



University Assessment Services

Academic Affairs

FY 13 Annual Report

Submitted: March 2013

I. Accomplishments and Productivity for FY12

A. List the unit's goals and how the goals support *Educating Illinois*.

Table 1 illustrates how UAS goals align with and support institutional, state, and accreditation goals through *Educating Illinois* and the *Public Agenda for Higher Education* in Illinois. Last year's report also aligned UAS's goals with the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) criteria and minimum expectations. This year's annual report reflects the new criteria, guiding values, and assumed practices (replacing minimum expectations) that were adopted by the HLC in 2012. This year's report also aligns goals with the new ISU Strategic Plan, *Educating Illinois*.

Table 1. UAS Goal Alignment

UAS Goal	Goal/Standard Alignment		
<p>1. Actively participate in the planning, implementation, analysis, summarization of results and dissemination of findings for institution-wide assessment efforts.</p>	<p>Educating Illinois</p>	<p>Goal 1 – Provide a supportive and student-centered educational experience for high-achieving, diverse, and motivated students that promotes their success.</p>	<p>Strategy 1.2. – Strengthen the University’s commitment to continuous improvement of educational effectiveness as reflected in student learning outcomes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1.2.A. – Continue effective integration of the assessment of student learning outcomes into the curricula and review process of the General Education Program and all degree programs
		<p>Goal 2 – Provide rigorous, innovative, and high-impact undergraduate and graduate programs that prepare students to excel in a globally competitive, culturally diverse, and changing environment.</p>	<p>Strategy 2.1 – Enhance and support rigorous and innovative undergraduate and graduate programs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2.1.D. – Implement administrative recommendations of the General Education Task Force to enhance support for student learning.
		<p>Goal 3 – Foster an engaged community and enhance the University’s outreach and partnerships both internally and externally.</p>	<p>Strategy 3.2 – Increase pride, engagement, and sense of community among University stakeholders.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 3.2.C. – Provide opportunities for students, alumni, and their families to create enduring connections to ISU.
	<p>HLC Criteria & Assumed Practices</p>	<p>HLC Criteria 4 – Teaching & Learning: Evaluation and Improvement</p>	<p>Core Component 4.A – The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 4.A.1. – The institution maintains a practice of regular program review. - 4.A.6. – The institution evaluates the success of its graduates. <p>Core Component 4.B. – The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational achievement and improvement through ongoing assessment of student learning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 4.B.1. – The institution has clearly stated goals for student learning and effective processes for assessment of student learning and achievement of learning goals. - 4.B.2. – The institution assesses the achievement of the learning outcomes that it claims for its curricular and co-curricular programs. - 4.B.3. – The institution uses the information gained from assessment to improve student learning. - 4.B.4. – The institution’s processes and methodologies to assess student learning reflect good practice, including the substantial participation of faculty and other staff.
		<p>HLC Criteria 5 – Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness</p>	<p>Core Component 5.C. – The institution engages in systematic and integrated planning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 5.C.2. – The institution links its processes for assessment of student learning, evaluation of operations, planning, and budgeting.
		<p>HLC Assumed Practices</p>	<p>C. Teaching & Learning: Evaluation & Improvement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - C.6. – Institutional data on assessment of student learning are accurate and address the full range of students who enroll. <p>D. Resources, Planning, & Institutional Effectiveness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - D.4. – The institution maintains effective systems for collecting, analyzing, and using institutional information.
	<p>IBHE Public Agenda</p>	<p>Goal 3 – Increase the number of quality credentials to meet the demands of the economy and an increasingly global society.</p>	<p>Strategy 3.1.C.1 – Encourage institutional participation in such accountability measures as the CLA, NSSE, CCSSE, and VSA.</p>

Table 1. UAS Goal Alignment (continued)

UAS Goal	Goal/Standard Alignment		
2. Work with other units to increase cooperation and coordination of assessment on campus.	Educating Illinois	Goal 2 – Provide rigorous, innovative, and high-impact undergraduate and graduate programs that prepare students to excel in a globally competitive, culturally diverse, and changing environment.	Strategy 2.1 – Enhance and support rigorous and innovative undergraduate and graduate programs. - 2.1.E. – Discuss and implement curricular changes and enhancements recommended by the General Education Task Force through the shared governance process.
		Goal 3 – Foster an engaged community and enhance the University’s outreach and partnerships both internally and externally.	Strategy 3.1 – Enhance cross-divisional and cross-departmental collaboration. - 3.1.A. – Identify cultural and structural barriers to collaboration, and develop strategies to overcome them.
	HLC Criteria & Assumed Practices	HLC Criteria 5 – Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness	Core Component 5.B. – The institution’s governance and administrative structures promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes that enable the institution to fulfill its mission. - 5.B.1. – The institution has and employs policies and procedures to engage its internal constituencies in the institution’s governance. - 5.B.3. – The institution enables the involvement of its administration, faculty, staff, and students in setting academic requirements, policy, and processes through effective structures for contribution and collaborative effort.
3. Develop and maintain assessment efforts, in consultation with units, which result in appropriate data regarding learning outcomes for the purpose of accreditation.	Educating Illinois	Goal 4 – Enhance institutional effectiveness by strengthening the organizational operation and enhancing resource development.	Strategy 4.1. – Review processes and practices to ensure efficiency and effectiveness in the University’s operations. - 4.1.C. – Formalize a university program to monitor compliance with, and changes in, federal state laws and regulations. Strategy 4.4. – Continue to promote the university planning efforts and ensure all plans are integrated with Educating Illinois. - 4.4.C. – Review the academic plan to ensure integration with Educating Illinois.
		HLC Criteria & Assumed Practices	HLC Criteria 4 – Teaching & Learning: Evaluation and Improvement HLC Assumed Practices
	IBHE Public Agenda	Goal 3 – Increase the number of quality credentials to meet the demands of the economy and an increasingly global society.	Strategy 3.1.C.1 – Encourage institutional participation in such accountability measures as the CLA, NSSE, CCSSE, and VSA.
	4. Serve as partners on select assessment projects of university programs.	Educating Illinois	Goal 1 – Provide a supportive and student-centered educational experience for high-achieving, diverse, and motivated students that promotes their success.
Goal 3 – Foster an engaged community and enhance the University’s outreach and partnerships both internally and externally.			Strategy 3.1 – Enhance cross-divisional and cross-departmental collaboration. - 3.1.A. – Identify cultural and structural barriers to collaboration, and develop strategies to overcome them.

Table 1. UAS Goal Alignment (continued)

UAS Goal	Goal/Standard Alignment		
5. Advise faculty and staff on purpose, design, methodology, and use of assessment techniques to enhance student learning.	Educating Illinois	Goal 1 – Provide a supportive and student-centered educational experience for high-achieving, diverse, and motivated students that promotes their success.	<p>Strategy 1.2. – Strengthen the University’s commitment to continuous improvement of educational effectiveness as reflected in student learning outcomes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1.2.B – Provide professional development opportunities and create administrative support structures to ensure that assessment of student learning outcomes is central to program improvement.
		Goal 2 – Provide rigorous, innovative, and high-impact undergraduate and graduate programs that prepare students to excel in a globally competitive, culturally diverse, and changing environment.	<p>Strategy 1.3 – Increase opportunities for students to engage in high-quality, high-impact educational experiences.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1.3.A. – Increase professional development offerings designed to help faculty deliver high-quality educational experiences, especially in one-on-one or small group settings. <p>Strategy 2.3 – Recruit and retain high-quality diverse faculty and staff.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2.3.D. – Enhance leadership for professional development opportunities for faculty and staff.
6. Serve the campus by engaging in outreach activities.	Educating Illinois	Goal 1 – Provide a supportive and student-centered educational experience for high-achieving, diverse, and motivated students that promotes their success.	<p>Strategy 1.2. – Strengthen the University’s commitment to continuous improvement of educational effectiveness as reflected in student learning outcomes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1.2.B – Provide professional development opportunities and create administrative support structures to ensure that assessment of student learning outcomes is central to program improvement.
7. Maintain a level of expertise in higher education assessment through staff development.	Educating Illinois	Goal 2 – Provide rigorous, innovative, and high-impact undergraduate and graduate programs that prepare students to excel in a globally competitive, culturally diverse, and changing environment.	<p>Strategy 2.3 – Recruit and retain high-quality diverse faculty and staff.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2.3.D. – Enhance leadership for professional development opportunities for faculty and staff.
	HLC Criteria & Assumed Practices	HLC Criteria 5 – Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness	<p>Core Component 5.A. – The institution’s resource base supports its current educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 5.A.4. – The institution’s staff in all areas are appropriately qualified and trained.

Sources: Illinois State University. *Educating Illinois (2008-2014): Priorities for Illinois’ First Public University*. On-line: <http://educatingillinois.illinoisstate.edu/>. Normal, IL.; State of Illinois. *The Public Agenda for Higher Education in Illinois*. On-line: <http://www.ibhe.state.il.us/masterPlanning/>. Springfield, IL: Illinois Board of Higher Education.; Higher Learning Commission. (2013, January). *HLC Criteria*. On-line: <http://www.ncahlc.org/Information-for-Institutions/criteria-for-accreditation.html>

B. List major accomplishments for each goal.

Table 2. UAS Goals and Major Activities & Accomplishments

UAS Goal & Theme	Major Activities & Accomplishments
1. Actively participate in the planning, implementation, analysis, summarization of results and dissemination of findings for institution-wide assessment efforts (<i>coordination</i>).	PRAAP, Engagement Surveys, Alumni Survey, Survey support/consultations, reports, internal presentations
2. Work with other units to increase cooperation and coordination of assessment on campus (<i>collaboration and service</i>).	Committees/Teams: Council for General Education (CGE), Assessment Advisory Council (AAC), Academic Planning Committee (APC), HLC Assessment Academy, Foundations of Excellence (FOE), HLC re-accreditation support, Teaching, Collaborations with other units, other service
3. Develop and maintain assessment efforts, in consultation with units, which result in appropriate data regarding learning outcomes for the purpose of accreditation (<i>accreditation</i>).	Specialized and institutional accreditation support
4. Serve as partners on select assessment projects of university programs (<i>institutional partnerships</i>).	See summaries from goals 1, 2,3, and 5
5. Advise faculty and staff on purpose, design, methodology, and use of assessment techniques to enhance student learning (<i>consultation</i>).	Staff and unit consultations, survey design/analysis, data analysis and support, professional development for ISU faculty and staff
6. Serve the campus by engaging in outreach activities (<i>outreach</i>).	Newsletter, website, workshops, Assessment Initiative Award (AIA) program
7. Maintain a level of expertise in higher education assessment through staff development (<i>professional development</i>).	Conferences, publications, presentations, training and professional development

Goal 1. Actively participate in the planning, implementation, analysis, summarization of results and dissemination of findings for institution-wide assessment efforts.

Table 3. UAS Goals and Major Activities & Accomplishments for Goal 1

UAS Goal	Major Activities & Accomplishments
1. Actively participate in the planning, implementation, analysis, summarization of results and dissemination of findings for institution-wide assessment efforts (<i>coordination</i>).	PRAAP, Engagement Surveys, Alumni Survey, Survey support/consultations, reports, internal presentations

Major Activities & Accomplishments:

UAS Goal 1 is aligned with the following:

- Educating Illinois Goal 1 (strategy 1.2.A.), Goal 2 (strategy 2.1.D.), and Goal 3 (strategy 3.2.C.).
- HLC Criteria 4 (core components 4.A.1., 4.A.6., and 4.B.1.through 4.B.4) and Criteria 5 (core component 5.C.2.).
- HLC Assumed Practices C.6. and D.4.
- IBHE Public Agenda Goal 3 (strategy 3.1.C.1.).

The theme of this goal is coordinating campus-level assessment processes and projects. These activities include the following:

1. Coordinating the review of assessment plans as part of the Process for Review of Academic Assessment Plans (PRAAP)
2. Coordinating general education assessment
3. Engagement surveys
4. Alumni survey

1. Coordinating the review of assessment plans as part of the Process for Review of Academic Assessment Plans (PRAAP)

UAS supports the PRAAP process in two ways. First, academic programs submit assessment plans prior to the program review process. The plans are reviewed by members of the Assessment Advisory Council (AAC). After the review, UAS staff meet with chairs/directors to discuss the results of the review and make recommendations for changes, if any. This year, the AAC reviewed 14 academic plans. UAS will meet with 15 academic programs to discuss PRAAP process.

The second way in which UAS supports the PRAAP process is through serving on the Academic Planning Committee (APC), which reviews program review submissions. This year, the UAS coordinator served on the APC and reviewed 26 program reviews.

2. Coordinating general education assessment

In fall 2011, UAS coordinated the general education IAP process [assessing the Life-Long Learning Shared Learning Outcome (SLO)] and produced two reports to the Council on General Education (CGE); one was a report of the Critical Inquiry and Problem Solving SLO (with data collected during fall 2010), and the second was a report of the Public Opportunity SLO (with data collected during spring 2011).

In January 2012, the Council on General Education (CGE) decided to suspend the IAP process for assessing general education. The rationale for this decision was based on the work of the General Education Task Force (GETF), which is currently revising the general education goals, and the General Education Task Force sub-committee on assessment, which has been tasked with making recommendations for general education assessment.

The director served as a representative on the GETF and was on the GETFAST. Final recommendations from the GETF were made in May 2012. Since that time, UAS staff have been working with the new associate provost for undergraduate education in the design of a new general education assessment plan. Starting in spring 2013, UAS staff have started attending every CGE meeting as non-voting members.

3. Engagement Surveys

UAS is responsible for conducting university-wide engagement surveys. Three engagement surveys are administered on a three year schedule (see table 4). The most recent engagement surveys administered by UAS were the Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement (BCSSE) in summer 2012 and National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) in spring 2013.

The summer survey was administered in paper to over 2000 new ISU students during Preview week. Since the NSSE is being administered in spring 2013, final results have not been compiled.

Results of the BCSSE survey were shared with the campus in the following forums:

- Herrmann, D., & Smith, R. (2013, January). *Helping us become knowledge-able about student engagement*. On-line: <http://assessment.illinoisstate.edu/workshops/>
- Smith, R. (2013, February). *Results of the Foundations of Excellence Survey*. (Included BCSSE information).
- Overview of 2012 BCSSE survey (to be published in the spring 2013 Progressive Measures newsletter).
- Presentation to AAC about the BCSSE survey on January 15th.

Table 4. Engagement Survey Schedule and Calendar for Illinois State University

Year	2006 Sum.	2007 Spr.	2008 n/a	2009 Sum.	2010 Spr.	2011 Spr.	2012 Sum.	2013 Spr.	2014 Spr.	2015 Sum.	2016 Spr.
Survey	BCSSE	NSSE	--	BCSSE	NSSE	FSSE	BCSSE	NSSE	FSSE	BCSSE	NSSE
Cohort 1	Beginning	First-Yr.			Senior						
Cohort 2				Beginning	First-Yr.			Senior			
Cohort 3							Beginning	First-Yr.			Senior
Cohort 4										Beginning	First-Yr.

4. Alumni Survey

This year, UAS will administer the alumni survey in May 2013. Due to low response rates and attendance at a presentation by Alumni Relations¹, several changes were proposed and implemented in the 2012 Alumni Survey:

- *Eliminating most of the extra questions except those required by the IBHE.* This significantly shortened the survey. Although no library questions are required by the IBHE, Milner Library included three questions.
- *Providing more room for program-specific questions.* Some programs expressed interest in designing their own alumni survey. A compromise was instituted to allow institutions to include up to 20 questions. Last year, 27 programs submitted extra questions, and all teacher education majors responded to additional questions.
- *Changing the invitation from the President to department chairs/school directors.* Students tend to be more familiar with faculty in their degree program. The hope was that students will be more likely to respond to the survey if the invitation comes from a department chair/school director.
- *Modifying the name of the survey.* We are still considering adding an extension or by-line to the survey name to reflect the survey's focus on educational experiences and student perceptions of quality.

Unfortunately, the survey response rate for the Alumni Survey continued to decline, resulting in a 8.6% response rate (857 alumni responded out of 9,961 contacted). Historically, ISU has witnessed lower survey response rates than other institutions, particularly in regard to the alumni survey. For instance, the 1998 survey had a 17% response rate, compared to a 42% rate for all universities in Illinois. The Alumni Attitude survey conducted periodically by Alumni Affairs has also witnessed lower response rates than comparable universities (2008 and 2011). UAS will continue to monitor this, and look for input from the campus community in regard to gaining more participation from the alumni in the survey.

The results of the 2012 alumni survey were presented in the following avenues:

- *Highlights from the 2012 Alumni Survey.* Article by Derek Herrmann, UAS Progressive Measures Newsletter, Volume 8 (1), p. 20. Online: <http://assessment.illinoisstate.edu/about/newsletter.shtml>
- *What's In It For Me? A Discussion of Survey Response Rates,* presentation at the annual Illinois Association for Institutional Research (I-AIR), November 2012, Peoria, IL
- Reports were distributed to each department/school with their alumni results, and institutional reports were presented to the Associate Provost and the Provost

¹ 2011 National Alumni Attitude Survey of ISU Graduates, Illinois State University, Alumni Relations, January 6, 2012, ISU Alumni Center.

Major FY14 Objectives for this Goal (from the FY14 Planning Document):

Objective 1.1 – Work with the general education task force in the development of an assessment plan for general education that is manageable and meaningful.

Result: We are continued to work with the associate provost for undergraduate education and CGE in the implementation of recommendations and design of assessment process for general education. UAS staff are regularly attending CGE meetings and attended a February 2013 American Association of Colleges & Universities general education assessment conference with the associate provost. Progress in meeting this objective are also articulated in the bi-annual updates on general education made through the ISU's participation in the HLC assessment academy.

Objective 1.2 – Use the results of the Assessment Academy project on reviewing academic plans to identify improvements in the PRAAP process and implement in FY 2013 and beyond. Activities include:

- Include statistics/data on annual updates
- Using select survey to streamline collect processes
- Update assessment plans to include dates
- Evaluate assessment plan rubric
- Evaluate feedback form to ensure that all program data is captured and to verify that the form meets institutional needs for assessment

Result: The results of this project are articulated in the bi-annual reports to the HLC through ISU's participation in the HLC assessment academy (see goal 2).

Objective 1.3 – Evaluate the results of the changes to the alumni survey and continue to identify methods for increasing response rate.

We will continue to evaluate the results of the alumni survey and make changes after consulting the evidence and appropriate leadership and governance entities.

Goal 2. Work with other units to increase cooperation and coordination of assessment on campus.

Table 5. UAS Goals and Major Activities & Accomplishments for Goal 2

UAS Goal	Major Activities & Accomplishments
2. Work with other units to increase cooperation and coordination of assessment on campus (<i>collaboration and service</i>).	Committees/Teams: Council for General Education (CGE), Assessment Advisory Council (AAC), Academic Planning Committee (APC), HLC Assessment Academy, Foundations of Excellence (FOE), HLC re-accreditation, Teaching, Collaborations with other units, other service

Major Activities & Accomplishments:

UAS Goal 2 is aligned with the following:

- Educating Illinois Goal 2 (strategy 2.1.E.), and Goal 3 (strategy 3.1.A.)
- HLC Criteria 5 (core components 5.B.1 and 5.B.3.)

The theme of this goal is collaboration with other campus entities and service to the university. These activities include the following:

1. Council for General Education (CGE)
2. Academic Advisory Council (AAC)
3. Academic Planning Committee (APC)
4. Foundations of Excellence (FOE)
5. HLC Assessment Academy
6. Higher Learning Commission (HLC) re-accreditation support
7. Work with other divisions

1. Council on General Education (CGE)

In January 2013, UAS staff began attending bi-weekly CGE meetings. UAS staff will continue to attend these meetings as long as the CGE continues to work on an assessment plan for the general education. The chair of the CGE is also on the AAC and HLC Assessment Academy, which will help in the implementation of the new assessment plan for general education.

2. Assessment Advisory Council (AAC)

The goal of the AAC is to meet periodically throughout the year to review processes related to the assessment of student learning outcomes and various reports and utilization of assessment results to improve student learning. Based upon this continuous review, the charge of the AAC is to recommend additions, deletions, and modifications of these processes to advance the quality of student learning at Illinois State. The AAC provides recommendations to UAS staff in its service to the institution on related matters.

In FY 2013, the AAC will have met six times (9/18/12, 10/16/12, 11/13/12, 1/15/13, 3/19/13, 4/16/13). Major discussions and activities of the AAC in FY 2013 have focused on the following topics:

- Regular updates about general education assessment.
- Review of assessment plans for PRAAP.
- General updates about UAS (consultations, surveys, etc.)
- General updates about the assessment academy team.
- Presentations relating to student engagement data through BCSSE

3. Academic Planning Committee (APC)

UAS has a standing membership role on the APC. The goal of the UAS representative is to provide insight into academic program assessment plans and work with programs and centers that required follow-up related to assessment. This year, the UAS coordinator served as the UAS representative on the APC, attending 10 meetings and reviewing 26 academic plans, including the program assessment plans for each of the programs under review.

4. Foundations of Excellence (FOE)

The director served as one of the steering committee members of the FOE project. Between 4/24/12 and March 2013, the director attended 17 meetings, planning sessions, or webinars, and one conference in Asheville, NC. Specific activities related to this service included:

- Administration of two surveys related to the project. The first survey was of faculty and staff opinions and perceptions about ISU's performance related to the first-year and transfer students. The second was a survey of first-year and transfer students.
- Co-chairing the Improvement Sub-committee. The sub-committee met 10 times throughout the past year. The result of the project was two reports that evaluated ISU's performance in terms of first-year and transfer student success, along with a series of recommendations aimed at improvements.
- Analysis of the survey results and presentation of the results at the FOE kick-off meeting on 1/23/13.
- The UAS coordinator also served on the Improvement Sub-committee and provided support in the administration of the survey and analysis of the results.

5. HLC Assessment Academy

This year, UAS assumed responsibility for the coordination of ISU's participation in the HLC Assessment Academy, under the leadership of the associate provost. Results and progress reports are required every six months by the HLC. More background information is available in the assessment academy portal, and the February 2013 updates are included in Appendix A.

6. HLC Re-accreditation Support

The coordinator and director of UAS are both serving on re-accreditation teams in preparation for the 2014-15 re-accreditation, under the leadership of the associate provost.

7. Teaching

- EAF 411: Assessment and Evaluation, spring 2012, by UAS director
- EAF 411: Assessment and Evaluation, summer 2013, by UAS director
- Guest lecture by UAS coordinator at spring 2012 EAF 411 course
- Guest lecture by UAS director at Dr. Gina Hunter's class, 10/24/12 and 10/29/12

8. Work with other Divisions

UAS has worked with individuals across all four divisions of the university, mostly related to survey administration. For example, UAS staff met with Strategic Partnerships working group (part of Finance and Planning) to provide feedback on the survey they administered, and UAS staff administered a survey for the Business Process Improvements working group (also from Finance and Planning). UAS staff administers a survey every semester for the Up Late @ State late night programming unit in the Dean of Students Office. UAS staff have been asked to assist with data analysis and interpretation by Diversity Advocacy staff and Health Promotion and Wellness staff. And for the past three years, UAS staff have administered the Homecoming survey for Alumni Relations.

9. Other Service

- Cross Chair in SoTL search committee
- Designed community survey for NAACP (with ISU Chief of Police Aaron Woodruff)
- Consulted with visitors from Srinakharinwirot University (Indonesia), Department of Educational Measurement and Research (4/20/12)
- Civic Engagement team (spring 2013)

Major FY14 Objectives for this Goal (from the FY14 Planning Document):

Objective 2.1 – Continue to work with other units in helping ISU meet the goals of *Educating Illinois*.

Goal 3. Develop and maintain assessment efforts, in consultation with units, which result in appropriate data regarding learning outcomes for the purpose of accreditation.

Table 6. UAS Goals and Major Activities & Accomplishments for Goal 3

UAS Goal	Major Activities & Accomplishments
3. Develop and maintain assessment efforts, in consultation with units, which result in appropriate data regarding learning outcomes for the purpose of accreditation (<i>accreditation</i>).	Specialized and institutional accreditation support, HLC assessment academy

Major Activities & Accomplishments:

UAS Goal 3 is aligned with the following:

- Educating Illinois Goal 4 (strategies 4.1.C. and 4.4.C.)
- HLC Criteria 4 (core component 4.A.5.)
- HLC Assumed Practice D.4.
- IBHE Public Agenda Goal 3 (strategy 3.1.C.1.)

The theme of this goal is supporting programmatic and institutional accreditation efforts at ISU and include the following activities:

1. Specialized accreditation support
2. HLC assessment academy
3. HLC continued accreditation support

1. Specialized and Institutional Accreditation Support

UAS will provide support for programs that have specialized accreditation. Generally, programs require 1) advice and consultation on assessment plans related to accreditation; 2) assistance with administering online surveys to alumni and analyzing the results; or 3) survey data about students, generally from the NSSE and alumni surveys. The UAS coordinator has worked with the Coordinator of Academic Programs and Policy to develop a comprehensive list of the specialized accreditations that units/programs receive. A simple list of accrediting bodies existed previously, but specific information (which programs, how long, next visit, etc.) was not included. This information has been gathered, and the list is being circulated to check for accuracy.

2. HLC Assessment Academy

See goal 2.5 and Appendix A in this report.

3. HLC continued accreditation support

See goal 2.6 in this report.

Major FY14 Objectives for this Goal (from the FY14 Planning Document):

Objective 3.1 – Use the results of the Assessment Academy project on reviewing academic plans to identify improvements in the PRAAP process and implement in FY 2014 and beyond.

Result: Progress in meeting this goal is articulated in bi-annual updates to the HLC (see appendix A in this report for more information).

Goal 4. Serve as partners on select assessment projects of university programs.

Table 7. UAS Goals and Major Activities & Accomplishments for Goal 4

UAS Goal	Major Activities & Accomplishments
4. Serve as partners on select assessment projects of university programs (<i>institutional partnerships</i>).	See summaries from goals 1, 2,3, and 5

Major Activities & Accomplishments:

UAS Goal 4 is aligned with the following:

- Educating Illinois Goal 1 (strategy 1.2.D.) and Goal 3 (strategy 3.1.A.)
- HLC Criteria 4 (core component 4.A.5.)

The theme of this goal is serving as partners on select assessment projects. UAS partnerships are established through the coordination of assessment-related activities (goal 1), through collaboration and service (goal 2), working with other units on accreditation efforts (goal 3), and through advice and consultation (goal 5). We will propose merging this goal into goal 2 in the FY 2014 planning document.

Major FY14 Objectives for this Goal (from the FY14 Planning Document):

N/A

Goal 5. Advise faculty and staff on purpose, design, methodology, and use of assessment techniques to enhance student learning.

Table 8. UAS Goals and Major Activities & Accomplishments for Goal 5

UAS Goal	Major Activities & Accomplishments
5. Advise faculty and staff on purpose, design, methodology, and use of assessment techniques to enhance student learning (<i>consultation</i>).	Staff and unit consultations, survey design/analysis, data analysis and support, professional development for ISU faculty and staff

Major Activities & Accomplishments:

UAS Goal 5 is aligned with the following:

- Educating Illinois Goal 1 (strategies 1.2.B. and 1.3.A.) and Goal 2 (strategy 2.3.D.)

The theme of this goal is supporting programs and units through consultation on assessment and evaluation projects. These activities include:

1. Consultations
2. Survey design/analysis
3. Data analysis and support
4. Professional development for ISU faculty and staff

1. Staff and unit consultations

UAS staff provided consultations for 17 units on assessment-related matters. For example, the Director of the B.A., B.S. in Interdisciplinary Studies met with UAS staff to discuss how to assess this individualized program of study. A student-designed portfolio method was recommended and will be implemented in the next few years. UAS staff met with the new chair of the Department of Philosophy to discuss the department’s assessment plan and how they can work to improve it. Similarly, faculty from two CAST departments consulted with UAS staff on ways to improve their assessment plans and make them more manageable to implement.

2. Survey design/analysis

UAS staff met with faculty and/or staff from 28 units to discuss using surveys to collect data. Sometimes, UAS administered the survey (including sending emails and providing reports of the results). whereas other times, UAS provided feedback on survey design. Some of the surveys that UAS administered were the International Student survey (OISP), Open House survey (Admissions), Transfer Day evaluation (University College), and the ISU Police Department survey. Some of the surveys on which UAS provided feedback were related to the LEAP Forward Project (Administrative Technologies), and the Strategic Partnerships working group (Finance and Planning).

3. Data analysis and support

UAS staff received 6 requests for data and/or assistance analyzing and interpreting data collected for assessment purposes. Planning, Research, and Policy Analysis has several reports that they complete each year related to the success of ISU graduates, and they ask UAS staff for the information they need,

which is gathered from the alumni survey. Diversity Advocacy collects data from their activities, and they consulted with UAS staff to assist in organizing/managing the data in a computer software program (SPSS). Health Promotion and Wellness consulted with UAS staff to assist in the analysis of multi-year data from the CORE alcohol and drug survey.

4. Professional development for ISU faculty and staff

In fall 2012, UAS participated in the CTLT Teaching Excellence Series. The UAS coordinator facilitated four workshops, each designed around elements of the rubric used in the PRAAP process. All of the presentations can be viewed online: <http://assessment.illinoisstate.edu/workshops/>

Major FY14 Objectives for this Goal (from the FY14 Planning Document):

Objective 5.1. – Continue to offer professional development opportunities for ISU faculty and staff through increased collaboration with the Center for Teaching & Learning Technology (CTLT).

Objective 5.2. – Develop a process for tracking UAS consultation activities.

Goal 6. Serve the campus by engaging in outreach activities.

Table 9. UAS Goals and Major Activities & Accomplishments for Goal 6

UAS Goal	Major Activities & Accomplishments
6. Serve the campus by engaging in outreach activities (<i>outreach</i>).	Newsletter, website, Assessment Initiative Award (AIA) program, presence at campus events

Major Activities & Accomplishments:

UAS Goal 6 is aligned with the following:

- Educating Illinois Goal 1 (strategy 1.2.B.)

The theme of this goal is outreach to the campus about assessment-related activities. These activities include the following:

1. Progressive Measures newsletter
2. University Assessment Services website
3. Assessment Initiative Award (AIA)
4. Presence at campus events

1. Progressive Measures Newsletter

FY 2013 is the eighth year for the UAS newsletter, *Progressive Measures*. Two issues are published each year and highlight results of assessment projects, include interviews, and guest contributors.

All of the newsletters are announced in an email to the campus and uploaded online at:

<http://assessment.illinoisstate.edu/about/newsletter.shtml>

2. Website Communications

The UAS website is the primary vehicle for assessment information and archive for documents and other materials. Both the coordinator and office manager are able to edit the website and have access to the website shared drive. They update the website periodically, with these updates mostly related to posting the unit's online newsletter and updating program assessment plans as they are received.

3. Assessment Initiative Award

Every year, UAS awards two grants for program-level assessment projects. The grants are generally around \$1,500 each. The AAC evaluates applications for the award using an established evaluation form. This year, no proposals were submitted. Thus, no award was given.

4. Presence at Campus Events

UAS often conducts outreach by making a presence at campus events. Between March 2012 and March 2013, these included:

- Table presentation at Founder's Day (2/21/13)
- Grad Finale (11/19/12)
- Grad Finale (10/2/12)
- Grad Finale (2/6/13)
- Grad Finale (3/19/13)

UAS won second place in the Homecoming floor decoration contest for the Building/Multi-office category.

Major FY14 Objectives for this Goal (from the FY14 Planning Document):

Objective 6.1 – Increase visibility and awareness of the AIA.

Objective 6.2 – Evaluate the UAS website for content and design and implement changes.

Goal 7. Maintain a level of expertise in higher education assessment through staff development.

Table 10. UAS Goals and Major Activities & Accomplishments for Goal 7

UAS Goal	Major Activities & Accomplishments
7. Maintain a level of expertise in higher education assessment through staff development (<i>professional development</i>).	Conferences, publications, presentations, training and professional development

Major Activities & Accomplishments:

UAS Goal 7 is aligned with the following:

- Educating Illinois Goal 2 (strategy 2.3.D.)

The theme of this goal is internal professional development for UAS staff. These activities include the following:

1. Conference and meeting attendance.
2. Internal and external publications.
3. Internal and external presentations.
4. Training and professional development.

1. Conference and meeting attendance (March 2012-March 2013)

- Council for Assessment & Institutional Research (CAIR), Peoria, IL (3/12/12)
- HLC Conference & Assessment Academy Roundtables, Chicago, IL (3/30/12-4/2/12)
- Digital Measures Update webinar, Normal, IL (5/8/12)
- Association for Institutional Research conference, New Orleans, LA (6/1/12-6/6/12)
- Foundations of Excellence conference, Asheville, NC (7/24/12-7/26/12)
- HLC New Criteria meeting, St. Charles, IL (10/16/12-10/17/12)
- HLC Assessment Workshop, St. Charles, IL (10/17/12-10/19/12)
- HLC webinar on assessment and accreditation, Normal, IL (11/14/12)
- American Association of Colleges & Universities general education conference, Boston, MA (2/28/13-3/2/13)

2. Internal and external presentations (March 2012-March 2013)

Herrmann, D., Smith, R., Murphy, J., Chapman, M., & Bailey, R. (2012, March). *Student Learning Outcome Plans to Improve Learning in All Degree Programs*. Poster presented at the Academy Learning Exchange and Showcase as part of the Higher Learning Commission Annual Conference, Chicago, IL.

Smith, R., Herrmann, D., & Murphy, J. (2012, March). *Informing General Education through Assessment*. Roundtable session presented at the Academy Learning Exchange and Showcase as part of the Higher Learning Commission Annual Conference, Chicago, IL.

Herrmann, D., & Smith, R. (2012, June). *It Takes Two: A Systematic, Effective, & Practical Process for Integrating Assessment & Program Review*. Symposium presented at the meeting of the Association for Institutional Research, New Orleans, LA.

Herrmann, D., & Smith, R. (2012, November). *What's In It For Me? A Discussion of Survey Response Rates*, presentation at the annual Illinois Association for Institutional Research (I-AIR), East Peoria, IL.

Herrmann, D., & Smith, R. (2013, January). *Helping us become knowledge-able about student engagement*. Presentation at the CTLT Teaching-Learning Symposium, Illinois State University.

Herrmann, D., Cutting, J. C., Latham, N., Wilson, D., & Smith, R. (2013, January). *Helping us become knowledge-able about assessment*. Panel session presented at the CTLT Teaching-Learning Symposium, Illinois State University.

3. Internal and external publications (March 2012-March 2013)

Herrmann, D. (2012, Fall). Overview of the 2012 ISU Alumni Survey Results. *Progressive Measures*, 8(1), 20. Online: <http://assessment.illinoisstate.edu/downloads/Fall2012Vol8Issue1.pdf>

Herrmann, D. (2012, Spring). A comparison of student perceptions and faculty perceptions of student engagement. *Progressive Measures*, 7(2), 15-17.
Online: <http://assessment.illinoisstate.edu/downloads/Spring2012Volume7Issue2.pdf>

Whalen, K. (2012, Spring). Two Perspectives on Assessment (Interview with Dr. Sally Parry & Dr. Cooper). *Progressive Measures*, 7(2), 12-14.
Online: <http://assessment.illinoisstate.edu/downloads/Spring2012Volume7Issue2.pdf>

4. Training and Professional Development (March 2012-March 2013)

All UAS staff have completed the CITI online training.

UAS staff attended the following workshops through CTLT:

- Excel, Level 2 (4/12): office manager
- Access, Level 1 (4/12): office manager
- Access: Queries (4/12): office manager
- Access: Forms (4/12): office manager
- Access: Reports (4/12): office manager

The UAS office manager also has received Datatel, Budget Wizard, and student hiring training.

The UAS director is currently participating in the ISU Leadership Initiative through the Provost Office.

The Office Manager in UAS worked with the Uptown Crossing building manager to institute new OSHA procedures for the office suite.

Major FY14 Objectives for this Goal (from the FY14 Planning Document):

None

C. Indicate measures of productivity by which the unit's successes can be illustrated (refer to Planning and Institutional Research for Academic Productivity Measures and other qualitative measures of productivity as appropriate).

During FY 13, UAS staff:

- Taught 1 course
- Presented one four-part workshop
- Published 2 issues of the online newsletter, *Progressive Measures*
- Served on 7 committees
- Contributed 3 publications
- Attended 9 conferences/webinars/information sessions
- Made 6 internal/external presentations
- Attended 9 workshops/training sessions
- Administered 23 online surveys
- Administered annual Alumni Survey, BCSSE, and NSSE
- Provided 17 assessment-related consultations
- Reviewed 14 program assessment plans through PRAAP

II. Internal Reallocations and Reorganizations in FY12

A. Describe any reallocations or reorganizations, including the movement of positions, upgrade of positions, creation of new positions, or reallocation of personnel or operating funds.

None.

B. Describe how the unit used additional funds to enhance accomplishments and productivity. Additional funds include enhancement dollars, instructional capacity dollars, summer session funding, external funding, Foundation funds, variance dollars, external contracts, and technology tuition dollars.

Not applicable.

Accountability Reports

The Provost's Accountability Reports can be accessed using the following links:

A & B are Due – March 26, 2012

A. [Provost Enhancement Accountability Report](#)

B. [Enrollment Enhancement Accountability Report](#)

C & D are Due – September 15, 2012

C. Instructional Capacity Accountability Report

D. Travel Enhancement Program for Field Supervision Accountability Report

Units in Academic Affairs are requested to submit an Annual Report for FY12 – including a narrative report and Accountability Reports [as applicable] utilizing new online submission forms. Much of the data requested have been provided in your *College/Unit Working Folder* on the *Budget Docs Drive*. Because the online Accountability Report forms will not allow you to print a completed form for your records, you are encouraged to compose your descriptions/narrative for the Accountability Reports in a Word document and cut and paste the text into the online form. If you have any questions or experience difficulty with the forms please contact Destini Martinez (damart2@ilstu.edu).

All documents and presentations (as applicable) are due to the Provost's Office by March 26, 2012. The public presentations of both the FY12 Annual Report and FY13 Planning Document will be held April 3-4, 2012 at the Alumni Center, Room 118.

Narrative – Due March 26, 2012 (Word format – save to your *College/Unit FINAL Folder*)

Appendix A. February 2013 Updates of the HLC Assessment Academy (also included in the HLC Assessment Academy collaboration portal)

QUALITY INITIATIVE 1: STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING IN GENERAL EDUCATION

Version 1.0 – 2012-05-01

Version 2.0 – 2012-05-04 (this is actually our update from 1-12-2012)

Version 3.0 – 2012-12-04 (this is actually our update from 7-11-2012)

Version 4.0 – Due 2-17-2013

Identify and explain any specific changes to your project scope or design since August 2012.

There have been several changes to this project's design and scope since August 2012.

In July 2012, the general education task force (GETF) completed its work, and delivered recommendations to the Provost Office.

A second change has been the creation of a new position titled Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education. The Associate Provost has been working with the University Assessment Services (UAS) office and Council on General Education (GCE) in developing implementation strategies based on the Assessment Subcommittee's recommendations.

Another change has been increased collaboration between areas responsible for general education assessment. On January 29, 2013 UAS staff began attending CGE meetings, and will continue to attend until final implementation of the general education assessment plan. The chair of the CGE is a member of the HLC assessment academy team and is also chair of the CGE.

What were your goals for the past six months? Did you achieve them? Why or why not?

After the GETF made its recommendations, no specific goals were set for the last six months (between July 2011 and February 2012). However, long-range goals were set by the GETF subcommittee on assessment. The long-term goals include the following:

- Adopt a multi-source, multi-method approach to assessment, employing the institutional artifact portfolio as the centerpiece of the assessment effort (with incentives for increased faculty participation), but also including systematic audits of syllabi, alumni surveys, and analyses of data drawn from surveys of student engagement.
- Identify a full-time director for General Education, with expertise in administration, instruction, and assessment.
- Systematize the professional development of General Education faculty members in ways that foster a culture of participation in assessment of the General Education program.
- Simplify the wording of General Education goals and objectives in ways that will facilitate program assessment.
- Give a new name to "General Education."

There are several reasons for why no new 6-month implementation goals were set. First, recommendations had been established, and a response from campus leadership was needed before implementation strategies were developed. An additional delay was created because, other than the

CGE's role in governance, there was no specific person or entity with general education as their primary responsibility. Second, a new position was created in late fall 2012 (the associate provost for undergraduate education). Now that leadership is in place, a draft implementation plan has been established, and regular meetings are being held with multiple governance entities and departments, operational goals will be easier to establish.

How did you incorporate the feedback that you received on your previous posting?

Feedback version 3.0 for the July 2011 update was received on 12/4/2012, so we have not had too much time to incorporate feedback. However, we were able to incorporate feedback from the 2.0 and already moving forward on some of the recommendations in the 3.0 review. Both are described below.

2.0 Review Recommendations - Follow-up

- The GETF assessment subcommittee reviewed many assessment methods and models, and felt that the institutional artifact portfolio system (IAP) suits ISU well because it provides direct evidence of learning collected over time; is non-intrusive; faculty-friendly; includes faculty participation; and familiar to the campus community. It was felt that a standardized test would not provide meaningful information in the context of ISU, and would not receive buy-in from ISU faculty.
- The GETF assessment subcommittee plans to adapt some of the LEAP rubrics, and will likely modify them to make them relevant for ISU. This will be a major part of our conversations regarding general education assessment when looking at implementation strategies.
- Anecdotal evidence suggests that the campus was well-informed about the GETF and its recommendations (it seems to come up in a lot of meetings and is referenced in other reports).
- The CGE understands that faculty development is a key component of general education assessment. The current draft of the CGE plan (referenced in the last section) calls for professional development activities to be coordinated by the ISU Center for Teaching and Learning Technology (CTLT). The exact details of how this would work are currently in the planning stage.

3.0 Review Recommendations - Follow-up

- We did not hire a full-time director of general education. However, the new Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education will likely assume part or all of the duties recommended by the GETF for the proposed director of general education position.
- We feel like we learned a lot about what works, and what does not work, from the old Institutional Artifact Portfolio (IAP) process. Several of our current ideas are articulated in the next section.

What are your plans and goals for the next six months? What challenges to you anticipate?

Our current general education assessment goals are articulated in a current draft plan based on recommendations of the GETF assessment subcommittee. The elements of this plan are currently being discussed at bi-weekly meetings of the CGE. The current plan for operationalizing general education assessment includes the following. (It needs to be noted this is a draft. Although the ideas are based on recommendations from the GETF subcommittee, several of the ideas have not been vetted by

appropriate campus leadership or governance structures. At this point, they are in the draft stage as of January 2013).

Assessment Plan for general education (draft stage as of February 2013):

- The General Education Task Force Assessment Subcommittee Team (GETFAST) recommends that written communication, oral communication and co-curricular experiences be assessed each fall and spring semester. Remaining General Education goals would continue to be assessed on a cyclical basis as in the past. The IAP would continue to be the principal tool for assessment using criteria modified from AAC&U rubrics or on-campus rubrics (eg. COM 110). A service from an external vendor could be integrated into ReggieNet (ISU's course management system) and modified to reflect program outcomes if costs are reasonable and product is deemed sufficiently valuable.
- It may also be possible to include a question on the alumni survey about Gen Ed and to glean relevant information from NSSE, BCSSE, and FSSE surveys.
- General Education Assessment will be a shared activity among several entities. These entities include CGE, UAS, CTLT, and the associate provost for undergraduate education.
- On a rotating basis, the Council on General Education will call for syllabi from all sections in a category to be reviewed according to the simple rubric: 0=no evidence of general education outcomes present, 1=developing, 2=established.
- UAS will continue to administer the IAP and provide results to the CGE. CGE will have overall responsibility for analysis of data. UAS consults with the Assessment Advisory Committee. The Assessment Academy, as part of Pathways accreditation, is also charged with General Education program assessment. It will be important to assure coordination and to avoid duplication of effort. The chair of the CGE also sits on the assessment advisory council and assessment academy. Two staff members from UAS also sit on the assessment advisory council and assessment academy, and will regularly attend CGE meetings through the spring.
- In addition to the current Communication and Critical Inquiry advisory group, CGE will establish three parallel advisory groups for mathematics and the natural sciences, humanities and fine arts, and the social sciences. These groups will be responsible for syllabus review and will receive data from the institutional artifact portfolio. These committees with specific disciplinary expertise will also provide CGE and General Education instructors with recommendations for possible improvements to the program.
- CGE will request that CTLT be the primary venue for faculty development related to General Education. CGE will make available to CTLT pertinent assessment data that may be useful for professional development activities.

QUALITY INITIATIVE 2: STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME PLANS TO IMPROVE LEARNING IN ALL DEGREE PROGRAMS

Version 1.0 – 2012-05-02 (I was not here yet or had just arrived, and I assume this is from July 2011)

Version 2.0 – 2012-05-04 (this is actually our update from 1-12-2012)

Version 3.0 – 2013-01-21 (this is actually our update from 7-11-2012)

Version 4.0 – Due 2-17-2013

Identify and explain any specific changes to your project scope or design since August 2012.

In fall 2011, the assessment academy conducted an audit of all academic degree programs using the ISU rubric for evaluating academic assessment plans. In Spring 2012, the assessment academy decided to gather assessment information from the campus through an online survey. The original goal of the survey was to effectively categorize assessment plans for interviews and additional data gathering.

Based on the results of the audit (using the rubric), most programs have established or exemplary learning goals and intended student learning outcomes (65%). 57% of academic programs systematically collect assessment data, and 37% were making progress in this area (developing). The results of the audit showed that improvement is needed in two areas: feedback from key stakeholders and using the results in decision-making. One interesting finding was that accredited programs seem to have more established assessment plans.

Results from the survey of department chairs/school directors showed that the main organizing framework for assessment are accreditation, chairperson leadership, non-assessment committees (like curriculum) and general faculty collaborations. Results from the survey also showed that resistance to assessment is generally small. Indifference, disinterest, and a lack of time and expertise are cited as the main barriers/challenges to assessment. Programs that articulated an interest in using assessment cited meeting requirements (compliance), participating with colleagues, and understanding the value of student learning as the main drivers for developing interest in assessment.

Upon receiving the results of the survey and when discussing the audit results, however, it was decided that two sources of information (from the audit and the survey results) were sufficient to move forward in regarding to implementing elements of the project. So, it was decided to start implementation on meeting the original goal of facilitating a cultural shift towards strengthening assessment and tying it to the educational process on ISU's campus by fostering the creation of meaningful assessment plans for degree programs, and using routinely to improve student learning.

What were your goals for the past six months? Did you achieve them? Why or why not?

Our goals were to analyze the results of the survey and the audit in order to develop a plan for implementing this project. These goals were met, as results from the audit and survey were analyzed and discussed by the assessment academy.

In previous 6-month updates, implementation goals were also included, which included items like processes, budgets, programs, and other operational items. Although there has not been much progress in terms of moving forward with operational and structural recommendations, we feel like we are continuing to move forward with some new projects (see the last section) and are cognizant that structural or operational changes (if any) will require proper consultation with appropriate governance entities, and appropriate planning and budgeting. We anticipate that as we move forward, that

How did you incorporate the feedback that you received on your previous posting?

Feedback version 3.0 for the July 2011 update was received on 1/20/2013, so we have not had too much time to incorporate feedback. However, we were able to incorporate feedback from the 2.0 and already moving forward on some of the recommendations in the 3.0 review. Both are described below.

2.0 Review Recommendations - Follow-up

- The recommendation about focusing on better assessment and student learning – as opposed to review process, operational items, and statistics – is on point. In the last section of this update, we propose a workshop series that shifts focus from process to more of a focus on learning outcomes, sharing, and professional development.
- Programs receive feedback on assessment plans in a variety of ways. First, programs receive feedback at least every eight years as part of the program review process at ISU (Process for Review of Academic Assessment Plans [PRAAP]). This feedback comes from the Assessment Advisory Council (AAC). Some programs solicit feedback from University Assessment Services (UAS) staff in regard to consultations. Accredited programs will also receive feedback from their accreditation agencies. Still, there are many programs that only receive feedback every eight years through the PRAAP process. The idea of providing more ongoing, regular feedback is definitely one that we will consider.

3.0 Review Recommendations - Follow-up

- The point about moving on from analysis to implementation is a direction the academy decided to move in the fall 2012 semester.

What are your plans and goals for the next six months? What challenges to you anticipate?

Our primary goal is to use the information from the audit and survey to focus on professional development by establishing a workshop series for faculty. (UAS conducted a similar workshop series in fall 2012. This series focused on the development of assessment plans, with four workshops organized around the four evaluation criteria of the assessment rubric). A workshop for 1) chairpersons/directors and 2) those with responsibility for assessment is scheduled for March 29, 2013, and the academy team is currently working on plans for making the workshop part of a series. As part of our audit, we discovered variability in terms of maturity with assessment among academic programs. One of our goals will be for mature programs to take a more interactive and leadership role in terms of professional development, teaching, and advocacy for assessment.