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“Can our faculty actually provide meaningful evidence on the kind of learning that matters in the twenty-first century?”

“For a college or university that seeks to provide a high-quality education [and for students from less traditional and more diverse backgrounds], the evidence about what students know and can do with their learning is the crucial question.”

Daniel F. Sullivan, President Emeritus, St. Lawrence University; Senior Advisor to the AAC&U President; and Chair, AAC&U Presidents’ Trust
The **National** Level
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The **Campus** Level
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The **Classroom** Level
THE NATIONAL LEVEL

Association of American Colleges and Universities
State Higher Education Executive Officers Association
To explore the kinds of learning Americans need now to engage, contribute, and thrive as participants in a fast-changing global economy and as citizens whose choices will affect the future both of US democracy and of global interdependence.

To probe higher education’s role in engaging students with the world’s “grand challenges” and in helping to create a more just and sustainable future for the United States and for societies around the globe.
Need to provide **better evidence** of what students are learning as they progress toward completion—not just better data on completion rates.

AAC&U wants “what counts as primary evidence” when it comes to assessing students’ learning gains in college.

These faculty-led approaches move **students’ own complex college work**—projects, writing, research, collaborations, service learning, internships, creative performances—to the center of the assessment equation. Faculty members have a **central role** in judgments about the goals of higher learning and about the rubrics or standards that should be used in evaluating students’ attainment of those goals.
VALUE initiative supported with a grant from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. Begun in December 2013. Funding supports the
Multistate Collaborative to Advance Learning Outcomes Assessment (MSC) - a partnership among the State Higher Education Executive Officers' association (SHEEO) and nine state higher education systems and two- and four-year campuses in those states.
The Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) and the State Higher Education Executive Officers Association (SHEEO) announced today the 68 institutions—including both 2-year and 4-year institutions—participating in the Multi-State Collaborative to Advance Learning Outcomes Assessment (MSC).

The nine states currently participating in the MSC include: Connecticut, Indiana, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, Oregon, Rhode Island, and Utah.

“So you got a degree. What can you actually do with your learning?”
Connecticut
- Central Connecticut State University
- Eastern Connecticut State University
- Manchester Community College
- Naugatuck Valley Community College
- Southern Connecticut State University
- Three Rivers Community College
- Western Connecticut State University

Kentucky
- Hazard Community and Technical College
- Northern Kentucky University
- University of Kentucky

Utah
- Salt Lake Community College
- Snow College
- University of Utah
- Utah State University

Indiana
- Ball State University
- Indiana State University
- Indiana University Bloomington
- Indiana University East
- Indiana University Kokomo
- Indiana University Northwest
- Indiana University South Bend
- Indiana University Southeast
- Indiana University Purdue University
- Indiana University Purdue University Fort Wayne
- Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana
- Purdue University Calumet
- Purdue University North Central
- University of Southern Indiana
- Vincennes University

Massachusetts
- Berkshire Community College
- Bristol Community College
- Cape Cod Community College
- Fitchburg State University
- Framingham State Community College
- Holyoke Community College
- Massasoit Community College
- Middlesex Community College
- Mount Wachusett Community College
- North Shore Community College
- Northern Essex Community College
- Quinsigamond Community College
- University of Massachusetts Lowell
- Worcester State University

Minnesota
- Century College
- Hibbing Community
- Inver Hills Community College
- Itasca Community College
- North Hennepin Community College
- Minnesota West Community and Technical College
- Minnesota State Community and Technical College
- Vermilion Community College
- St. Cloud State University
- University of Minnesota, Duluth

Oregon
- Chemeketa Community College
- Eastern Oregon University
- Oregon Institute of Technology
- Portland Community College
- Southwest Oregon Community College
- University of Oregon

Rhode Island
- Community College of Rhode Island
- University of Rhode Island

Utah
- Salt Lake Community College
- Snow College
- University of Utah
- Utah State University

Minnesota
- Century College
- Hibbing Community
- Inver Hills Community College
- Itasca Community College
- North Hennepin Community College
- Minnesota West Community and Technical College
- Minnesota State Community and Technical College
- Vermilion Community College
- St. Cloud State University
- University of Minnesota, Duluth

Missouri
- Crowder College
- Harris-Stowe State University
- Ozarks Technical Community College
- Southeast Missouri State University
- Three Rivers Community College
- Truman State University
- University of Central Missouri
THE STATE LEVEL

Led by a team of faculty and staff from each of the 28 undergraduate campuses to improve curriculum and learning through development of learning outcomes assessment.

Funded by the Davis Educational Foundation

Which also funds faculty stipends for workshops and summer assessment.
THE CAMPUS LEVEL

General Education Assessment

FSU Office of Assessment
Dr. Mark Nicholas, Director
Dr. Rebecca Shearman, Faculty Administrator
Ms. Brittany Brown, Administrative Assistant
GENERAL EDUCATION ASSESSMENT PLAN

**Created:** September 14, 2012 **Revisited:** April 26, 2013 **Revised:** April 26, 2013

**SUMMER 2012**
- AAG members to evaluate potential assessment tools using sample artifacts
- Finalize assessment tools to be used

**AY 2012-2013**
- Overarching Objective: Solve problems using critical thinking
- Objective 1: Communicate effectively orally
- Objective 2: Communicate effectively in writing
- Objective 3: Solve problems using quantitative thinking
- Objective 4: Develop informational technology competency
- Objective 5: Locate, evaluate, and apply information
- Objective 6: Finalize assessment tools to be used
- Objective 7: Collect artifacts and supplemental materials
- Objective 8: Remind faculty of artifacts to be collected
- Objective 9: Collect artifacts and supplemental materials

**SUMMER 2013**
- Analysis of artifacts and results reported

**AY 2013-2014**
- Objective 1: Communicate effectively orally
- Objective 2: Evaluate potential assessment tools using sample artifacts
- Objective 3: Finalize assessment tools to be used
- Objective 4: Collect artifacts and supplemental materials

**SUMMER 2014**
- Analysis of artifacts and results reported

**AY 2014-2015**
- Objective 1: Demonstrate critical understanding of human diversity
- Objective 2: Evaluate potential assessment tools using sample artifacts
- Objective 3: Finalize assessment tools to be used
- Objective 4: Collect artifacts and supplemental materials

**SUMMER 2015**
- Analysis of artifacts and results reported

**AY 2015-2016**
- Objective 1: Collect artifacts and supplemental materials
- Objective 2: Remind faculty of artifacts to be collected
- Objective 3: Collect artifacts and supplemental materials

**SUMMER 2016**
- Analysis of all General Education assessment data

**AY 2016-2017**
- Objective 1: Overall evaluation of General Education curriculum
- Objective 2: Results of General Education assessment reported
- Objective 3: Evaluation of General Education assessment process

**SUMMER 2017**
- Propose assessment cycle for AY 2017-2018 through AY 2022-2023

*Objectives are pilot tested in advance of their formal assessment.*
The Assessment Advisory Group (AAG) at Framingham State University consists of at least one faculty member from every academic department on campus.

Members of the AAG serve as ambassadors of assessment for their discipline and provide a faculty voice to institutional assessment processes.

The AAG is charged with three primary responsibilities:

1) To represent respective departments in matters related to program-level assessment and thereby serve as the department expert in assessment.

2) To be the voice of respective departments in the assessment of the General Education curriculum.

3) To share information and make recommendations to other departments to improve program-level assessment processes.
## AAG Current Members 2014-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Department</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art and Music</td>
<td>Prof. Stephanie Grey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Dr. Rebecca Shearman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry and Food Science</td>
<td>Dr. Catherine Dignam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Arts</td>
<td>Dr. Audrey Kali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>Prof. David Keil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Econ Prof. &amp; and Business Admin</td>
<td>Prof. Karen Druffel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Dr. Julia Zoino - Jeannetti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Dr. Patricia Crouch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fashion Design and Retailing</td>
<td>Prof. Pam Sebor-Cable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>Dr. Judy Otto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>Dr. Sarah Adelman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Dr. Sheree Arpin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics and Earth Science</td>
<td>Dr. Vandana Singh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Dr. Paul Ewenstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology and Philosophy</td>
<td>Dr. Charles Sachs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>Dr. Marian Cohen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Languages</td>
<td>Dr. Juliana Freire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE DEPARTMENTAL LEVEL
Program Assessment
Department Mission Statement

The Department of Communication Arts combines the theoretical foundations and practical applications of human communication, creating a hybrid experience grounded in the liberal arts. In addition to engaging in general approaches to communication theory, critical media, and visual studies, all students are exposed to a wide range of educational methods in visual production, performance competence, and writing proficiency. This integrated curriculum gives students an enhanced learning opportunity and a substantial grounding for futures in both the workplace and post-baccalaureate study.

Mission Statement is to Align with the Program Goals
Program Learning Objectives

GOAL - Communication Theory:
PLO I: Apply communication theories to written, visual, oral, or mediated texts.

- Identify theories of perception that inform an understanding of communication
- Differentiate concepts of persuasion as they apply to oral, visual, and written communication
- Employ the theories that correspond to media effects research
- Illustrate how theories of communication pertain to media criticism

GOAL - Visual Studies:
PLO II: Analyze visual texts using appropriate disciplinary terminologies.

- Identify iconic concepts in history and design
- Categorize the semantics of color in visual texts
- Evaluate the structures of visual texts

GOAL - Performance Competence:
PLO III: Express a non-mediated spoken message using vocalics and gestures aligned with the context.

- Relate to an audience with focus and engagement
- Express a message with hand gestures, facial expressions, and eye contact
- Show incorporation of appropriate vocalics for performance context

GOAL - Writing Competence
PLO IV: Express a non-mediated spoken message using vocalics and gestures aligned with the context.

- Develop a written message while maintaining a unifying idea
- Illustrate the use of proficient word choice
- Produce a written message that maintains the appropriate structural integrity
- Write a message that is free of errors in grammar, spelling and punctuation

GOAL - Visual Production
PLO V: Produce a visual communication message employing a process and design acceptable to the medium.

- Design a motion, image or graphic media piece form concept to complete artifact
- Demonstrate competency in digital imaging technologies
- Differentiate the employment of appropriate aesthetics for the visual genre
- Justify the application of design principles as associated with the medium

GOAL - Media Studies
PLO VI: Interpret how social media and mass media inform human communication dynamics in contemporary culture.

- Explore the interactions of mediated communication with the institutions of society and the development of the self
- Demonstrate knowledge of the history of media forms—including film, video, television, Internet, and digital text

- Identify the historical, social, cultural, and political contexts within which a mediated text is produced, including the conditions of its production and reception.
A Curriculum Map is Created to indicate which Program Learning Objectives are reflected in each course in addition to the level of proficiency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication Arts</th>
<th>Core Requirements</th>
<th>Communication Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Learning Objectives</td>
<td>COMM 115</td>
<td>COMM 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kali, Audrey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Theory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply communication theories to written, oral visual or mediated texts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze visual texts using appropriate disciplinary terminologies and protocols.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Express a non-mediated spoken message using vocalics and gestures aligne with a given context.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a written message using appropriate word choice, structure, and mechanicals suitable to the genre.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produce a visual communication message employing a process and design strategy acceptable to the medium.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Criticism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpret how social media and mass media inform human communication dynamics in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Departments have a **Five-year Cycle** Assessment Plan

**Communication Arts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F 2012</td>
<td>Communication Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 2013</td>
<td>Visual Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 2013</td>
<td>Performance Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 2014</td>
<td>Writing Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 2014</td>
<td>Visual Production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 2015</td>
<td>Media Studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Assessment Rubrics for the Goal are established by the Dept. Assessment Committee and the instructors teaching courses related to that goal.

2. The Rubrics are distributed to instructors whose classes reflect program learning opportunities for that goal - as indicated on the Curriculum Map.

3. Those instructors select assignments (artifacts) that incorporate that program learning opportunity.

4. After those assignments are completed, they are scrubbed of identifying information and turned into the Dept. Assessment Committee for scoring.

**STUDENTS SHOULD BE INFORMED OF THE PROGRAM GOALS AND OUTCOMES!**
The above is NOT what assessment will lead to . . .

THANK YOU!