Languages and Literatures: *Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan*

Goals

1. Advanced “four skill” proficiency in German: speaking, comprehension, writing, and especially reading
2. Excellent general knowledge of German culture past and present
3. Development of one or more special competencies (both language and academic “content”) in a sub-field such as Literature, History, Film, or Business German.
4. Whenever possible, providing possibilities for students either to study or to work abroad
5. Prepare students for careers in academia or Business or other professions
6. Provide students with basic skills in critical thinking, close reading, writing (both German and English), and cultural sensitivity

Methods of Assessment

Evaluation of student work and abilities

- Analysis of required 3rd semester final projects
- Feedback from professorial faculty teaching 4th semester and third-year courses
- Feedback from employers of students who pursue internships in Germany
- Student self-assessment on E&E forms

Evaluation of concentration program and courses

- Ongoing analysis of course offerings and concentration requirements
- Ongoing close scrutiny of E&E student course evaluations
- Mid-term course evaluations
- Periodic external reviews
- Ongoing comparisons with programs at peer institutions
- Exit interviews with students
- Interviews of concentrators and potential concentrators, both individually and in focus groups

Evaluation of preparedness for employment and graduate school

- Review of concentrators’ graduate school admissions and success
- Surveys of employers of interns and graduates
- Exit interviews with graduating concentrators

Feedback Mechanisms

- Chair's annual "state of the department" address to the faculty
- Ongoing discussion of outcomes in monthly departmental meetings
- Intensive discussion of outcomes in occasional faculty retreats

* * *

Department of Germanic Languages and Literatures: *Graduate Program Assessment Plan***Goals**

1. Provide advanced training in the theories, methods, and practices of German Studies generally
2. Provide advanced training in one or more specialized sub-disciplines such as Literary History, Literary Theory, Film, German History, or German Philosophy
3. Provide graduate students with scholarly skills needed to engage in advanced, independent research
4. Prepare graduate students for careers in one of several possible fields such as academia, business, government, publishing, journalism, etc.

Methods of Assessment

- Annual departmental review of each graduate student's progress
- Annual departmental review of performance in MA and preliminary doctoral examinations
- Detailed scrutiny of E&E evaluations of sections taught by GSIs
- Faculty visits to classes taught by GSIs
- Annual competitions for various graduate-level prizes
- Annual tracking of job placements of graduates

Feedback Mechanisms

- Chair's annual "state of the department" address to the faculty
- Ongoing discussion of outcomes in monthly departmental meetings
- Intensive discussion of outcomes in occasional faculty retreats
- Intensive mentoring of individual graduate students

Department of History: *Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan***Goals**

The goal of the undergraduate concentration in history is to provide a broad familiarity with the histories of various regions of the world, along with training in the theory and method of historical research. Our area distribution requirement provides a mechanism for achieving breadth, and our senior colloquium requirement (a seminar-sized course on a special topic) provides an apprenticeship in historical methods and primary research itself. Honors concentrators receive special training in methods in the Junior Honors Seminar as well as peer and faculty mentoring in the senior Honors Colloquium; each honors thesis is evaluated by two faculty members. The formal public presentation of research findings at the Honors Symposium, held during the week of graduation, gives the entire department faculty an opportunity to see the quality of work being prepared by some of our best students. A number of our courses are designed for the general undergraduate student population and provide non-concentrators as well as pre-concentrators with an introduction to the discipline along with a broad historical overview of a region or a theme. In these courses, students learn how to read critically in primary and secondary sources, and to synthesize information to construct a historical argument. The History concentration prepares

students for a number of careers including teaching, government, diplomacy, journalism, museology and information sciences. A background in history is also useful for admission to law school.

Methods of Assessment and Feedback

Our own assessment of the success of the program takes place through several mechanisms. First, faculty concentration advisors meet with students individually to discuss their progress. These meetings can help us to identify problems. Second, we require of all faculty that they use a systematic student evaluation form, usually the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching's machine-readable form, plus an open-ended set of questions. All evaluations are submitted to the Associate Chair, who reviews the summary reports, and reads the full evaluations in conjunction with award nominations, tenure reviews, and salary discussions. We have also recently added a new staff person, with the title Undergraduate Student Service Assistant, whose task it is to provide practical counseling to undergraduates, facilitate their access to appropriate faculty, and oversee all aspects of the undergraduate experience.

Overall responsibility for periodic evaluation of the program rests with the Associate Chair and the Curriculum Committee, who report at intervals to the full faculty. We conducted a preliminary review of the undergraduate curriculum in 1997-98, and the Curriculum Committee carried out an additional statistical review of enrollments in April, 1999, with special attention to lower-division offerings. (That review found stability over the last three years in enrollments in introductory courses, and a slight drop in the number of concentrators.) The department has scheduled a full review of the undergraduate curriculum to be carried out in 1999-2000, under the leadership of a senior U.S. historian with experience in the undergraduate surveys.

* * *

Department of History: *Graduate Program Assessment Plan*

Goals

The goal of the graduate program of the Department of History is to create a community engaged in advanced historical study, one capable of attracting a portion of the country's most promising students and enabling them to discover ways of expanding and enriching historical thinking. Our aim is to produce distinguished historians with new approaches to the past, as well as to provide training for college teachers of history. We also work with doctoral students who may wish to pursue careers in public history, archives management, or other history-based professions.

The graduate training program has recently been reorganized, and now includes a first-semester studies course, "Introduction to the Comparative Study of History." Taught as two separate sections with periodic joint meetings, the course provides an introduction to historical literatures on several regions and encourages the development of critical skills and esprit de corps among the students. Students go on to take additional studies courses in their fields of specialization, as well as research seminars in which they carry out primary, often archival, historical research. After screening by the graduate committee, and a prospectus defense with the proposed dissertation committee, the student goes on to carry out doctoral research and writes a thesis.

Methods of Assessment and Feedback

Encouraged by the Rackham Graduate School and the College of LSA to evaluate our graduate training, we have done so over the past three years, changing our curriculum, modifying our admissions criteria, and increasing our attention to faculty mentoring and oversight of students. Our internal records on the incoming and continuing graduate student population have, since 1991, been reported annually as part of the departmental participation in a Mellon Foundation Graduate Education Project. The data track all students entering the doctoral program since 1986, following the academic milestones, attrition, financial support, and years-to-degree. We also report the placement status of Ph.D. recipients at six months after the degree is awarded, and again three years later.

The History Department has a well-established review of student progress each February. Students prepare an annual statement of academic progress and solicit evaluations from course instructors, thesis advisors, and faculty supervisors of teaching assistantships. These statements and comment letters are read by a Fellowship Committee of three faculty members, who determine appropriate awards and teaching appointments based upon the evaluations. Students also receive advice, directly, in written and oral comments from faculty concerning their course participation, papers, and the quality of the discussion sections their supervising instructor has visited. After three terms in the program a screening review by a committee of graduate advisors results in a recommendation at a History Faculty Meeting regarding the student's continuance in the program; the faculty then discuss and vote on the recommendations.

The Department of the History of Art: *Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan*

Goals

Mission:

The Department of the History of Art's undergraduate program is designed to allow students to become conversant with the world's cultures and develop skills in visual analysis in order to understand how images, objects, and built environments communicate. Students also learn to employ a broad selection of interpretive methodologies, considering how art objects were understood in their own time and place, and how they continue to function in the contemporary world. In doing so, art history students become acute observers and interpreters of the visual environment.

Instructional Goals and Learning Objectives:

- A. The fundamental goal of the History of Art undergraduate program is to train students in visual literacy from a breadth of historical, cross-cultural, and theoretical perspectives.

Students realize this goal by:

- practicing visual analysis with multicultural sensitivity;
- engaging with original works of art;
- conducting historical research using primary documents;
- developing and honing critical and analytical writing and reading, study and communication skills.

B. Objectives: Desired Learning Outcomes

1. Content-based: Undergraduates will expand their knowledge of history of art by:
 - identifying major monuments, paintings, and sculptures---those regarded as important by subsequent artists in the traditions in question;
 - understanding how the appearance and content of particular works are related to and the result of the sociocultural issues of the time and place in which they were created;
 - exploring the various ways art is situated in society and culture; its production and reception; the interaction of text and image;
 - studying art by theme, genre, or by issue, e.g. landscape, word/image, gender/sexuality;
 - comparing artifacts with bodies of historical data and across cultures so as to assess the relevance of one for the others as well as identify general questions related to cultural production.
2. Competency-based: Undergraduates will improve their intellectual skills and abilities in history of art by:
 - developing the vocabulary to articulate the complexity of visual analysis in speaking and writing;
 - reading critically both primary and secondary sources;
 - finding, assessing, and using essential research sources, secondary materials, and primary sources (often in languages other than English);
 - making oral presentations using multi-media hardware/software;

- formulating own questions, comparing different premises, positions, and original interpretation of a problem supported by visual evidence.

Methods of Assessment

[N.B. The History of Art faculty just completed a substantial survey and held a number of focus groups that have resulted in the restructuring and implementation of a new history of art undergraduate curriculum for concentrators (Sept. 1997-April 1999). These discussions have also lead to the creation of specific goals and objectives regarding the acquisition of content and competency skills at each course level (100-599).]

- 1) Survey recent graduates of the concentration (via email), inquiring about their satisfaction with or experience in the history of art undergraduate program. Survey other alumni three and six years after graduation.
- 2) Periodically review (faculty) course offerings as they relate to and satisfy the distribution requirements of the concentration.
- 3) Survey employers of those students who worked as summer- or yearlong interns for various museums and cultural organizations.
- 4) Monitor concentrators' graduate school admissions (graduating seniors) and/or graduate school success.

Feedback Mechanisms

Results of the surveys and other information gathered will be reviewed by the Department's undergraduate curriculum committee and presented to the faculty at one of their monthly meetings. Some results will be incorporated into the Department- or College-wide publicity literature--departmental leaflets, the undergraduate newsletter, and the Department's home page--for the purpose of introducing and drawing undeclared majors to the history of art concentration.

* * *

The Department of the History of Art: *Graduate Program Assessment Plan*

Goals

Mission:

The University of Michigan offers a highly competitive Ph.D. in the History of Art with a transitional MA degree. The Ph.D. is geared toward preparing students for academic and curatorial careers. It aims first and foremost to provide both the broad intellectual foundation and specialized training needed to conduct advanced scholarly research. We offer a multicentric, culturally interlaced approach to the study of visual cultures—an approach that takes advantage of our faculty expertise in an unusually wide range of areas and time periods. We emphasize the importance of primary research methodologies (with collections and archives) and historical depth. We offer specializations in a wide range of world cultures and theoretical approaches. The program is currently designed to be completed in six and one-half to seven years; but the length of time to degree is largely dependent upon factors such as necessary language training and field work for specific types of dissertation work. In order to equip students rapidly for specialized careers, we devote a great deal of faculty energy to a mentoring system that works in teams with each student. Our Graduate Committee, led by a rotating Director of Graduate Studies (usually serving a two-year term with some course release) oversees the program and monitors all aspects of mission and individual performance.

Methods of Assessment

We find that it is difficult to extricate assessment of individual students' progress from notions of program assessment per se. If, for instance, we find in discussion of a specific issue relating to a particular student that there is an issue emerging of programmatic significance, this issue is then directed toward a more far-reaching discussion as well as to the individual situation. For this reason, we have not attempted to separate these items below.

Trends in applicant pools and applicant quality as well as trends in admissions, actual enrollments, and retention are kept in a departmental database. The Graduate Committee considers these data routinely and very carefully for their implication in program assessment.

Individual faculty are asked to submit to the Graduate Committee a brief narrative report on each student's performance in courses and seminars over and above the letter grade received. On the basis of the first three terms in residence each student is evaluated in a "third term review." All faculty who have had meaningful contact with the student (in our department and in other departments; through coursework and, if applicable, through teaching or research assistantships) submit remarks on a standard format. This information combined with performance on language exams and other relevant information on progress toward degree are evaluated by the Graduate Committee extensively. Individual Mentoring Committees are invited to share their particular insights into problems or special potentials faced by individual students. The outcome of this entire process is summarized in a letter to each student. If there are any problems, these are monitored carefully.

In order to qualify for candidacy each student must have submitted a Qualifying Paper which exemplifies their best seminar effort and stands as an example of their research proficiency and intellectual sophistication to date. Each paper is evaluated and discussed in Committee.

Other traditional hurdles of a doctoral program also take a place in the ongoing assessment of each individual student (preliminary examinations; oral defense of the dissertation prospectus; work on and defense of the dissertation itself). In addition, the Committee regularly reviews students in the course of making decisions on ranked nominations for awards and fellowships both internal and external.

The Department does not have a "formal" internal review procedure for evaluation of individual student teaching on a routine annual basis. Nevertheless, assessment of individual teaching does occur within the framework of our discussions of overall performance and expectations. And it definitely occurs as we make determinations about teaching assignments for the coming year. The Department receives copies of any and all graduate student course evaluations. We have a training system for graduate student teaching. We seek input on this program from the graduate students themselves and we are constantly fine-tuning its effectiveness.

In the course of our extensive and ongoing revitalization of our Undergraduate Program, we have energetically involved our graduate students in dialogues on pedagogy and the state of the field of art history. These dialogues have served parenthetically as it were as a major forum for conversation on "graduate" program assessment.

The Department maintains a constantly updated file on current students and alumni that tracks job interviews, job placements, publications, conference presentations, external fellowships and awards, etc. Maintenance of contact with alumni occurs informally through the obvious mechanisms; it also occurs through alumni response to our annual solicitations for news through our Department newsletter. We keep a well-maintained alumni address list in-house. Once again, the information gleaned is considered thoughtfully as we assess what we are about, what we do really well, and what we could be doing better.

We do not currently conduct any sort of specific exit interviews with doctoral students. We are, however, considering conducting a survey of graduate student alumni this coming year in conjunction with ongoing discussions of a possible reinstatement in some modified form of our former museum practices certificate program.

Honors Program: *Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan*

Goals

The objectives of the Honors Program are to help its students develop their intellectual abilities as fully and effectively as possible during their undergraduate career at the University. This is done by providing challenging, rigorous coursework in Honors courses and sections, by offering individual advising for each student each semester, and by creating special opportunities for individual study and supervised research. The capacity to accept and meet new challenges will help students to mature intellectually and develop the ability to deal effectively with the

Honors Program Assessment Plan, cont.

complexities of modern life, handle the rigorous demands of professional training, or a rewarding and responsible career, and derive maximum satisfaction and fulfillment from their future activities.

Methods of Assessment

The core of the efforts of the Program to meet the objectives listed above is the organization of an Honors curriculum. The course offerings can be divided into three parts:

- Honors sections of existing departmental courses or especially designed Honors courses offered by the departments, and the courses offered by the Great Books Program,
- Sophomore seminars offered as Honors 250, 251 and 252 courses,
- Individualized course conversions to Honors courses and independent study offerings.

Courses in the first of these three categories are assessed and evaluated by the departments and other programs of the College. The second category is evaluated by the Honors Program through anonymous student course evaluations using a specially designed questionnaire. Results from these evaluations are shared with the instructors, allowing them to plan for improvements. The directors of the Honors Program, in turn, use these evaluations to select the optimal offerings in subsequent years. The third category is informally evaluated in advising sessions with individual students.

Feedback Mechanisms

In addition to course evaluations, the overall activities of the Honors Program are assessed in the following fashion, which provides feedback on our *modus operandi*:

- An annual orientation survey—to evaluate advising, peer advising, Honors written materials and its website.
- A CRLT-designed and conducted survey, using focus groups of Honors first and second year students to gauge satisfaction with the underclass Honors component. This was last conducted in the academic year 1997-98.
- Exit surveys, filled out by students who ask to be transferred out of Honors. A questionnaire asks students to evaluate their Honors experience and also inquires as to why they are leaving Honors. (Most common answer is that students cannot find the time or do not want to finish their Honors thesis.).
- An Honors Student Advisory Board is annually constituted to channel feedback from the overall Honors student population (some 1800 undergraduates) to the directors of the Program. This Board also advises the directors of the Program about the appropriateness of Honors courses for the career and personal goals of the students, and makes suggestions for changes in the curriculum.

Program in Judaic Studies: *Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan*

Goals

The goal of the Judaic Studies program is to provide undergraduate majors with general knowledge of Judaism, Jewish culture and history from ancient times to the present. Since Jewish culture has been largely text-based, we insist on reading proficiency in Hebrew or another Jewish language so that concentrators have direct access to many of the primary sources in Jewish religion and culture.

The Program aims to develop:

- familiarity with the classic works of the Biblical and rabbinic traditions and with those of secular Jewish culture;
- knowledge of Jewish history from ancient times through the twentieth century;
- working knowledge of Hebrew and Yiddish and the ability to read texts and conduct conversations in those languages;
- familiarity with modern Jewish literatures, politics and history;
- some knowledge of basic bibliographical aids in the study of Judaica;

- prepare students for careers in the rabbinate, Jewish education, Jewish communal services, Judaica scholarship and librarianship.

Methods of Assessment

- regular written examinations in all courses, oral drills in language courses;
- term papers or critical analyses of literature required in most courses;
- senior thesis is read by two faculty members and discussed in an oral defense after the thesis is returned with comments to the author.
- discussions with alumni of the program, especially those who have gone on to careers related to Judaica.

Feedback Mechanisms

- annual review of program by Judaic Studies executive committee;
- meeting with Project STaR director to assess how well Judaica courses are meeting needs of this Social Work program;
- feedback from other institutions' Judaica programs' newsletters, students and faculty;
- student course evaluations;
- regular meetings of concentration counselor, traditionally the director of the program, with students;
- feedback from visiting professors (we have at least one every year) on the quality of the curriculum, students and library.

Program in Linguistics: *Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan*

Goals

The linguistics undergraduate curriculum is intended to give a broad range of LS&A students a basic understanding of the nature, structure, and importance of language in human cognition and behavior. The program aims to:

1. Provide students with training in the analytic tools, formal procedures, argumentation, and critical thinking used in linguistic investigation.
2. Provide non-concentrators with general knowledge of the nature and structure of human language, including its diversity, that might prove to be valuable in a liberal arts and sciences education, and as a part of a more general education for citizenship.
3. Provide concentrators with in-depth knowledge of three central areas of the field.
 - Within sound structure: knowledge of key properties of sounds as physical (phonetic) entities and linguistic (phonological) units.
 - Within syntactic structure: knowledge of the fundamental aspects of transformational generative analyses of natural human language.
 - Within semantics: knowledge of key aspects of semantic and pragmatic systems in natural language, including logic and formal systems, reference / co-reference, and text analysis.
4. Provide concentrators with opportunities outside of the classroom for applying and enhancing their knowledge of the field, including an undergraduate linguistics association, colloquia and workshops, and experiential practice.
5. Encourage concentrators to explore the importance of language in a variety of areas of human life by offering a broad range of courses and guiding students in selecting an appropriate concentration program.
6. Prepare concentrators for graduate study in linguistics or related disciplines, and to provide concentrators who emphasize applied linguistics in their coursework with background relevant to teaching English as a Second Language, especially in an international setting.

Methods of Assessment

1. Evaluation of student work and abilities
 - Instructors' assessment of linguistic knowledge and abilities in three core upper division courses
 - Senior thesis for honors students
 - Annual program award for best honors thesis in linguistics
 - Undergraduate student publications and presentations at scholarly meetings
2. Evaluation of concentration program and courses
 - Regular assessment of course offerings and requirements by Program's Undergraduate Committee
 - Analysis each term of E&E course evaluations by director and associate director, which includes assessment of where to place the best teachers.
 - CRLT mid-term course evaluations are encouraged
 - Observation of GSI and junior faculty teaching in undergraduate classes
 - Informal exit interviews with graduating seniors
 - Recent survey of the undergraduate programs of five other linguistics departments/programs

Feedback Mechanisms

1. Regular reports of the Undergraduate Committee at Program faculty meetings on the undergraduate program, including proposed curricular changes or other program innovations
2. Director discusses with individual faculty problems that emerge in E&E course evaluations, or through other channels

* * *

Program in Linguistics: Graduate Program Assessment Plan**Goals**

The graduate program reflects the Program in Linguistics' commitment to the diversity inherent in the study of language. The program aims to:

1. Provide all graduate students with solid training in the history of the field, as well as advanced training in current theory and methods of the core areas of the field: phonetics, phonology, syntax, and semantics.
2. Provide all graduate students with training in the interdisciplinary areas reflecting the cognitive and contextual foundations of linguistics, as well as the interfaces of linguistic subfields (e.g., syntax-semantics, phonetics-phonology).
3. Expose graduate students to alternative theoretical frameworks, and to alternative data sources and techniques of linguistic data collection and analysis.
4. Provide graduate students with specialized knowledge of at least one, and ideally two related subfields, and with the skills needed to conduct independent research in these areas of specialization.
5. Prepare graduate students as teachers of linguistics, and to more generally prepare graduate students for a career in academia or industry.

Methods of Assessment

1. Evaluation of graduate student progress and career potential
 - End-of-year review by all Program faculty of the annual progress report of each graduate student, plus reports by graduate student advisors of performance on coursework, qualifying research paper, language exams, dissertation prospectus, dissertation, and teaching (where relevant)
 - Evaluation each term by the Program's director and associate director of teaching evaluations for GSIs; the graduate student mentor and course instructors also discuss GSI performance with the associate director
 - Graduate student publications and presentations at scholarly meetings

- Systematic tracking of job placement of PhD recipients
2. Evaluation of graduate program
 - Review by Graduate and Admissions Committees of applications, admissions statistics (percent admitted, percent enrolled, GRE scores and GPAs, fields of study, student demographics, funding packages), and years-to-degree data
 - Regular discussion of graduate program in Program faculty meetings
 - Recent survey of the graduate programs of five other linguistics departments/programs
 - Internal and external grants, fellowships, and other funding awarded to the Program, to faculty for graduate student support, and to graduate students

Feedback Mechanisms

1. Director sends annual letter to each graduate student that reports on the student's progress that year (based on end-of-year review by Program faculty), plus offers an assessment of recent developments within the graduate program.
2. Twice a year, the associate director discusses with GSIs their course evaluations, their teaching strengths and weakness, and their future teaching interests.
3. Director and associate director meet at the end of each academic year with the Dean of Rackham School of Graduate Studies to discuss program progress, recent curricular changes or other innovations, and planned initiatives.

Department of Mathematics: *Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan*

Mission:

To provide a wide range of opportunities for students to acquire the mathematical skills and methods of problem solving needed in their chosen field of study, including mathematics.

Goals

1. Diverse levels of student preparation and career goals require a variety of content and pedagogy. In each course we seek to:
 - Establish constructive student attitudes toward mathematics, its value and links to the real world and toward effective methods of learning mathematics
 - Strengthen students' general academic skills of critical thinking, writing, teamwork, and oral communication by giving assignments that use these skills
 - Improve students' quantitative reasoning skills, such as translating a word problem into a mathematical model and back again and forming reasonable descriptions and judgements based on quantitative information
 - Develop a strong base of disciplinary knowledge appropriate to the course, including understanding mathematical concepts, basic computational skills, and quantitative, geometric, and symbolic senses
 - Teach understanding and appropriate use of technology in doing mathematical work.
2. At the upper division level, we seek to have programs that prepare students for careers demanding a high level of quantitative and problem solving skills as well as a program that prepares students for graduate work in mathematics and other scientific and engineering disciplines.

Methods of Assessment

1. Evaluation of student work
 - Regular assessment of progress through evaluation of assigned homework or projects
 - Evaluation of student proficiency by written and/or oral examinations
 - Review of student projects in the REU program

2. Evaluation of concentration programs
 - Analysis of course offerings and concentration requirements
 - Review of IDQ evaluations
 - Survey of programs at peer institutions
 - Focus group discussions with alumni
 - Exit interviews with students
 - Survey of placement of graduates

Feedback Mechanisms

- Annual reports from the undergraduate program and freshman-sophomore program committees to faculty
- Annual solicitation of comments from alumni in departmental newsletter
- Alumni participation in annual Career Symposium
- Alumni advisory committees

* * *

Department of Mathematics: *Graduate Program Assessment Plan*

Goals

1. Provide advanced training in broad areas of mathematics and specialized knowledge of one subfield (or more).
2. Provide graduate students with the scholarly skills needed to engage in independent advanced research.
3. Prepare graduate students for careers in academia, industry, finance, or government.

Methods of Assessment

1. Annual review by Fellowships and Admissions Committee of trends in applications, admissions, enrollments, and admissions scores.
2. Annual review by Doctoral Committee of grades, faculty reports on progress in the program, and performances on qualifying exams and language exams. More frequent reviews of progress of students taking qualifying exams.
3. Semi-annual review of teaching evaluations and other indicators of teaching performance for GSIs, in connection with reappointments and course assignments.
4. Annual tracking by Graduate Program Office of job placement of graduates.

Feedback Mechanisms

1. Periodic review of indicators and report to Rackham about improvements to the program.

Recent Developments

1. New doctoral program in Applied and Interdisciplinary Mathematics, scheduled to begin admitting students in 2000.
2. National Science Foundation funding, under the VIGRE program (“Vertically Integrated Graduate Research and Education”), primarily for graduate students and postdoctoral scholars.

Museum of Zoology and Herbarium: *Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan*

Goals

- Offer training in the principles of diversity, behavior, ecology, and evolution of plants and animals.
- Provide research experience in the analysis of animals and plants in nature and in the laboratory.
- Provide training in analysis of evidence for phylogeny and evolution.

Methods of Assessment

Evaluation of student accomplishment

- Evaluation of written exercise and research papers
- Monitoring student participation in research, seminars, and meetings
- Course examinations and grades
- Exit interviews
- Graduate student feedback

Evaluation of concentration program and courses

- Feedback on student preparedness in more advanced courses
- Faculty discussions of student success in research rotations
- Faculty discussions of student performance in seminars
- Graduate student evaluations
- Trends in course enrollment and undergraduate evaluations

Evaluation of preparedness for graduate school and employment

- Direct discussion with graduate advisors and employers
- Post-employment follow-up interviews with former graduates
- Post-employment letters from former graduates

Feedback Mechanisms

- Periodic faculty discussion of new needs and new courses
- Faculty participation in each other's courses
- Graduate Student Instructor feedback

* * *

Museum of Zoology and Herbarium: *Graduate Program Assessment Plan***Goals**

- Provide opportunities for research on diversity, ecology, and evolution of plants and animals.
- Provide field and laboratory research experience in the analysis of animal and plant ecology and animal behavior.
- Provide training in analysis of phylogeny and evolution.
- Establish our students on faculties of peer institutions.

Methods of Assessment

- Graduate School feedback on comparative admissions trends
- Feedback on students' teaching preparedness
- Monitoring students' success in publication
- Monitoring students' success in access to employment
- Undergraduate evaluations of graduate student performance

Feedback Mechanisms

- Periodic faculty discussion of graduate student preparedness
- Faculty participation on graduate committees
- Long-term feedback from former Ph.D. graduates

Department of Near Eastern Studies: *Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan*

Goals

The Department of Near Eastern Studies is organized to provide training for concentrators in three fields of Near Eastern Studies, namely Arabic, Armenian, Persian, Turkish and Islamic studies, Ancient Near East and Biblical Studies and Hebrew and Judaic Studies. Concentrators acquire a comprehensive knowledge of the languages, cultures and religions of Near Eastern societies and civilizations that prepare them for a variety of professional careers from library and museum sciences to language training and social sciences. Non-concentrators gain a basic understanding of the specificity of Near Eastern societies, religions and cultures and of their interaction with the West across the ages. In the process, students learn to appreciate cultures, religions and the arts other than their own. This, in turn, will broaden their intellectual horizons and inculcate in them tolerance toward peoples of different cultural and ethnic backgrounds.

Objectives:

Students completing a major in Near Eastern Studies should have attained the following:

- Familiarity with the languages, cultures and social organizations of Near Eastern people from the ancient time up to the present;
- A critical understanding of historical, archeological and cultural data from the region;
- An ability to see political processes in the Near East in the historical perspective;
- Critical reading, thinking and communication skills;
- Acquisition of appropriate language skills and linguistic training;
- Ability to write clearly reasoned, coherent and persuasive essays;
- Commitment to intellectual, cultural, religious and ethnic diversity.

Methods of Assessment

In evaluating the undergraduate program the department will make use of the following assessment measures:

- In-depth evaluation of concentration program and courses and their relevance to the above objectives;
- Periodical analysis of course offerings and updating of the curriculum;
- Review of papers in specific courses (100 through 400 level) submitted by concentrators;
- Evaluation of questions on final exams;
- Instructors' report on preparedness of students in targeted upper division courses.
- Awards and grants received;
- Analysis of CRLT course evaluations;
- Survey of courses at peer schools;
- Exit interviews with students.
- Investigation of departmental ranking, regionally and nationally.

Feedback Mechanisms

1. Regular reports of assessment results to individual faculty, with discussion of plans for improvement.
2. Regular reports by the department's director of undergraduate studies with discussion of plans for improvement.
3. Periodical reports on CRLT course evaluations at the departmental meetings.

* * *

Department of Near Eastern Studies: *Graduate Program Assessment Plan*

Goals

- Provide advanced training in the field of Near Eastern Studies and specialized knowledge of one of its sub-fields, namely, Ancient and Biblical Studies and Early Christianity; Arabic, Armenian, Persian, Turkish and Islamic Studies; Hebrew and Jewish Studies.

Department of Near Eastern Studies Assessment Plan, cont.

- Provide students with the scholarly and critical skills needed to engage in independent research.

- Prepare graduate students for careers in academia, museums, libraries as well as regional businesses, public health, law firms (together with CMENAS).

Methods of Assessment

- Annual departmental review of trends in applications, admissions, enrollments, admissions scores and years-to-degree data provided by Rackham School for Graduate Studies.
- Annual departmental review of papers, faculty reports on progress in the program, and performances on qualifying exams and language exams.
- Annual tracking reviews of teaching evaluations for GSIs.
- Annual tracking review of job placement of graduate.
- Bi-annual review of graduate curricula and MA and Ph.D. requirements.

Feedback Mechanisms

- Annual departmental review of indicators and report to Rackham about improvements to the program.

Department of Philosophy: *Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan*

Goals

To provide for students who take our various introductory courses an intensive engagement with a variety of philosophical problems and texts to enable them to acquire:

- skills and habits of critical thinking and precise expression of thought,
- an appreciation for the philosophical and ethical dimensions of life,
- an openness to and appetite for new ideas and perspectives,
- a desire to reflect critically on the grounds of their own ideas and assumptions;

To provide for students who take a number of philosophy courses in conjunction with another concentration, either informally, as a minor, or as a second concentration, in addition to the above:

- an appreciation for the distinctive philosophical issues that arise in relation to their primary area of study,
- an ability and desire to reflect critically on the most basic assumptions and methods of their primary area;

To provide for students who concentrate in philosophy:

- an intensive engagement with central figures, problems, and ideas in the history of philosophy, including that of ancient Greece and 17th and 18th century western Europe,
- the opportunity to study a broad range of philosophical areas and traditions, including nonwestern philosophy,
- logical acumen and skill in symbolic mathematical logic,
- broad training in the central philosophical areas of metaphysics, epistemology, and the philosophies of language and mind,
- significant exposure to ethics and/or social and political philosophy,
- some experience of philosophical inquiry at graduate-level or proto-graduate-level depth,
- the opportunity for honors students to do original research guided by individual faculty.

Methods of Assessment

Evaluation of student progress and abilities:

- evaluation of work in capstone seminar,
- review of work submitted for undergraduate essay prizes,
- analysis of student transcripts,

Department of Philosophy Assessment Plan, cont.

- review of student preparedness for upper-level courses,
- analysis of student placement in graduate study,

- analysis of student success in graduate study,
- analysis of student placement more generally.

Evaluation of concentration program and courses:

- CRLT mid-term course evaluations,
- annual review of junior faculty teaching materials: syllabi, handouts, course evaluations,
- annual review of course evaluations in all undergraduate courses,
- periodic survey of programs at peer schools,
- discussions with concentrators in advising sessions about the program
- survey of alumni and alumni focus groups during visits to the department.

Feedback Mechanisms

- Review by the Undergraduate Studies Committee, which reports to the faculty of the department, with the development of plans for improvement.
- Review of junior faculty teaching, an important part of the annual review of junior faculty by the Committee of Tenured Members, shared in depth with junior faculty as part of the mentoring process.
- Regular reports of assessment results to individual faculty, with discussions of plans for improvement.

* * *

Department of Philosophy: *Graduate Program Assessment Plan*

Goals

- Provide students with a broad education covering the main areas, including metaphysics and epistemology, philosophy of language and philosophy of mind, moral and social philosophy, and the history of philosophy.
- Provide students with training, and preparation for original research, in a specific area of philosophy.
- Provide students with training and mentoring in the teaching of philosophy.
- Nurture and cultivate the broad range of skills, attitudes, sensibilities, and habits necessary to flourish as a researcher and educator in philosophy.

Methods of Assessment

- Written reports by faculty of student progress in individual courses.
- Annual discussion by the faculty of the progress of each individual student.
- Review of dossiers of students applying for candidacy.
- Annual departmental review of trends in admissions, enrollments, and year-to-degree data.
- Discussions with graduate students in a variety of venues about various aspects of the graduate program.
- Annual review of teaching evaluations of GSIs.
- Annual review of placement activity, including final placement, discussions with hiring departments about candidates' interviews, etc.
- National peer rankings (National Research Council).

Feedback Mechanisms

- Faculty evaluation of student progress is annually communicated to individual students through faculty advisors.
- Graduate Studies Committee is charged with regular evaluation of the program, reports to the department faculty to inform future plans for improvement

Department of Physics: *Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan*

Goals

The undergraduate program in physics educates students about the basic principles governing the operation of our physical universe and provides them with the tools needed to describe the behavior of physical systems. Central to this is to develop an understanding of how knowledge about the world is acquired through the use of the scientific method. Introductory laboratories introduce students to the process of making simple measurements and comparing those measurements to theory. A systematic approach to problem solving and critical thinking in general is acquired in the process of learning physics. Non-concentrators are trained to understand and solve practical problems in mechanics and in electricity and magnetism that they can use in fields such as engineering, medicine and education. Concentrators are given additional training in modern physics and advanced instruction in a number of more specialized areas such as atomic physics, condensed matter physics, nuclear physics and particle physics. Intermediate and advanced laboratories provide an opportunity for students to perform advanced measurements of physical processes using state-of-the-art equipment and to compare their results to theory. Many of our concentrators choose to avail themselves of the numerous opportunities to become involved in research projects that help prepare them for a career in experimental physics.

Methods of Assessment

- Exams: most of our courses have one or more midterms and a final exam that test mastery of the subject material.
- Reports: many of our courses, including our laboratories require students to submit formal reports on their work.
- Standard exams testing student understanding of basic concepts have been administered in our large introductory courses at the beginning and end of the courses to assess student learning and to compare the effectiveness of different instructional techniques.

Feedback Mechanisms

- Student questionnaires are distributed in all our introductory courses and both the instructor and the departmental administration review the results. Written comments are entered into a database that is screened periodically to identify successful teaching styles and flag problem areas.
- An in-depth evaluation of selected courses is performed by CRLT on a regular basis.
- A record is kept of graduate school/and or job placement for our concentrators on graduation.
- A committee consisting of the Associate Chair for the Undergraduate Program and several other faculty members conducts an annual review of assessment tools. Their findings are reported to the departmental Executive Committee and to the entire faculty when appropriate.

* * *

Department of Physics: Graduate Program Assessment Plan

Goals

Our program seeks to educate students about the nature of our physical universe, to give them an understanding and working knowledge of the fundamental laws of physics and how they govern the behavior of physical systems of all kinds. This endeavor encompasses a wide range of topics, from the largest possible size scales (e.g., universe as a

whole) down to the smallest possible size scales (elementary particles and quantum field theory), and includes atomic physics, lasers, condensed matter physics, applied physics, space physics, particle physics, astrophysics, biophysics, and other subdisciplines. A key component of the program is to teach students how to apply knowledge of physics to real research problems: each student must undertake a deep and original thesis project to contribute to our ever-growing knowledge of physics. The students thus not only learn physics, but they learn how to think deeply about difficult problems and how to carry out large research projects to completion.

Students completing a Ph.D. in Physics should have the following basic skills:

- 1) Fundamental understanding of the basic laws of physics, including quantum mechanics, electromagnetism, thermodynamics, statistical physics, optics, and special relativity.
- 2) Fundamental understanding of the advanced physical concepts of their chosen subdiscipline.
- 3) The ability to carry out an original research project to its completion.
- 4) The communication skills, both written and oral, required to present ideas and results to both the scientific community and to the public.

Methods of Assessment

- 1) Graduate courses provide a mechanism to impart knowledge of the field and assess the results (grades).
- 2) The graduate qualifying exam, a two-day written test to be completed by the end of the second year, directly measures the overall competence in physical understanding.
- 3) The prelim exam, an oral test taken near the beginning of a student's Ph.D. thesis research work, examines both the student's ability to undertake the research project and the suitability of the project itself.
- 4) Yearly written progress reports provide students with writing experience and allow both the thesis committee and the department as a whole to track students' progress.
- 5) The thesis defense (taken at the very end of the program) and the thesis document itself provide a clear measure of the research produced by the student.
- 6) Tracking of Ph.D. graduates, to academic jobs and to industry, provide a longer term assessment tool.
- 7) The progress of graduate students (and their research) is also tracked indirectly in our annual reviews of every faculty member.

Feedback Mechanisms

- 1) We have recently instituted an annual graduate student survey, given to the graduate students during the fall semester, to obtain their views on the effectiveness of the department in meeting all of these broadly defined goals. We plan to continue this effort and expand it to include an outside assessment by an external "visiting" committee.
- 2) We have started a "life after graduate school" program which provides students with an interface to industry and other potential employers. We plan to improve this program and strengthen it in the future. This program facilitates contacts between our students and industry and other non-academic contacts, provides additional outside opinions of our graduate program, and will ultimately help in tracking our Ph.D. recipients.
- 3) The overall research mission of the department is reviewed approximately every five years by an external review committee. Since graduate students (and their research) are a vital part of our total research effort, this assessment of the overall productivity of our department, and its future research directions, also feeds back to the way in which we educate our graduate students.

Department of Political Science: *Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan*

Goals

The general goal of the undergraduate program in political science is to provide students with the analytical skills and level of knowledge of politics and political issues essential for understanding politics and political affairs. An education in political science exposes students to contemporary debates about politics and to issues of politics and public policy in the United States as well as throughout the world. The study of political science provides all

Department of Political Science Assessment Plan, cont.

students with the tools for life long learning and prepares them for active, informed citizenship. Concentrators receive in-depth training in theory, methods and practices of contemporary political analysis.

Methods of Assessment

Evaluation of student work and abilities Evaluation of student work and abilities is carried out through review of papers, examinations, oral reports, and through student-faculty meetings. Instructors' reports of achievement in upper level courses take into account students' creativity, their critical and analytical capacities and the range and accuracy of their knowledge. The ability to identify problems and to give clear written and oral explanations is of central importance.

Evaluation of concentration program and courses Departmental committees carry out regular evaluations of course offerings and concentration requirements. E & E student course evaluations are reviewed and exit interviews with seniors are employed.

Evaluation of preparedness for employment and graduate school Reviews of employment, graduate student entry of former students, exit interviews and surveys of alumni concerning how well the program prepared them for current positions.

Feedback Mechanisms

Regular committee reports to the executive committee and to the department faculty with establishment of reasonable timetables for action.

* * *

Department of Political Science: *Graduate Program Assessment Plan***Goals**

- To provide advanced training in theory, methods, and practices of contemporary political science. To provide specialized knowledge in several subfields and training for independent research.
- To prepare graduate students for careers in academia, government, and related professions.

Methods of Assessment

- Annual departmental reports on trends in applications, admissions, enrollments, and progress to degree data provided by the graduate school.
- Periodic review of student progress through faculty reports, review of papers, and performances on qualifying examinations.
- Annual review of GSI performance, including teaching evaluations.
- Annual reports on job placement of graduates.
- Periodic review of departmental rankings in national assessments

Feedback mechanisms

- Annual review of indicators and report to Rackham about improvements in the program.

Department of Psychology: *Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan*

Goals

The undergraduate program in psychology is designed to give students an opportunity to learn what research has shown about how behavior is motivated; how we perceive, learn, and think; how individuals differ from one another; how personality develops from infancy to maturity and is expressed by behavior; and how interpersonal factors affect human relationships in the home, on the job, and in the community.

Objectives:

Students completing the psychology concentrations should have attained the following:

- The ability to give clear written and oral analyses of the basic psychological processes that give rise to complex human and animal behaviors.
- An understanding of the breadth and diversity of research in psychology which includes work in biopsychology, cognition and perception, developmental psychology, organizational psychology, clinical psychology, social psychology, and personality psychology.
- The ability to read and understand original research as published in scholarly journals.
- The ability to think critically about psychological theories and to evaluate scientific data.
- The ability to synthesize interconnected ideas and to apply psychological concepts to everyday life.

Assessment Tools

- Evaluation of student work and abilities through exams, written reports, and oral presentations.
- Instructors' reports on the preparation of students in targeted upper division courses.
- Annual research fairs in which students doing directed research and/or honors research present their work to the department.
- Ongoing analysis of course offerings and concentration requirements by the Committee for Undergraduate Studies.
- Periodic analysis of selected students' transcripts.
- Periodic surveys of concentrators regarding the coherence, interest, and perceived strengths and weaknesses of the concentration.
- Review of all end-of-term course ratings by the Department Chair and Departmental Executive Committee.

Feedback Mechanisms

- Regular reports by the Committee for Undergraduate Studies at faculty meetings.
- Regular reports by the Chair of assessment results to individual faculty, with discussion of plans for improvement.
- Salary increases that are tied to merit.

* * *

Department of Psychology: *Graduate Program Assessment Plan*

Goals

The department is organized into seven areas: Biopsychology, Clinical, Cognition & Perception, Developmental, Organizational, Personality, and Social.

The general objectives of the Ph.D. program are to permit the student to achieve:

- 1) a general knowledge of the broad subject matter of psychology
- 2) mastery of a specialized field
- 3) competence in organizing, interpreting, and communicating effectively
- 4) competence in research skills and creative work
- 5) professional skills relevant to his or her field of specialization

Methods of Assessment and Feedback

A student is allowed to continue work toward the Ph.D. only after his or her performance at the University of Michigan is judged sufficiently promising by the faculty of one of the areas to justify that group's sponsorship of the student's independent research and eventual professional placement. At the end of the student's first full year of residence and no later than the completion of the second year, the student's progress is formally evaluated by his or her area. At this time, a student's work may be judged suitable for continuation in the area of first choice or, while one's work is regarded as adequate, changing interests may dictate transfer to another area of specialization. Occasionally, a student's performance is deemed to be so marginal that either interruption or termination of graduate study is recommended.

Each area has its own recommended schedule for completion of requirements but all agree that a student's readiness to continue to the Ph.D. cannot be fairly judged until he or she has completed the breadth requirement (Psychology 600 and a core course from another area), the statistics requirement, the 619 research project, and at least two of the three-unit Core Courses within the student's particular area.

Overall breadth and integration of preparation of each student, quality of work, research promise, work habits, and other related factors will be considered by the staff of the student's area and will be reviewed by the graduate committee at the time of the annual evaluation.

Residential College: *Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan*

Goals

1. To provide students with a broad liberal arts education that will enable them both to pursue successful career paths and to participate as informed citizens in the affairs of their communities and their society.
2. To develop students' skill in learning, in critical thinking, and in communication—all of which will contribute to their success in a rapidly evolving job market and an ever-changing world.
3. To enable students to develop their intellectual interests and creative talents and to find their own voice.
4. To encourage students to engage actively with other communities, within and outside the University, and to combine learning with doing.
5. To train students intensively in a second language so that they will develop both a high level of practical language proficiency and familiarity with another culture.

Methods of Assessment

1. Instructors in RC courses write narrative written assessments of the performance of each RC student in their classes, which are kept in RC office files as well as provided to students in lieu of letter grades.
2. Academic advisors (all of them members of the RC faculty), who work with students to select appropriate courses and fields of concentration as well as to enforce all of the RC graduation requirements, meet weekly as members of the RC's Board on Academic Standing to evaluate student progress and—in particular—to address cases of apparently unsatisfactory performance.
3. Every RC student meets in the senior year with an RC (faculty) academic advisor to review progress toward attaining the LS&A and RC degree and to ensure that each student will satisfy all of the graduation requirements.
4. Every RC student must pass a first-semester seminar course, which emphasizes active classroom discussion and includes frequent and substantial writing assignments. Beginning in fall 1999 students will have to demonstrate (with papers written for their seminar) achievement of basic writing proficiency—failing which they will be assigned to remedial writing workshops in the second semester.
5. RC students taking one of the four second languages taught intensively at the College (Spanish, French, German and Russian) must pass a demanding proficiency examination administered by RC faculty in the relevant language program; the results of these exams are carefully monitored.

6. In the context of periodic requests for information and evaluation from the College of LS&A, RC faculty committees prepare reports documenting the activities of the RC's various instructional programs and the performance of students in program concentrations and courses. (Most recently, such reports were prepared annually from 1992-93 through 1995-96; and an RC-wide self-study was prepared in fall 1997 for an external review carried out in winter 1998.)
7. Information on post-college studies and career paths of RC graduates is continually solicited and gathered by the RC's Coordinator of Alum Relations and Development. The RC would be delighted to undertake a much more systematic survey of its graduates in order to compile and analyze information about their post-RC studies, careers and other accomplishments (including contributions to their communities and their society). Through our alum database we are in touch with about 75% of our graduates. We have not, however, had access to the resources required to carry out such a project on a sufficient scale and in a professional manner.

Feedback Mechanisms

1. The RC Executive Committee receives reports from other administrative committees (e.g., the Educational Policy and Curriculum Committee, the Board on Academic Standing) and develops policies to address identifiable problems in student learning.
2. Following upon the most recent external review process undertaken in 1997-1998, the RC established a Strategic Planning Committee to review assessments of the RC's success over past years in meeting its educational objectives and to oversee a systematic effort to renew, revise and improve the RC curriculum and overall living-learning environment.

Department of Romance Languages and Literatures: *Undergraduate Programs Assessment Plan*

Goals

The Department of Romance Languages and Literatures offers undergraduate concentrations in French, Italian, and Spanish. All three programs have essentially the same goals: to provide students (be they concentrators or not) with proficiency in the language in question and basic knowledge of and familiarity with the culture (in the broad sense of the term) for which the chosen language is the vehicle. The programs also strive to teach the students to think critically about the study of culture and the analysis of language.

Methods of Assessment and Feedback

- Currently in the concentration, assessment is based on the final grades in each course. Students doing an Honors concentration must write an Honors thesis and undergo an oral exam. During the forthcoming academic year the Department of Romance Languages and Literatures plans to develop an ongoing process for assessment of student learning in these concentrations. The Executive Committee will appoint an Assessment Committee to make concrete proposals. Feasible measures would include instructor's reports on the preparedness of students in targeted upper division courses and a review of a random sample of written work produced by concentrators. The concentration program as a whole as well as individual courses would be evaluated by means of a survey administered to concentrators, as well as by an analysis of the answers to certain questions on the current student course evaluations. The Department will also encourage concentration counselors to ask advisees to evaluate their intellectual experience in the Department when they do senior check-out. The Department will institute regular reports to the faculty by a departmental assessment committee and will transmit regular reports of assessment results to individual faculty.
- The Department of Romance Languages and Literatures also offers four semester sequences of courses in French, Italian, Portuguese, and Spanish so that students can satisfy the LS&A Foreign Language Requirement. In these courses student learning is constantly assessed through regular testing of the appropriate language skills in quizzes, oral interviews, and course examinations.

* * *

Department of Romance Languages and Literatures: *Graduate Programs Assessment Plan*

Goals

The Department of Romance Languages and Literatures offers graduate doctoral programs in French, Spanish, and Romance Linguistics. The Department no longer offers a stand-alone MA program in its graduate offerings. A proposal for a joint doctoral program in Romance and General Linguistics between the Department of Romance Languages and Literatures and the Program in Linguistics is before the Graduate School; when approved, the current doctoral program in Romance Linguistics will be terminated. The graduate programs are designed to provide advanced training in theory, methods, and practice of high-level literary and/or linguistic analysis, with specialized knowledge of a student's main field and broad-based advanced knowledge of related fields. The program aims to train research scholars who, for the most part, go on to careers in academia.

Methods of Assessment and Feedback

Each year the Graduate Committee of the Department, under the leadership of the Graduate Chair, reports to the department on applications, admissions, enrollments, and on curricular issues pertaining to the graduate programs. Faculty in each course are asked to prepare an individual evaluation of each student in the graduate courses they have taught during the academic year. Each student is assigned a three person mentoring committee, which advises the student, monitors his/her choice of courses to insure both breadth and depth in graduate training and progress, discusses matters of concern with the student, and reports to the Graduate Committee. The mentoring committees also conduct a thorough and searching fourth-term review of each graduate student and recommend whether he/she should be permitted to continue and take the preliminary examinations, which are themselves another form of learning assessment. The elementary language directors, along with their course coordinators, annually review the teaching evaluations of the GSIs. The Department carefully monitors the success of our students on the job market and actively helps them to prepare for interviews at the annual meeting of the Modern Language Association and for on-campus interviews. Students are also required to prepare a portfolio for their dissertation committee which must include a written statement from the student on his/her teaching and research experiences as well as a list of materials that have contributed to the student's intellectual and professional preparation.

Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures: *Undergraduate Russian Concentration Program Assessment Plan*

Mission:

The Russian Concentration aims to combine, in the best traditions of the liberal arts degree, practical language learning with the study of culture through literature. It provides extensive language training, and demanding courses in literary history and analysis. Moreover, the Department firmly believes that serious language study offers broad intellectual benefits in and of itself, and aims, in the upper-level Russian language courses, to develop linguistic self-consciousness and basis for the study of linguistics proper.

Goals

General Goals of the Undergraduate Russian Concentration:

- language proficiency in speaking, listening, reading and writing Russian;
- familiarity with literatures written in Russian and with the Slavic literary tradition;
- understanding of texts in their cultural and historical contexts;
- appreciation for the aesthetic qualities of literature and literary production;
- awareness of critical and interpretive methods;
- critical reading, thinking, and communication skills.

Desired Learning Outcomes:

1. Declarative knowledge: the Russian Concentration aims to increase student's familiarity with:
 - literary terms, forms, and genres;
 - representative authors and cultural characteristics of major literary historical periods;
 - critical and interpretive methods.
2. Intellectual Skills and Abilities: the Russian Concentration aims to improve students' ability:
 - to acquire language proficiency in Russian;
 - to comprehend texts from a variety of historical periods and to relate them to each other formally, thematically, culturally, or historically;
 - to understand the process by which literature is produced in response to and in reaction against prior literary texts and cultural settings;
 - to construct critical and interpretive arguments;
 - to reflect self-consciously on the cultural, psychological and aesthetic base of literary response;
 - to write clear, coherent, and persuasive essays.
3. Attitudes: the Russian Concentration aims to increase students':
 - appreciation for the aesthetic pleasures of literature and good writing;
 - openness to a variety of cultural or ethnic perspectives;
 - awareness of and reflection on personal values and openness to the possibility of self-transformation through reading and creating literature;
 - commitment to intellectual honesty and integrity in the use of sources;
 - confidence in critical thinking and analytic skills.

Methods of Assessment

In evaluating the Undergraduate Russian Concentration the department will make use of the following assessment measures:

- periodic review of CRLT questionnaires from selected courses
- periodic review of departmental course evaluation forms that more accurately reflect the goals of instruction in Russian
- periodic review of the results of the language proficiency test
- yearly e-mail survey of concentrators inquiring about their satisfaction with experience in the major

Feedback Mechanisms

- Results of the surveys and other information gathered will be reviewed by the Curriculum Committee, which will prepare a biennial report to the faculty for discussion in a departmental meeting.

* * *

Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures: *Graduate Program Assessment Plan***Goals**

- provide advanced training in Russian, Polish, Serbo-Croatian, Czech and Ukrainian languages and literatures
- provide advanced training in literary theory
- provide scholarly skills needed to engage in independent advanced research
- provide training in teaching methodology and practical teaching experience
- prepare graduate students for a career in academia, i.e., in the field of Slavic Languages and Literatures

Methods of Assessment

1. annual departmental review of trends in applications, admissions, enrollments, admission scores, and years-to-degree data provided by Rackham;
2. annual departmental review of papers, faculty reports on progress in the program, and performance on qualifying exams and language exams;
3. annual departmental review of teaching evaluations for GSIs;
4. annual tracking of job placement of graduates.

Feedback Mechanisms

- annual departmental review of indicators and report to Rackham about improvements to the program.

Department of Sociology: *Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan***Goals**

- Provide training for concentrators in social theory, research methods, and the main subfields of Sociology.
- Prepare concentrators for post-graduate study and/or professional careers in a wide range of relevant public and private settings.
- Provide non-concentrators with a basic understanding of the field, its main empirical findings, theoretical contributions, and policy implications.
- Enhance students' capacity for critical thinking while providing basic skills in problem-solving, data analysis, and an appreciation for the craft of research.
- Provide hands-on learning experiences in various social science settings through Project Community.
- Prepare concentrators for future roles as aware and active citizens.

Methods of Assessment

Evaluation of student work and abilities:

- Review written work and research papers in specific courses
- Evaluate common integrative questions on final exams
- Review outstanding student papers submitted for departmental awards
- Awards, grants and other recognition received
- Scholarly work that is published or presented at professional meetings
- Performance as peer instructors
- Evaluation of required theses produced by honors students

Evaluation of concentration program and courses:

- Periodic evaluation of targeted courses
- Evaluate enrollment trends to monitor student interest
- Analyze of course offerings and concentration requirements
- CRLT mid-term and final evaluations for selected classes
- Monitor departmental ranking, regionally and nationally
- Periodic review of programs at peer schools
- Survey concentrators through reports from academic advisors, etc.

Evaluation of preparedness for employment and graduate school:

- Review concentrator's success in applying to graduate school
- Survey alumni regarding how well the program served their needs

- Selective exit interviews with students

Feedback Mechanisms

- Regular reports from academic advisors and counselors, with establishment of timetables for improvement
- Regular reports of assessment results to individual faculty, with discussion of plans for improvement
- Reports from student instructors and undergraduate student services assistant

* * *

Department of Sociology: *Graduate Program Assessment Plan*

Goals

- Provide advanced training in social theory, research methods, and mastery of the main subfields of specialization in Sociology
- Provide graduate students with the scholarly skills needed to engage in independent advanced research.
- Prepare graduate students for careers in academia, private and government sector research, and other public sector employment.

Methods of Assessment:

- Annual departmental review of trends in publications, applications, admissions, year-to degree data.
- Annual departmental review of scholarly papers published or delivered at conferences, faculty reports on progress in the program, performance on preliminary examinations, and results of merit award competitions outside the department
- Periodic departmental review of teaching evaluations for GSIs
- Regular tracking of job placement of graduates

Feedback Mechanisms

- Annual departmental review of indicators and report to Rackham about improvements to the program

Department of Statistics: *Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan*

Goals

1. Train undergraduate concentrators in statistical theory, methodology, applications, computing and data analysis.
2. Prepare concentrators for careers in the private and public sector as well as prepare them for graduate studies in statistics.
3. Provide non-concentrators with basic understanding of the principles of statistics and data analysis, including variation, quantitative reasoning, and scientific investigation.

Methods of Assessment

1. Evaluation of student work and abilities:
 - Evaluation of course knowledge through regular homework, discussion sessions, mid-terms, and final exams
 - Evaluation of work in senior projects for honors students
2. Evaluation of courses and concentration program:
 - Regular analysis of course offerings and requirements by the curriculum committee
 - Analysis of CRLT course evaluations and mid-term feedback
 - Survey of concentrators and students in large service courses

3. Evaluation of preparedness for employment and graduate school
 - Review of concentrators' graduate school admissions
 - Informal survey of recruiters, alumni and interviews with students

Feedback Mechanism

1. Regular discussion among faculty and feedback to individual faculty as required on course evaluations and plans for improvement.

* * *

Department of Statistics: *Graduate Program Assessment Plan*

Goals

1. Provide students with graduate level training in statistical methods, theory, data analysis and computing with possible specializations in one of several areas of application.
2. Train students for a career as an applied statistician in the private or public sector.

Goals of Regular Masters Program

1. Intended as a dual degree earned while a student is working towards a Ph.D. in Statistics or a graduate degree in another field.

Goals of Ph.D. Program

1. Provide students with advanced training in probability, theoretical and applied statistics.
2. Prepare students for careers in academia, private or public sector

Methods of Assessment

1. Annual review of applications, admissions, and trends.
2. Annual departmental review of students' performance in courses, consulting class (for Applied Masters students), and qualifying exams (for Ph.D. students).
3. Regular departmental review of teaching evaluations of GSI's and ELI tests
4. Regular tracking of job placements and informal survey of alumni

Feedback mechanisms

1. Regular discussion among faculty on programs and plans for improvement
2. Annual departmental GSI workshops

Program in Women's Studies: *Graduate Program Assessment Plan*

Goals

The joint doctoral programs in Women's Studies (with Psychology, English, and History) are committed to an interdisciplinary approach to the study of women and gender in their intersections with race, ethnicity, and class. The structure of the doctoral program is designed to encourage comparative thinking within feminism, as well as across disciplines.

The graduate curriculum is designed to:

- provide in-depth knowledge of interdisciplinary scholarship on women
- ensure in-depth knowledge of an academic discipline

- offer comparative knowledge of feminist thinking across the humanities, social sciences, and applied sciences (medicine, public health, etc.)
- encourage comparative thinking through exploration of the multicultural nature of feminist scholarship
- promote the development of an interdisciplinary approach to a research program that culminates in an interdisciplinary dissertation

Methods of Assessment

Evaluation of doctoral programs and courses:

- Mandatory course evaluations through CRLT
- Mid-term course evaluations through formal and informal mechanisms
- Periodic review and evaluation of individual courses by the Interdisciplinary Doctoral Program Committee (IDPC), under the leadership of the Director of Graduate Studies
- Periodic comparative survey of Women's Studies doctoral programs at peer institutions
- Exit interviews with graduates (to be instituted when the first cohort of students graduates)
- Periodic survey of alumni/ae (to be instituted when the first cohort of students graduates)
- Periodic external review, initiated by the Dean of LS&A

Evaluation of preparedness for employment:

- Annual review of resumes of students on the job market
- Exit interviews with graduates (to be instituted when the first cohort of students graduates)
- Periodic survey of alumni/ae (to be instituted after the first cohort of students graduates)

Feedback Mechanisms

- The IDPC will issue an annual report evaluating doctoral program goals and assessments methods and recommending changes in goals, assessment methods, or courses where necessary.
- The report will be discussed at the first Women's Studies faculty meeting of the academic year.