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I. COMMITTEE CHARGE

Our campus is committed to the educational achievement of our students, and we strive to offer educational programs that are of the highest quality. A regular and thoughtful practice of articulating and assessing student learning outcomes allows for our campus to ensure that our graduates are receiving the world-class education that we promise. We are increasingly called on to demonstrate that our students have met certain learning goals, and to continuously review and affirm or improve our curricula based on feedback obtained through assessment.

To promote and guide these activities on our campus, I am appointing you to the Provost’s Council for Learning Outcomes Assessment (C-LOA). Thank you for agreeing to serve. You were each nominated to serve on the Council by your dean or other unit leader because of your broad understanding of quality teaching and learning and your commitment to continuous improvement of teaching and curricula.

An important role of the Council is to foster a practice of assessment that is ongoing and meaningful to campus units. Our assessment efforts should also satisfy the needs of program and institutional accreditation. Over the long-term, I expect the Council to coordinate the assessment of student learning at Illinois, both at the institutional level and at the unit level, assuring that learning goals have been identified, that continuous evaluation is occurring, and that the evidence from those evaluations is being used to improve educational quality when needed.

Many thanks to the previous members of this group who have successfully launched the assessment work on campus. Some are continuing on the Council, while others (Clare Chen, George Gollin, Dawn Marick, Isabel Molina, Colleen Murphy, Kristin Phelps, and Linda Robbennolt) are rotating off the Council. I welcome all new members to the group, who are noted with an asterisk in the list above. All new members have been asked for a three-year commitment.

In this, as in all of your work, I ask you to respect the variety of goals and types of evidence of student learning that may be appropriate across different programs.

For the 2018-19 academic year, I ask you to:

- Familiarize yourselves with the expectations of the Higher Learning Commission (HLC), our regional accreditor, around assessment;
- Communicate with the campus community about the expectations for assessment, including expectations related to regional accreditation;
- Continue to collect assessment materials and reports from across campus to serve as examples of assessment practices, to assure that units are actively engaged in examining educational quality, and to fulfill the expectations of accreditation with a particular focus on developing a strategy to assure that general education is being assessed and that course proposals and approvals have embedded learning outcomes and assessment plans;
- Provide evaluations of the Graduate-level assessment reports using a rubric designed by C-LOA;
- Review the updates submitted for the Undergraduate-level assessment work, using a rubric designed by C-LOA;
- Work with Educational Policy Committee to assure that changes in curriculum or new programs have assessment built into the proposals, including the stated learning outcomes for the programs;
Establish a more transparent process to share program-level learning outcomes by adding program-level outcomes to Courseleaf, so that they are easily accessible to students;

Continue to recognize good assessment work by creating awards for assessment;

Recommend policy changes that might be needed to ensure that outcomes assessment on campus is ongoing, effective and meaningful.

In addition, there will be two sub-groups for this year’s work:

One group will write the assurance argument for HLC criterion 4. Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement

Another group will examine the federal compliance expectations for the transparency of outcomes and develop a strategy for more fully adopting the campus-wide learning outcomes.

Cheryl Hanley-Maxwell, Dean of the College of Applied Health Sciences, has agreed to continue to chair this Council. Staci Provezis, the Associate Provost for Academic Effectiveness, will serve as the co-chair for this year’s work. Linell Edwards will serve as support for the Council as an ex officio member. A member of my staff will contact you shortly to set up a schedule of meetings.

II. COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Cheryl Hanley-Maxwell, AHS, Chair
Anna Dilger, ACES
Dilip Chhajed, BUS*
Jenny Amos, Carle Illinois COM
Luc Paquette, EDU
Matthew West, ENGR
John Toenjes, FAA* and General Education Board
Kelly Ritter, LAS and General Education Board
Kari Sanderson, LAW*
Ryan Lamare, LER
Linda Smith, LIS
Alexis Thompson, Graduate College*
Shachar Meron, Media
Min Zhan, School of Social Work
Christopher Seals, VetMed*
Denice Hood, OLOAC Liaison**
Jen-chien Yu, University Library
Julia Makela, Student Affairs
Eric Meyer, Senate
Verna Orr, Graduate Student
Michel Bellini, CITL
Staci Provezis, Office of Provost, ex officio

*on Council starting in Fall 2018
**requested membership in Fall 2018
III. ACTIVITIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

For the 2018-2019 academic year, the Council made considerable progress on its charges, and it has made several recommendations to move this work forward. The following lists each charge, activities undertaken, and recommendations. Appendix A provides a more detailed summary of each meeting.

**Charge:** Familiarize yourselves with the expectations of the Higher Learning Commission, our regional accreditor, around assessment

- **Activity/Decision:** The Council learned more about the HLC expectations, and it had a sub-group assigned to write the assurance argument for parts of Criterion 3 and most of Criterion 4. Another sub-group looked at federal compliance expectations.

- **Recommendation(s):**
  - Communicate more widely with the University community about HLC accreditation, and how it is different from specialized accreditation, so that the campus is aware of the upcoming accreditation and its importance.
  - Continue to engage C-LOA on accreditation for the Criterion that aligns with the work of the Council.

**Charge:** Communicate with the campus community about the expectations for assessment, including expectations related to regional accreditation

- **Activity/Decision:** The Council engaged in discussions within colleges and departments and served as the College liaison by answering questions within their colleges about assessment. The Assessment Community was created to better foster communication about assessment work and to build a community of practice.

- **Recommendation(s):**
  - Continue to provide workshops and the brownbag sessions. Look to the assessment updates and feedback from C-LOA for workshop topics.
  - Encourage departments to learn more about the different department assessment processes, so that they could work together.
  - Encourage graduate programs to discuss assessment with UG program assessment liaisons.

**Charge:** Continue to collect assessment materials and reports from across campus to serve as examples of assessment practices, to assure that units are actively engaged in examining educational quality, and to fulfill the expectations of accreditation with a particular focus on developing a strategy to assure that general education is being assessed and that course proposals and approvals have embedded learning outcomes and assessment plans

- **Activity/Decision:**
  - The Council successfully collected over 98% of the reports for graduate programs and 94% of the undergraduate progress reports. A few programs continue to work on their reports and updates due to changes in department leadership or major changes in the program. They continue to be monitored, so the University reaches 100% complete.
  - The General Education Assemblies on Learning Outcomes were completed as well as discussions about general education assessment.


- **Recommendation(s):**
  - Show more examples of assessment work that include the entire assessment templates, and show more examples of how programs use direct and indirect measures.
  - Continue to refine the process for the collection and review of assessment information.
  - In next year’s review, begin the process for awarding good assessment activity.
  - Engage the General Education Board to include assessment in course approval process.
  - Finalize a strategy for assessing general education building on the work of the General Education Assemblies and the USMC assessment work.

**Charge:** Provide evaluations of the graduate and professional assessment reports using a rubric previously designed by C-LOA

- **Activity/Decision:** The previously designed rubric was revised to evaluate the learning outcomes assessment plans for graduate programs. A total of 217 graduate assessment plans were submitted/received. Each report was reviewed by two CLOA members, with each member reviewing about 20 assessment plans.

- **Recommendation(s):** Continue providing guidance to graduate programs and questioning the pairing of masters and doctorate programs submitting the same assessment template.

**Charge:** Review the updates submitted for the Undergraduate-level assessment work, using a rubric designed by C-LOA

- **Activity/Decision:** The rubric that was previously designed to evaluate the undergraduate assessment plans was modified to evaluate the undergraduate assessment update. A total of 108 undergraduate assessment updates were submitted/received and subsequently reviewed by C-LOA.

- **Recommendation(s):** Request the UG and G programs to submit updates to their assessment work by October 1, using an updated on-line submission system designed by C-LOA.

**Charge:** Work with Educational Policy Committee to assure that changes in curriculum or new programs have assessment built into the proposals, including the stated learning outcomes for the programs

- **Activity/Decision:** Discussed the importance of including assessment information in proposals, but did not fully explore this topic.

- **Recommendation(s):** Include this item in next year’s charge letter for C-LOA.

**Charge:** Establish a more transparent process to share program-level learning outcomes by adding program-level outcomes to Courseleaf, so that they are easily accessible to students

- **Activity/Decision:** Learning outcomes for 132 undergraduate programs were added to the academic catalog (Courseleaf). Learning outcomes for graduate programs will be added to the academic catalog during summer/fall 2019.

- **Recommendation(s):** Determine the best way for this information to be updated when needed.

**Charge:** Continue to recognize good assessment work by creating awards for assessment
• **Activity/Decision:** CLOA discussed options to recognize/consider outstanding assessment work through/for Teaching Advancement (TAB) Awards. The Distinguished Teacher Scholar award and the Provost’s initiative on Teaching Advancement (PITA) grant were identified as potential starting points.

• **Recommendation(s):** Formally move forward with the awards for assessment.

**Charge:** Recommend policy changes that might be needed to ensure that outcomes assessment on campus is ongoing, effective and meaningful

• **Activity/Decision:** The Council discussed policies that would be helpful to promote meaningful assessment. Adding program level outcomes to academic catalog to make this information more easily accessible to students was completed for UG programs. Steps were taken to create awards based on awards already available on campus. C-LOA reiterated the following two recommendations from last year.

• **Recommendation(s):**
  - Work with Educational Policy Committee to assure that changes in curriculum or new programs have assessment built into the proposals, including the stated learning outcomes for the programs.
  - Work with the General Education Board to encourage that learning outcomes and assessment of the courses are embedded into the course proposals.

**Charge:** Write the assurance argument for HLC criterion 4. Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement

• **Activity/Decision:** The Accreditation Sub-Group worked collectively to produce a working draft of the assurance argument for HLC criterion 4. The entire draft of the assurance argument is under review by various stakeholders.

**Charge:** Examine the federal compliance expectations for the transparency of outcomes and develop a strategy for more fully adopting the campus-wide learning outcomes

• **Activity/Decision:** The Transparency Sub-Group reviewed HLC Federal Compliance expectations for transparency. Members discussed adding learning outcomes to the academic catalog and various strategies to increase awareness of campus-wide learning outcomes (CLOs) as well as a plan for assessing CLOs.

• **Recommendation(s):**
  - Collaborate with Student Affairs on assessing campus learning outcomes.
  - Create reports from Chancellor's Senior Survey that aligns with the campus learning outcomes.
  - Start assessing campus learning outcomes by beginning with “Effective Leadership and Global Consciousness” given that only 70% of UG programs indicated that one or more of their LOs align with this CLO.

In summary, C-LOA members addressed the major items in its charge: collected reports and updates, reviewed both UG updates and Grad reports, wrote a major section of the accreditation report, provided guidance on transparency and placing learning outcomes in the academic catalog, and began the process for General Education Assessment. The Council continues to promote a culture of assessment on campus.
APPENDIX A: DETAILED COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES AND PROCESS

New Member Meeting, September 11, 2018:

The five new members of the committee met with the co-chair, Staci Provezis, to learn about the activities of the Council over the last two years. This meeting served as an orientation to the Council and its activities.

Full Council Meeting, September 27, 2018:

During the first meeting of the year, new members were welcomed and introductions occurred. Then, Vice-Provost Kevin Pitts charged the committee talking about the importance of assuring high quality student learning on our campus not to simply fulfill accreditation standards, which is very important, but to also show our commitment to the educational experiences of our students.

Because the learning outcomes assessment work may involve some sensitive data and descriptions. Associate Provost Staci Provezis explained the Provost’s office confidentiality agreement as well as federal and state policies relating to the following: FERPA, Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), and Institutional Review Board (IRB) for Human Subjects research.

Dean Cheryl Hanley-Maxwell explained the expectations of the work that would take place this year, and shared the timeline that C-LOA would follow that intermixes full Council meetings with two working groups meetings.

Prior to the meeting, the Council members reviewed two reports so as to provide feedback on the review system, to get experience looking at the assessment plans, and to establish inter-rater reliability. Linell Edwards, Coordinator for Assessment and Evaluation, shared with the group areas where there were discrepancies and further defined the questions and the intentions of the questions in the review system.

Full Council meeting, October 26, 2018:

Each member was asked to review about twenty assessment plans by November 12, and during this meeting we discussed the progress on those reviews and questions that were emerging. Throughout the day, the room was reserved to allow partners to gather, share reviews, and discuss discrepancies. During this meeting, we discussed that a department’s submissions may be the department’s first attempt in doing learning outcomes assessment. It is possible that no one in the department knows much about assessment. As such, our role is to help provide guidance rather than to “get them” for not completing the template as we would hope. That said, we want to help the departments understand how to write measurable student learning outcomes, to create curriculum maps as best they can given the lack of similar courses across some graduate curriculums, and to share multi-year plans for assessment. The Council read the article from AAC&U, Assessment: What is it good for? Like this article emphasizes, we want faculty to see this work as coming from their interest in teaching and learning, not by the requirement of filling out the form. The goal of the Council is to be sure that the reviews and reflections help move the campus in this direction and do not set the wrong tone.

The Council discussed that the section about assessment work that was done over the last five years is optional. So if this section is not up to par, then the Council can make suggestions to help guide departments future assessment work, but the omission at this point should not be counted against them.
Some C-LOA members were interested in the Assessment in Doctoral Education (AIDE) work, and documents on AIDE were shared after the meeting.

We spent a majority of the time trying to better understand the difference between doctorate degrees and masters degrees, and afterward the following article was shared: *What is a Ph.D? Reverse-Engineering our Degree Programs in the Age of Evidence-Based Change*. The C-LOA work may lead to a bigger conversation on this topic. The Council was asked to try their best to figure out if the template shows the difference between degree programs or if it should have been two reports.

Finally, the Council was made aware that there are opportunities to make comments to C-LOA in the review system. These comments will allow the group to identify the campus needs for providing support to our community on assessment. For instance, as the reviewers, are you seeing trends where departments could use a primer on writing learning outcomes? Do you see where too many departments are relying on indirect assessment strategies? By pulling this information we can identify areas for support, such as workshop topics. In addition, the Council is asked whether a program should be used as a model because it is a great example and should be viewed as such by others. Indicating this to the Council will allow for us to share good examples and best practices.

Besides talking about the reviews, Linda Smith gave us an update on the Accreditation Task Force, which is actively writing the assurance argument for items related to assessment, and Eric Meyer gave us an update on the Transparency Task Force, which is developing a way to make the learning outcomes more transparent using the academic catalog (Courseleaf).

**Full Council Meeting, February 15, 2019:**

We briefly discussed the graduate review process that took place in December 2018 (see Appendix B). The group was informed that feedback from the graduate review process was sent to all programs the previous week (see Appendix C). Letters of commendation were also sent to programs with exemplary assessment plans (see Appendix D). C-LOA initially identified 69 assessment plans that appeared to cover multiple degree programs, but further discussion revealed that only seven assessment plans actually covered multiple degree programs. To clarify this issue, it was suggested for the assessment update to ask programs to explain the difference if more than one degree program is included in the same assessment plan. It was also suggested that we ask the programs to look at their Programs of Study and explain how that compares to the curriculum map. Questions for programs to consider include: Are there different levels of mastery for the different programs? How do programs communicate information about learning outcomes to students? Linell and Staci are reviewing comments from the graduate review process and identifying themes that will be shared at a future meeting.

We discussed the undergraduate update review process (see Appendix E). The review template was shared with the group for feedback. Several questions were added to address units that may be creating assessment processes, but not doing assessment yet. Given the heavy workload of writing the assurance argument, identifying evidence, and revising the arguments, members of the Accreditation sub-group were assigned six reviews each, while members of the Transparency sub-group were assigned twelve reviews each. The group was asked to complete as many as possible on the reviews before the March 8th meeting, because we would like to send feedback to the units prior to spring break. The assessment update review process was anticipated to be more streamlined than the graduate program review process (see Appendix F).
Linda Smith and Eric Meyer provided updates on the sub-group activity. The Accreditation sub-group has been actively writing, revising, and identifying evidence for the accreditation assurance argument. The Transparency sub-group has been discussing plans to add learning outcomes to the academic catalog. The Senate is reviewing a syllabus policy. The sub-group began discussions on General Education assessment and promised to share an outline of a strategy (that is aligned with other general education assessment activities) at a future meeting.

Staci discussed the Provost’s Office initiative (General Education Assembly) to gather learning outcomes for all general education categories. She will follow-up with C-LOA to ask for volunteers to moderate discussions.

**Full Council Meeting, March 8, 2019:**

Staci provided an update on the General Education Assembly on Learning Outcomes. The General Education Assembly large group meetings were held March 5 & 6 with two more happening on March 13 & 14. Faculty and graduate students who teach courses related to each General Education requirement come together to brainstorm ideas for learning outcomes specific to their General Education category. Information from the large group meetings will be processed by working groups specific to each General Education category.

Staci and Linell provided an update on adding learning outcomes (LOs) to the academic catalog. The Provost’s Office is in the process of adding LOs to academic catalog using LOs that were submitted in the undergraduate (UG) learning outcomes assessment plans. The goal is to have all LOs entered into the academic catalog by the first week of April. Department heads will have until the first week of May to approve LOs. No response will be viewed as approval. If revisions are made to LOs, we will encourage programs to submit a revised assessment plan. Communication will be key throughout the process. Thus, the first message will go out to UG programs to inform them that feedback on their Assessment Update is available and that we will be adding LOs to academic catalog. A more detailed message about the academic catalog will follow, along with another reminder of the next assessment update. In August, another message will be sent to departments to remind them of the assessment update and to direct them to the catalog to view published LOs.

The group discussed the undergraduate assessment update review process and provided feedback (see Appendix G). Some feedback from C-LOA regarding the review process include:

- How to assess programs that are going through curricular revisions
- Creating a collection of “best practices” and sharing with programs
- Assessment updates reflect different levels of engagement
- Think about how to get programs to consider the purpose of the program and how the intended goals of the program are reflected in their student learning outcomes
- Include working definitions and/or examples of specific terms such as direct evidence, indirect evidence, etc.

In light of the 2019 assessment update, Staci asked the group “Are we getting the right information from the assessment update?” The group advocated for a more streamlined assessment update template. Additional feedback from C-LOA include:

- Provide examples of completed reports
- Ask more specific questions in the “Next Steps” section
• Instead of C-LOA making the determination, present programs with list of options to choose from
• Some programs might need refresher on “what is a learning outcome”
• Ask department if we can use LOs as examples
• Hyperlink relevant resources in feedback report

Full Council Meeting, May 6, 2019:

The meeting started with general updates. The “Let’s Talk Assessment” Brown Bags, which started spring 2019, will continue throughout next year (see Appendix H). The request for assessment updates were sent to both undergraduate and graduate programs with a deadline of October 1, 2019 (see Appendix I and Appendix J). The assessment update review process for AY 2019-2020 will take place October to December. The goal is to get feedback to units by December/January.

Linda Smith and Eric Meyer provided updates on the sub-group activity. The Accreditation sub-group finished a draft of the assurance argument. The Transparency sub-group discussed adding learning to the academic catalog, general education learning outcomes and assessment, and campus learning outcomes at their last meeting. A message was sent to units to approve learning outcomes for UG programs by May 15; learning outcomes for graduate programs will be added after the registrar has finished editing graduate academic catalog pages.

The majority of the meeting was spent discussing Teaching Advancement (TAB) Awards and C-LOA recommendations to TAB. The group reviewed three TAB Awards: Campus Awards for Excellence in Instruction, Distinguished Teacher/Scholar, and Provost’s Initiative on Teaching Advancement (PITA). It was suggested to encourage programs/departments to apply for assessment awards through feedback on their assessment updates. A tentative process was suggested starting with nominations. Those nominated would be asked to submit a 1-2 page document based on specific criteria, which would then be reviewed by C-LOA. Each nominee should receive a “certificate.”

The group also discussed recommendations for next year’s work, which are listed at the end of the report.

ACCREDITATION SUB-GROUP

Accreditation Sub-Group Meeting, October 3, 2018

During this meeting, members were assigned accreditation components related to assessment and evaluation (some of Criterion 3 and Criterion 4) that they would write to for the assurance argument. Two members were assigned to each component, so that there was a lead writer and a secondary writer. The expectation was to have the first draft completed by November 12 to allow all members to review the entire document prior to the next meeting.

Accreditation Sub-Group Meeting, November 26, 2018

Members reviewed the draft submissions by going through each sub-component, and notes were taken for possible revisions and evidence suggestions. Revisions were asked for by January 31, 2019.

Accreditation Sub-Group Meeting, March 1, 2019
Prior to the meeting, the members of this group were reminded to look at the distributed “writing tips and evidence tips” and to look at our peer examples of the assurance arguments as they continued to refine their sections of the assurance argument and identify evidence. During the meeting, the group continued to refine and provide feedback on the drafted assurance argument. Members were asked to address the comments for the final review and to complete this draft by April 15.

**Accreditation Sub-Group Meeting, May 1, 2019**

The members refined the draft in preparation of the May 1 meeting, they read both criteria 3 and 4, and during the meeting, the group continued to provide feedback on the draft—looking carefully at the wording of the components and the assurance argument’s connection to the expectations. The feedback from this meeting will be addressed by the Provost’s office during Summer 2019.

**TRANSPARENCY SUB-GROUP**

**Transparency Sub-Group Meeting, October 10, 2018**

Staci and Eric discussed the goals of the Transparency sub-group, which included a focus on Federal Compliance and Transparency Policy, General Education, and Campus Learning Outcomes. The group discussed federal compliance and identified steps to be more transparent. It was suggested that learning outcomes for each program, along with a summary of assessment activities (250 word limit) should be publically available. The group also discussed new programs and the assessment template that would be use to capture their assessment activities. It was suggested to embed assessment template into the program approval process. An abridged version of the assessment template that exclude the section on previous assessment activity was recommended for new programs.

**Transparency Sub-Group Meeting, December 4, 2018**

The group discussed general education. C-LOA will develop the policy and procedure for assessing general education, and thus will create a template for assessing each general education requirement. A suggestion was made to build assessment into the approval process for General Education courses. The group also indicated that the General Education assessment should be modeled after the assessment work done for the US-Minorities Cultural Studies (USMCS) requirement. Linell and Staci offered to develop a skeleton of general education assessment template based on USMCS assessment template and the learning outcomes assessment templates used for the degree programs for the group to review.

The group also discussed transparency of student learning outcomes. It was decided that C-LOA should focus efforts on making learning outcomes publically available via Courseleaf and request summaries of assessment activities at a later date. Staci will discuss the topic with the Council of Undergraduate Deans at a meeting later this week. The goal is to have learning outcomes posted on Courseleaf by the end of AY 2018-2019. Although each undergraduate program submitted learning outcomes with their assessment plans, many did so unbeknownst that they would be public. As such, proper communication to units is necessary.

**Transparency Sub-Group Meeting, February 28, 2019**

Staci discussed the process for adding programmatic learning outcomes to academic catalog. The C-LOA was informed that learning outcomes will not be made public until they are approved by the program. The group discussed adding learning outcomes to the course approval process.
Staci provided an update on the General Education Assembly on Learning Outcomes, where over 300 people signed up to attend. Working groups for each category will start meeting in April to interpret data gathered from the Assemblies. The plan is to have a draft of LOs for each General Education Category by May and finalize LOs by Fall 2019. The goal is to have LOs for each category, but also to create a community for General Education.

The group discussed plans to produce an assessment plan and assessment template for general education by the end of summer 2019. The ultimate goal is to get LOs in the approval process for certification and recertification. The group also provided feedback on a working draft of the assessment template for general education. The assessment methods section of the template was well received, but there was a discussion about assessment administration. C-LOA will build the structure for assessment.

**Transparency Sub-Group Meeting, April 25, 2019**

Staci provided update on the addition of learning outcomes to the academic catalog. Learning outcomes for undergraduate programs that submitted an assessment plan were added to the academic catalog and was awaiting approval by assessment liaisons. Assessment liaisons were instructed to approve/revise the learning outcomes by May 15 (see Appendix K).

Staci also provided an update on the general education assembly. Working group meetings for each General Education category were underway with the goal of drafting 2-5 learning outcomes for each General Education category based on ideas from General Education Assemblies. The working groups consisted of an undergraduate student, a graduate student, an advisor, a tenure track faculty, and a specialized faculty. Learning outcomes drafted by each working group will be added to General Education Assessment website. The University community will have an opportunity to provide feedback on LOs throughout the summer. LOs will be finalized Fall 2019, incorporating university-wide feedback. The plan is to have the LOs formally adopted by Spring 2020.

The group discussed the learning outcomes assessment plan for general education. Several ideas were proposed including integrating learning outcomes assessment into the course recertification process, assessing LOs for General Education at the course level, and adding assessment questions to ICES forms. The group also discussed the timeline for assessing learning outcomes for General Education. The group favored a staggered approach with each category undergoing assessment and report writing in different years; however, the preparation stage would be a three/four year process/period that happens simultaneously for all categories by the Assembly on Assessment. A non-staggered approach consisted of each General Education category undergoing LO’s development, assessment, data collection, and preliminary report by the Assembly on Assessment for the first 3-4 years, then integrating General Education assessment into the course recertification process.

The group discussed next steps surrounding the campus-wide learning outcomes. It was suggested to increase awareness of campus-wide learning outcomes by utilizing Chancellor’s Senior Survey (CSS) data as one method to assess CLOs. A learning outcomes report based on CSS data will be produced to support this effort. A tentative plan for assessing CLOs will involve separate assessment of each CLO. It was suggested that select data from multiple units across campus could be used to assess the CLOs in addition to making CLOs a focus of the brown bags or workshops. The group reviewed a document showing how many undergraduate programs aligned their LOs with the CLOs (see Appendix L). It was suggested that we start with “Effective Leadership and Global Consciousness” given that only 70% of UG programs indicated that one or more of their LOs align with this CLO.
APPENDIX B: MESSAGE - FEEDBACK FROM GRADUATE/PROFESSIONAL REVIEW

From: Provezis, Staci J <sprovez2@illinois.edu>
Sent: Monday, February 04, 2019 1:02 PM
To: Provezis, Staci J <sprovez2@illinois.edu>
Cc: Edwards, Linell D <lde2018@illinois.edu>; Pitts, Kevin T <kpitts@illinois.edu>; Chodzko-Zajko, Wojtek <wojtek@illinois.edu>
Subject: Feedback from Graduate/Professional Learning Outcomes Assessment Review

Dear Department Heads/Chairs and Assessment Liaisons,

During the 2017-2018 academic year, assessment information was collected for all graduate and professional programs, and you did an outstanding job submitting the templates in a timely way. Thank you.

During the Fall 2018 semester, the Council for Learning Outcomes Assessment (C-LOA) reviewed your assessment plans. Each assessment plan was examined by at least two different Council members. We are placing your assessment plan and the reviews in a box.com folder; if you don’t have access to this folder yet, you will by the end of the week. A notification will be sent.

As you read the feedback, we ask that you think about the next steps. If the reviewers indicate ways to strengthen your plan, please do so and resubmit the plan to Box.com through the website by going to this link and uploading your plan by October 1, 2019. Please retitle your assessment plan accordingly: College_Program_Degree_LOA_2019.

Whereas last year’s report outlined a plan for the assessment work you would do, this year we hope that you have been engaged in doing the assessment work. More details will follow, but know that we will ask for an update on this year’s Graduate/Professional assessment work by October 1, 2019.

We sincerely appreciate your commitment to the educational achievements of our students. If you have questions about the assessment work, they can be directed to me or to your college C-LOA member.

Sincerely,
Staci Provezis, Ph.D. on Behalf of the Council for Learning Outcomes Assessment

Council for Learning Outcomes Assessment
Cheryl Hanley-Maxwell, AHS, Chair
Staci Provezis, Office of Provost, Co-chair
Anna Dilger, ACES
Dilip Chhajed, BUS
Luc Paquette, EDU
Matthew West, ENGR
John Toenjes, FAA
Kelly Ritter, LAS
Kari Sanderson, LAW
Ryan Lamare, LER
Linda C. Smith, LIS
Shachar Meron, Media

Jenny Amos, Carle College of Medicine
Min Zhan, School of Social Work
Christopher Seals, VetMed
Jen-chien Yu, University Library
Julia Makela, Student Affairs
Alexis Thompson, Graduate College
Eric Meyer, Senate
Verna Orr, Graduate Student
Michel Bellini, CITL
Denice Hood, OLOAC
Linell Edwards, Office of Provost, ex officio
APPENDIX C: GRADUATE/PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENT PROCESS FEEDBACK FORM

Rubric for Evaluation of Assessment Process Reports || Graduate/Professional Degree Programs

Degree Program:
College:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1 Assessment Administration in the Department:</th>
<th>Describe how assessment will be administered in the department/program.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the &quot;Identifying Information&quot; section of the Assessment Process Template complete?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the assessment plan identify who will lead assessment work?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the assessment plan establish how assessment information will be shared within the department/program?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a plan for producing an annual summary report?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Additional Resources | For information on how to involve faculty in assessment, click here |

| Comments for the Department/Program: | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 2 Learning Outcomes:</th>
<th>List the intended Learning Outcomes for the degree program.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there at least 3-5 programmatic learning outcomes listed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the learning outcomes clearly stated?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"OTHER" / Specifying comment(s):

| Comments for the Department/Program: | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 3 Graduate/Professional Degree Curriculum Map:</th>
<th>Map the curriculum onto the student learning outcomes.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are all courses aligned to intended program outcomes?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"OTHER" / Specifying comment(s):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 4</th>
<th>Previous Assessment Activity: Explain what (if any) assessment activity has taken place.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did any assessment activity take place during the last five years?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>If yes,</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did past assessment work include specific assessment steps and/or assessment findings?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did past assessment work include authentic evidence arising from actual assignments and learning experiences?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did past assessment work focus on student learning and not on course outcomes statistics (e.g., completion or grades)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;OTHER&quot;</td>
<td>Specifying comment(s):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did past assessment work use student learning assessment for program improvement (e.g., revise curriculum, courses, and assignments)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did past assessment work improve student support services or activities (e.g., internships)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;OTHER&quot;</td>
<td>Specifying comment(s):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Resources**

For presentation on curriculum mapping, click here.

Resources for using assignments to assess learning can be found here.

Comments for the Department/Program:
**Step 5 | Assessment Planning:** Identify the questions the department wants to ask about the student outcomes and how the questions will be answered using direct and indirect assessment strategies.

| Did the assessment plan identify 3-5 questions about whether students are learning what the program wants them to learn? |
| Did the assessment plan list evidence of what will be collected to answer questions? |
| Did the assessment plan identify a timeline for the assessment work? |

**Additional Resources**

For examples of direct and indirect evidence of student learning at the course and program level, click [here](#).

**Comments for the Department/Program:**

**Overall**

| Does the program have a fully-articulated, sustainable, multi-year assessment plan? |

**"OTHER" | Specifying comment(s):**

**Comments for the Department/Program:**

**Multiple Degree Programs/Concentrations**

| Does the assessment report cover multiple degree programs and/or concentrations? |

**If yes,**

| Are the degree programs and/or concentrations distinct enough to warrant separate assessment reports? |

**Comments for the Department/Program:**

**Should the assessment report be used as a model?:**
COUNCIL FOR LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT

APPENDIX D: LETTER OF COMMENDATION - GRADUATE/PROFESSIONAL PLANS

Letter of Commendation

[Provost Letterhead]

[Date]

[Contact Information]

Dear [Name]:

On February 4, 2019, you received a message about your graduate learning outcomes assessment work that was sent to everyone who submitted a report. I write now to tell you that out of the 222 assessment reports we received, your assessment report was one of the best as determined by the fact that both of the reviewers that examined your report thought your work should serve as a model for campus.

I commend you on your thoughtful articulation of assessing student learning. Your report displays your deep understanding of how assessment will be administered and has a clear explicitly stated purpose. Moreover, we are pleased with your continuous reflection and ongoing assessment strategies.

Thank you for your commitment to the educational achievements of our students.

Sincerely,

Kevin Pitts
Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education

c: Wojtek Chodzko-Zajko
[Department Head/Chair/Director]
Staci Provezis

Exemplar Graduate/Professional Assessment Plans

Engineering - Civil & Environmental Engineering - MENG, MS, PhD
Fine & Applied Arts - Dance - MFA
Fine & Applied Arts - Music Education - MME
Fine & Applied Arts - Music Education - PhD
Liberal Arts & Sciences – Economics – MS, PhD
APPENDIX E: MESSAGE - UG ASSESSMENT UPDATE 2018

From: learningoutcomes <learningoutcomes@illinois.edu>
Sent: Friday, August 03, 2018 2:19 PM
Cc: Edwards, Linell D <lde2018@illinois.edu>; Provezis, Staci J <sprovez2@illinois.edu>
Subject: Undergraduate Assessment Update 2018

Hello, all.

You were listed as the lead for the Undergraduate Assessment work per the plans that were submitted in Spring 2017. On Wednesday, we sent a message to your department heads/chairs asking for an update on the assessment work that is being done. If you haven’t heard from your department leader, you may want to reach out to him or her because every program has its own link. I’ve copied the message below, but I have disabled the link to the update form, since you need to use your department’s link. A few items that are important for you to know:

1- see the list of questions that will be asked at the bottom of the message. You can prepare your responses and then copy and paste them into the form.
2- you can start the form and come back to it. The system should save what you have entered, allowing you to finish or to edit at a later time. Wait to hit “submit” until you have finished filling out the form.
3-the report is due October 15. You may remember, we delayed this due date from last spring to give you more time to complete your work for the year.

Do not hesitate to reach out to me or Linell Edwards, Coordinator for Assessment and Evaluation, lde2018@illinois.edu, if you have questions.

Best regards,
Staci (on behalf of the Council for Learning Outcomes Assessment)

Staci Provezis, Ph.D.
Associate Provost for Academic Effectiveness
Office of the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Provost
University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign
203 Swanlund Administration Building, MC-304
601 E John Street, Champaign, IL 61820
T: 217-333-1353 | E: sprovez2@illinois.edu | F: 217-244-5639

From: Office of the Provost <noreply@gemailserver.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 01, 2018 4:36 PM
To: Provezis, Staci J <sprovez2@illinois.edu>
Subject: Undergraduate Assessment Update 2018

Dear Dr. [insert name],
Your department submitted an Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan in Spring 2017, with the expectation that the assessment work would begin over the 2017-2018 academic year. We write now to learn about what assessment work was undertaken last year, and what you plan to do this year. In addition, the campus has adopted a set of learning outcomes (endorsed by the Senate in May 2017), so we would be interested in knowing if any of your program’s learning outcomes align with the campus outcomes.

We have created a form to collect this information from you. Please click the following link to access the form: Undergraduate Assessment Update 2018. You may find it helpful to review the outline below to get a better idea of the information you will be asked to provide.

We ask that you submit this form by **October 15, 2018**.

If you have any questions about this work or the form, please reach out to your Council for Learning Outcomes Assessment (C-LOA) representative, or Staci Provezis, Associate Provost for Academic Effectiveness (sprovez2@illinois.edu).

Sincerely,
Staci Provezis, Ph.D. on *Behalf of the Council for Learning Outcomes Assessment*
Associate Provost for Academic Effectiveness

Council for Learning Outcomes Assessment (2017-2018)

Cheryl Hanley-Maxwell, AHS, *Chair*
Anna Dilger, ACES
Xiaoling (Clare) Chen, BUS
Jenny Amos, Carle Illinois COM
Luc Paquette, EDU
Matthew West, ENGR
Linda Robbennolt, FAA
Kelly Ritter, LAS
Colleen Murphy, LAW
Ryan Lamare, LER
Linda C. Smith, LIS
Shachar Meron, Media
Min Zhan, School of Social Work
Dawn Morin, VetMed
Jen-chien Yu, University Library
Julia Makela, Student Affairs
Isabel Molina, Graduate College
Eric Meyer, Senate
George Gollin, General Education Board
Kirsten Phelps, Graduate Student
Michel Bellini, CITL
Staci Provezis, Office of Provost, *ex officio*
UG Assessment Update Outline

Assessment Lead
- Please indicate who is leading the assessment work.

Student Learning Outcomes
- How many student learning outcomes does your program have?
- Copy and paste each student learning outcome for your program into the form.
- Which campus learning outcome(s) are your program’s student learning outcomes most closely aligned?

Assessment Activity
- In Step 5 of the assessment plan, your program identified at least three questions it would pursue to better understand student learning at the program level. Which question(s) from your program’s assessment plan did the program explore during AY2017-2018? Describe what was done for each question you addressed.

Briefly reflect on your progress during AY2017-2018
- What was learned from doing the assessment work this year?
- How are the results of the assessment activities being used to impact student learning?
- Is more time needed for additional work in this area? If more time is needed, how will your program continue to follow this inquiry?
- Have the results of the assessment work been shared with others in the department? With others outside the department? How?
- What (if any) additional assistance or resources do you need to better understand this work?

Next Steps
- What assessment work will your program continue into next year? What would the program like to change or do differently? What would the program like to discontinue based on its experiences?
- Have any changes been made to the original Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan that was submitted in Spring 2017 (e.g., student learning outcomes, curriculum map, assessment planning, etc.)?
- Upload your revised Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan (if any changes/revisions were made).
### Review of Undergraduate Learning Outcomes Assessment | AY 2017-2018

**Degree Program:**

**College:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Activity</th>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Submitted Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did any assessment activity take place during AY2017-2018?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did the program mention any preparatory assessment work/activity (e.g., creating rubrics, surveys, exams, etc.)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did the program discuss any changes to the assessment process?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did the assessment work involve direct evidence arising from actual assignments and learning experiences?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did the assessment work involve indirect evidence (e.g., surveys, focus groups, interviews, etc.)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did the assessment work focus on student learning?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What was the focus of the assessment work? Select all that apply.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Response if &quot;Other&quot; was selected)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What improvements were made based on assessment work? Select all that apply.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Response if &quot;Other&quot; was selected)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments for Department:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reflection</th>
<th>Did the program reflect on their progress for AY2017-2018?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments for Department:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Next Steps</th>
<th>Did the program discuss &quot;Next Steps&quot;?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments for Department:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overarching Comments</th>
<th>Overarching Comments for Departments:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Dear Department Heads/Chairs, Assessment Liaisons, and Council of Undergraduate Deans:

The Council for Learning Outcomes Assessment (C-LOA) appreciates your continued commitment to learning outcomes assessment work. In October, all undergraduate degree programs submitted assessment updates, and this Spring semester, C-LOA reviewed those updates. Again, each assessment update was examined by two different Council members. These reviews along with your unit’s assessment template and assessment update are available in box.com. Look for a folder titled “dept name – Learning Outcomes Assessment Reports.”

C-LOA learned from reviewing your submissions that:

- about half of the programs are involved in preparation activities for assessment work, such as creating rubrics, surveys and exams;
- over half (62%) of the programs are using direct evidence to assess student learning;
- half of the programs (51%) are using indirect evidence to assess student learning;
- a majority of programs assessment activities are focused on skill development and knowledge acquisition;
- revising and redesigning the curriculum or specific courses within the curriculum are the improvements most being made as a result of assessment;
- the resources you want are workshops and examples of programs doing similar work.

Upcoming assessment activities:

- The next annual update will be due on October 1, 2019. Additional details available soon.
- To meet accreditation requirements, program-level learning outcomes will need to be added to the academic catalog this Spring. A message outlining this process will be sent separately.

We sincerely appreciate your commitment to the educational achievements of our students. If you have questions about the assessment work, they can be directed to me or to your college C-LOA member.

Sincerely,

Staci Provezis, Ph.D. on Behalf of the Council for Learning Outcomes Assessment

Council for Learning Outcomes Assessment 2018-2019:

Cheryl Hanley-Maxwell, AHS, Chair
Staci Provezis, Office of Provost, Co-chair
Anna Dilger, ACES
Dilip Chhajed, BUS
Luc Paquette, EDU
Matthew West, ENGR
John Toenjes, FAA
Kelly Ritter, LAS
Kari Sanderson, LAW
Ryan Lamare, LER
Linda C. Smith, LIS
Shachar Meron, Media
Min Zhan, School of Social Work
Christopher Seals, VetMed
Jen-chien Yu, University Library
Julia Makela, Student Affairs
Alexis Thompson, Graduate College
Eric Meyer, Senate
Verna Orr, Graduate Student
Michel Bellini, CITL
Linell Edwards, Office of Provost, ex officio
APPENDIX H: ORIGINAL ASSESSMENT GROUP INVITATION

Subject: Assessment Group Invitation
Date: Monday, January 28, 2019 10:46:00 AM

Dear Colleagues,

As you know, over the last few years, our University has engaged in collecting learning outcomes assessment information for both undergraduate and graduate programs. You have been a dedicated partner in this assessment work, so we invite you to participate in a newly established community of practice for assessment.

Our goal would be to have one meeting a month, which we are currently calling the “Let’s Talk Assessment” Brown Bag Series. During this meeting, we welcome you to bring your lunch and to discuss various assessment topics (i.e., resources, issues and trends, and best practices) among other people who are engaging in similar work. The group will drive the discussion topics, so we welcome your good ideas and thoughts.

The “Let’s Talk Assessment” Brown Bag Series will take place the first Friday of each month during the Spring 2019 semester. Due to the launch of the Illinois Strategic Plan on February 1st, the first brown bag session will take place the second Friday in February. The brown bag sessions will be held in 500 Swanlund from 12:00pm - 1:00pm on the following dates: February 8th, March 1st, April 5th, and May 3rd.

We will send a meeting invitation. Please accept our invitation if you can join us, so we have a general idea of the number of participants. If you prefer not to be on this invitation list, please let us know. Additionally, if you know anyone who would be interested in attending the brown bag series, please forward them this email and the subsequent meeting invitation.

We look forward to seeing you this Spring!

Staci & Linell

Staci Provezis, Ph.D.
Associate Provost for Academic Effectiveness

Linell Edwards, Ph.D.
Coordinator for Assessment and Evaluation
Assessment Update 2019

Dear Dr. [insert name],

Your department submitted Assessment Plans for its degree programs with the expectation that assessment work would be done over the 2018-2019 academic year. We write now to learn about what assessment work was undertaken this year and what you plan to do next year.

We have created a form to collect this information from you. You may find it helpful to review the questions to know what you will be asked to provide.

The degree programs and corresponding assessment leads are listed below. If you are not the assessment lead for the degree programs, please forward this email to the appropriate assessment lead. Each degree program has an individualized link for its assessment update. Click the degree program to complete the assessment update.

We ask that you submit the forms by October 1, 2019.

Please note that program-level learning outcomes are being added to the Academic Catalog. A message outlining this process will be sent separately.

If you have any questions about this work or the form, please reach out to your Council for Learning Outcomes Assessment (C-LOA) representative, or Staci Provezis, Associate Provost for Academic Effectiveness (sprovez2@illinois.edu).
Sincerely,

Staci Provezis, Ph.D. on Behalf of the Council for Learning Outcomes Assessment
Associate Provost for Academic Effectiveness

Council for Learning Outcomes Assessment

Cheryl Hanley-Maxwell, AHS, Chair
Staci Provezis, Office of Provost, Co-chair
Anna Dilger, ACES
Dilip Chhajed, BUS
Luc Paquette, EDU
Matthew West, ENGR
John Toenjes, FAA
Kelly Ritter, LAS
Kari Sanderson, LAW
Ryan Lamare, LER
Linda C. Smith, LIS
Shachar Meron, Media

Jenny Amos, Carle College of Medicine
Min Zhan, School of Social Work
Christopher Seals, VetMed
Jen-chien Yu, University Library
Julia Makela, Student Affairs
Alexis Thompson, Graduate College
Eric Meyer, Senate
Verna Orr, Graduate Student
Michel Bellini, CITL
Denice Hood, OLOAC
Linell Edwards, Office of Provost, ex officio

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
APPENDIX J: ASSESSMENT UPDATE 2019 QUESTIONS

Thank you for taking time to update the campus on the assessment activity for your program. This form will collect information on updates and progress based on the assessment plan you submitted. The Council for Learning Outcomes Assessment (C-LOA) looks forward to learning more about the assessment work you engaged in over the 2018-2019 academic year. If you have any questions about this form, please send a message to learningoutcomes@illinois.edu.

Specifically, you will be asked to:
1. Update the contact information for the Assessment Lead
2. Reflect on the assessment activity for AY 2018-2019
3. Comment on the need for additional resources to better understand the assessment work
4. Identify next steps in the assessment process
5. Share additional insights about the assessment experience
6. Upload a revised assessment plan if any changes were made to the assessment process (e.g., assessment lead, student learning outcomes, curriculum map, assessment planning, etc.)

Assessment Activity:

In Step 5 of the assessment plan, your program identified at least three questions it would pursue to better understand student learning at the program level.

1. Which question(s) from your program’s assessment plan did the program explore during AY 2018-2019?
2. Are you doing any preparatory assessment work (e.g., creating rubrics, surveys, exams, etc.)?
   a. Yes
   b. No
3. Did the assessment work involve direct evidence of student learning?
   Examples of direct evidence include (but are not limited to) written work, performances, or presentations, scored using a rubric; portfolios of student work; and observations of student behavior, such as presentations and group discussions.
   a. Yes
   b. No
4. Did the assessment work involve indirect evidence of student learning?
   Examples of indirect evidence include (but are not limited to) course grades; placement rates of graduates into appropriate career positions and starting salaries; alumni perceptions of their career responsibilities and satisfaction; student ratings of their knowledge and skills and reflections on what they have learned in the course or program; and student/alumni satisfaction with their learning, collected through surveys, exit interviews, or focus groups.
   a. Yes
   b. No
5. What was the focus of the assessment work?
   a. Skill development
   b. Knowledge acquisition
c. Professional attributes
d. Other: (specify)

6. Are results being used to improve student learning?
   a. Yes
   b. No

7. If YES, how are the results of the assessment activities being used to impact student learning?

8. What improvements were made based on assessment work? Check all that apply.
   a. No improvements were made based on assessment work
   b. Revised/redesigned curriculum
   c. Added new course(s)
   d. Removed course(s)
   e. Changed requirements
   f. Modified student learning objectives
   g. Increased mentoring and support
   h. Introduced new technology
   i. Improved advising
   j. Improved outcomes assessment
   k. Improved monitoring of student progress
   l. Other: (specify)

9. Is any additional assessment work needed to address the questions you explored during AY 2018-2019?
   a. Yes
   b. No

10. If YES, how will your program continue to address the questions you explored during AY 2018-2019?

11. Have the results of the assessment work been shared with anyone? Check all that apply.
   a. Yes, with others in the department
   b. Yes, with others outside the department
   c. Have not shared results

12. If YES, how have the results of the assessment work been shared with others in the department? With others outside the department?

13. What was learned from doing the assessment work this year?

Additional Resources:

14. Do you need any additional assistance or resources to better understand the assessment work?
   a. Yes
   b. No

15. If YES, what additional assistance or resources do you need to better understand the assessment work?
16. What workshops would you be interested in attending? **Check all that apply.**
   a. Course-embedded assessment
   b. Curriculum mapping
   c. Writing learning outcomes
   d. Assessing oral and written communication
   e. Using institutional surveys as evidence
   f. Other: (specify)

**Next Steps:**
17. What are your next steps?
   For example, what assessment work will your program continue into next year? What would the program like to change or do differently? What would the program like to discontinue based on its experiences?

**Additional Insights:**
18. If there is anything else you want to share about your assessment experience this year, please comment below.

**Revised Assessment Plan:**
19. Have you made any changes to the assessment process (e.g., assessment lead, student learning outcomes, curriculum map, assessment planning questions, etc.)?
   a. Yes
   b. No

20. If **YES,** what changes were made to the assessment process?
   a. Assessment lead
   b. Student learning outcomes
   c. Curriculum map
   d. Assessment planning questions
   e. Other: (specify)
APPENDIX K: MESSAGE - LEARNING OUTCOMES IN CATALOG

From: Provezis, Staci J <sprovez2@illinois.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, April 23, 2019 3:47 PM
Subject: Learning Outcomes in Catalog

Dear Colleagues,

The Council for Learning Outcomes Assessment (C-LOA) has reviewed the expectations from our accreditation agency, the Higher Learning Commission (HLC), and has taken into consideration a strategy to make learning outcomes more visible to students, per HLC’s expectations. C-LOA suggested including the learning outcomes you submitted in your assessment plans to the Academic Catalog.

To facilitate this process, the Office of the Provost took the first step to copy and paste your learning outcomes to the 2019 Catalog, but know that this information is not yet visible. The next step is up to you.

Please review the student learning outcomes that were submitted with the Assessment Plan for your degree program(s). Remember that your Assessment Plans are saved in the box.com folder, titled “dept_name – Learning Outcomes Assessment Reports.” Then, work with your catalog/page owner to do one of the following steps by May 15:

A. Approve the learning outcomes and ask your catalog/page owner to click on the “Start Workflow” button to submit the page to go live.
B. Make minor changes to the learning outcomes for clarity and style as needed. Your catalog/page owner can make the changes in the system and then approve as stated above.
C. Do not do anything. We will assume that you approve your learning outcomes as stated and will set the page to go live after the May 15 deadline.
D. Alert me if you need to make major changes that will take longer than the May 15 deadline.

Do not hesitate to reach out to me or Linell Edwards, Coordinator for Assessment and Evaluation, lde2018@illinois.edu, if you have questions.

Best regards,
Staci Provezis (on behalf of the Council for Learning Outcomes Assessment)

Council for Learning Outcomes Assessment

Cheryl Hanley- Maxwell, AHS, Chair
Staci Provezis, Office of Provost, Co-chair
Anna Dilger, ACES
Dilip Chhajed, BUS
Luc Paquette, EDU
Matthew West, ENGR
John Toenjes, FAA
Kelly Ritter, LAS
Kari Sanderson, LAW
Ryan Lamare, LER
Linda C. Smith, LIS
Shachar Meron, Media
Jenny Amos, Carle College of Medicine
Min Zhan, School of Social Work
Christopher Seals, VetMed
Julia Makela, Student Affairs
Alexis Thompson, Graduate
College
Eric Meyer, Senate
Verna Orr, Graduate Student
Michel Bellini, CITL
Denice Hood, OLOAC
Linell Edwards, Office of Provost, ex officio
APPENDIX L: CAMPUS LEARNING OUTCOMES ALIGNMENT

Background
- A total of 108 undergraduate programs submitted an Assessment Update for AY 2017-2018
- Programs were asked to identify the campus learning outcomes to which their programmatic learning outcome(s) were aligned. The results of this inquiry are below.

How many UG program aligned their programmatic outcomes with the campus level outcomes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Learning Outcomes</th>
<th># of Programs in Alignment</th>
<th>% of Programs in Alignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Reasoning and Knowledge (IRK)</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Inquiry and Discovery (CID)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Leadership and Community Engagement (ELCE)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Awareness and Cultural Understanding (SACU)</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Consciousness (GC)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of UG programs that submitted Assessment Update for AY 2017-2018: 108

Breakdown by College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IRK</th>
<th>CID</th>
<th>ELCE</th>
<th>SACU</th>
<th>GC</th>
<th>Assessment Updates Submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACES</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGR</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAA</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAS</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>