



**ILLINOIS STATE
UNIVERSITY**
Illinois' first public university

University Assessment Services

Academic Affairs

FY 2015 Annual Report

Submitted: March 2015

Also available online: <http://assessment.illinoisstate.edu>

Illinois State University Academic Affairs FY15 Annual Report

This annual report covers the time period 3/1/14 through 2/28/15

1. Accomplishments and Productivity for FY15

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*, the *Public Agenda for Higher Education* in Illinois, and the Higher Learning Commission Standards for Accreditation (adopted in 2012).

Table 1. UAS Goal Alignment

UAS Goal	Goal/Standard Alignment		
1. Actively participate in the planning, implementation, analysis, summarization of results and dissemination of findings for institution-wide assessment efforts.	Educating Illinois	Goal 1 – Provide a supportive and student-centered educational experience for high-achieving, diverse, and motivated students that promotes their success.	Strategy 1.2. – Strengthen the University’s commitment to continuous improvement of educational effectiveness as reflected in student learning outcomes. - 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
		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.D. – Implement administrative recommendations of the General Education Task Force..
		Goal 3 – Foster an engaged community and enhance the University’s outreach and partnerships both internally and externally.	Strategy 3.2 – Increase pride, engagement, and sense of community among University stakeholders. - 3.2.C. – Provide opportunities for students, alumni, and their families to create enduring connections to ISU.
	HLC Criteria & Assumed Practices	HLC Criteria 4 – Teaching & Learning: Evaluation and Improvement	Core Component 4.A – The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs: 4.A.1. – The institution maintains a practice of regular program review.; 4.A.6. – The institution evaluates the success of its graduates. Core Component 4.B. – The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational achievement and improvement through ongoing assessment of student learning: 4.B.1. – The institution has clearly stated goals for student learning and effective processes for assessment.; 4.B.2. – The institution assesses 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. – Good practice in assessment, including the substantial participation of faculty and other staff.
		HLC Criteria 5 – Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness	Core Component 5.C. – The institution engages in systematic and integrated planning: 5.C.2. – The institution links its processes for assessment of student learning, evaluation of operations, planning, and budgeting.
		HLC Assumed Practices	C. Teaching & Learning: Evaluation & Improvement: C.6. – Institutional data on assessment of student learning are accurate and address the full range of students who enroll. D. Resources, Planning, & Institutional Effectiveness: D.4. – The institution maintains effective systems for collecting, analyzing, and using institutional information.
	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.

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 and serve as partners on select assessment projects.	Educating Illinois	Goal 1 – Provide a supportive and student-centered educational experience for high-achieving, diverse, and motivated students that promotes their success.	Strategy 1.2 – Strengthen the University’s commitment to continuous improvement of educational effectiveness as reflected in student learning outcomes. 1.2.D. – Develop and assess student learning outcomes facilitated by out-of-class and cocurricular learning experiences.
		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. 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.	Strategy 1.2. – Strengthen the University’s commitment to continuous improvement of educational effectiveness as reflected in student learning outcomes. - 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. Strategy 1.3 – Increase opportunities for students to engage in high-quality, high-impact educational experiences. 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.
		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 2.3 – Recruit and retain high-quality diverse faculty and staff. - 2.3.D. – Enhance leadership for professional development opportunities for faculty and staff.

Table 1. UAS Goal Alignment (continued)

UAS Goal	Goal/Standard Alignment		
5. 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.	Strategy 1.2. – Strengthen the University’s commitment to continuous improvement of educational effectiveness as reflected in student learning outcomes. - 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.
6. 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.	Strategy 2.3 – Recruit and retain high-quality diverse faculty and staff. - 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	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: 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 summarizes the UAS goals and related activities and accomplishments associated with each goal. It also includes FY 2015 and FY 2016 objectives. More detail and narrative about the items in the table are outlined in the narrative following the table.

In summary, none of the UAS goals changed between FY 2015 and FY 2016. There was only one change in terms of major activities, due to participation in the HLC Assessment Academy concluding in June 2014. Changes to the objectives are described in more detail in the narrative section of this report.

Table 2. Summary of UAS Goals and Major Activities & Accomplishments

UAS Goal & Theme	Major Activities & Accomplishments	FY 15 Objectives	FY 16 Objectives
1. Actively participate in the planning, implementation, analysis, summarization of results and dissemination of findings for institution-wide assessment efforts (<i>coordination</i>).	1.1 Coordinating PRAAP 1.2 Consultation for general education assessment 1.3 Engagement Surveys 1.4 Alumni Survey 1.5 Reports and Internal Dissemination of findings	Objective 1.1 – Support the associate provost for undergraduate education and the Council on General Education (CGE) in the development of an assessment plan for general education that is manageable and meaningful. 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 2015 and beyond. Objective 1.3 – Evaluate the results of the changes to the alumni survey and continue to identify methods for increasing response rate.	Objective 1.1 – Continue to use the results of the Assessment Academy project on reviewing academic plans to identify improvements in the PRAAP process and implement in FY 2015 and beyond. Objective 1.2 – Evaluate the results of the changes to the alumni survey and continue to identify methods for increasing response rate and other methods of obtaining data. Objective 1.3 – Complete the ISU Graduate Salary and Labor Market study, including the development of a strategy for data analysis and reporting. Objective 1.4 – Implement three engagement surveys: FSSE-G (3/15), BCSSE (8/15), and NSSE (3/16).

UAS Goal & Theme	Major Activities & Accomplishments	FY 15 Objectives	FY 16 Objectives
2. Work with other units to increase cooperation and coordination of assessment on campus and serve as partners on select assessment projects. (<i>collaboration and service</i>).	2.1 Council for General Education (CGE) 2.2 Academic Advisory Council (AAC) 2.3 Academic Planning Committee (APC) 2.4 Foundations of Excellence (FOE) 2.5 International Strategic Planning Committee (ISP) 2.6 Writing Across the Curriculum team (WAC) 2.7 Civic Engagement Task Force 2.8 University College Program Council 2.9 Online Survey Working Group	Objective 2.1 – Develop a governance or organizational structure that accommodates the Assessment Academy Team. Objective 2.2 – Consult the FOE transition team on an assessment plan for the FOE process.	Objective 2.1 – Partner with the Provost office in the continued improvement and implementation of Academic Program Profiles
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>).	3.1 Specialized Accreditation Support 3.2 Institutional Accreditation Support 3.3 HLC Assessment Academy*	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 2015 and beyond. Objective 3.2 – Complete participation in the Assessment Academy Team.	Objective 3.1 – Identify academic programs due for specialized accreditation FY 16 and FY 17.
4. Advise faculty and staff on purpose, design, methodology, and use of assessment techniques to enhance student learning (<i>consultation & professional development</i>).	4.1 Staff & Unit Consultations 4.2 Survey design, analysis, and/or consultation 4.3 Data analysis/support 4.4 Professional development for ISU faculty & staff	Objective 4.1 – Revise the professional development component of the UAS website (specifically, Assessment Tutorial site). Objective 4.2 – Work with CTLT on professional development opportunities.	Objective 4.1 – Continue to develop and refine professional development curriculum for assessment in Academic Affairs.
5. Serve the campus by engaging in outreach activities (<i>outreach</i>).	5.1 Progressive Measures (Newsletter) 5.2 UAS website 5.3 Assessment Initiative Award 5.4 Presence at Campus Events	Objective 5.1 – Increase visibility and awareness of the AIA. Objective 5.2 – Work with LEAP Forward group in researching Business Intelligence options for data reporting and analysis.	Objective 5.1 – Develop and implement an online business intelligence component for the UAS website, potentially piloting with NSSE data. Objective 5.2 – Develop a list of assessment contacts by program or department.

UAS Goal & Theme	Major Activities & Accomplishments	FY 15 Objectives	FY 16 Objectives
6. Maintain a level of expertise in higher education assessment through staff development (<i>professional development</i>).	6.1 Conference and meeting attendance 6.2 Internal and external presentations 6.3 Internal and external publications 6.4 Training and professional development	None	None

**Participation in the HLC Assessment Academy concluded in June 2014. This will be removed in the FY 2016 Annual Report as an activity.*

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

Major Activities & Accomplishments	FY 15 Objectives	FY 16 Objectives
1.1 Coordinating PRAAP 1.2 Consultation for general education assessment 1.3 Engagement Surveys 1.4 Alumni Survey 1.5 Reports and Internal Dissemination of findings	Objective 1.1 – Support the associate provost for undergraduate education and the Council on General Education (CGE) in the development of an assessment plan for general education that is manageable and meaningful. 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 2015 and beyond. Objective 1.3 – Evaluate the results of the changes to the alumni survey and continue to identify methods for increasing response rate.	Objective 1.1 – Continue to use the results of the Assessment Academy project on reviewing academic plans to identify improvements in the PRAAP process and implement in FY 2015 and beyond. Objective 1.2 – Evaluate the results of the changes to the alumni survey and continue to identify methods for increasing response rate and other methods of obtaining data. Objective 1.3 – Complete the ISU Graduate Salary and Labor Market study, including the development of a strategy for data analysis and reporting. Objective 1.4 – Implement three engagement surveys: FSSE-G (3/15), BCSSE (8/15), and NSSE (3/16).

Major Activities and Accomplishments for Goal 1

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

UAS supports PRAAP 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 meets with chairs/directors to discuss the results of the review and make recommendations for changes, if any.

This year, the AAC reviewed 8 assessment plans. UAS will meet with 3 academic departments/schools or programs to discuss the PRAAP process. The annual update for academic assessment plans has existed for several years, but no formal mechanism for providing feedback was established. Last year, UAS staff and AAC members decided to develop such a mechanism. The annual update form was put online, and then UAS staff and AAC members reviewed the 35 submitted annual updates and provided feedback on the program assessment activities that were discussed and any suggestions regarding those activities.

The second way in which UAS supports PRAAP is through serving on the Academic Planning Committee (APC), which reviews program review submissions. This year, the UAS assistant director served on the APC and reviewed 15 program review self-studies.

1.2. Consultation for general education assessment

The general education assessment plan was completed in summer 2014, with implementation beginning in fall 2014. UAS continues to serve in a consultative role to the associate provost for undergraduate education in regard to general education assessment. More information about UAS's role in coordinating the general education assessment process is included in the narrative section for Goal 2 (specifically, 2.1: Council for General Education).

1.3. 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 was the FSSE in spring 2014. Three surveys are planned for administration in 2015 and 2016: the FSSE-G (for teaching graduate students) in April 2015, the BCSSE in summer 2015, and NSSE in spring 2016.

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

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

Results from engagement surveys were most recently shared in the following forums:

- Herrmann, D. (2014, Spring). A Longitudinal Examination of First-Year Student Engagement at Illinois State University. *Progressive Measures*, 9 (2), pp. 16-19. Online at: <http://assessment.illinoisstate.edu/downloads/Spring2014Volume9Issue2.pdf>
- Herrmann, D., & Smith, R. (2015, January). *Comparing Student and Faculty Perceptions of Student Engagement: What Next Steps Can We Take?* Presentation at the Teaching-Learning Symposium Online at: <http://ctl.illinoisstate.edu/downloads/symposium/2015/Herrmann%20%20Smith%20-%202015%20TLS.pdf>
- Presentation to AAC of the NSSE/FSSE results on February 17, 2015.
- Discussion of NSSE/FSSE results at the CTLT Teaching-Excellence Series, Session 1: *Competing Perceptions of Interaction*, January 20, 2015. Online: <http://ctl.illinoisstate.edu/events/teachingexcellence/>

1.4. Alumni Survey

UAS continues to administer the alumni survey on an annual basis. A total of 855 alumni responded to the 2014 alumni survey, for an overall response rate of 9%. Of the 855 who responded, 76% were undergraduate alumni and 24% were graduate alumni. A majority of students responded positively when evaluating their educational experiences and overall quality of ISU. Additional information about the alumni survey can be found online in the upcoming edition of *Progressive Measures*.¹

Due to low response rates, UAS continues to discuss potential and implement further changes to the alumni survey. Improvement ideas include some of the following:

- *Eliminating most of the extra questions except those required by the IBHE.* This significantly shortened the survey.
- *Providing more room for program-specific questions.* Some programs expressed interest in designing their own alumni survey. This has been an option for several years, but a closer examination of the items and their relevance is needed.
- *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.

In February 2014, UAS staff met with Doris Groves, Executive Director of Alumni Engagement. UAS plans on working more collaboratively with the office and implementing ideas to increase response rates.

Results of the alumni survey were shared in the following forums:

- Results distributed to campus leadership.
- Results distributed to individual departments/schools in individualized reports.

Status of Major FY15 Objectives

Objective 1.1 – Support the associate provost for undergraduate education and the Council on General Education (CGE) in the development of an assessment plan for general education that is manageable and meaningful.

An assessment plan for general education has been created and implemented. More details about this plan and progress made in the area of general education assessment are included in Goal 2 (2.1: Council on General Education).

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 2015 and beyond.

¹ <http://assessment.illinoisstate.edu/about/newsletter.shtml>

UAS has implemented and is working on several projects to improve the PRAAP process. A major change in the last year was a revision of the PRAAP process and timeline. This was based in part from ISU’s participation in the HLC Assessment Academy. The revised timeline and annual update process are below:

- Revised PRAAP Timeline*
- August – UAS sends a memo to academic programs requesting the most current version of their academic assessment plans.
 - By September 15 – The academic program submits their assessment plan to UAS.
 - October-November – A two-member team from the AAC reviews the academic assessment plans using the assessment plan rubric and records comments and feedback using the on-line PRAAP feedback form.
 - February – UAS contacts academic programs to meet for the purposes of discussing the AAC reviews. At this meeting, UAS provides consultation and offers its services in preparation for Program Review. During the spring, academic programs work on revising their academic assessment plans.
 - Spring through early fall – Academic programs work on updating their academic assessment plans and begin their self-study for program review.

- Revised Annual Update Timeline*
- September-October – Academic Program Profile data provided to academic programs by Planning, Research, and Policy Analysis (PRPA).
 - November – UAS sends a memo to academic programs requesting that they complete the Annual Update for Academic Programs by April 15.
 - By April 15 – Academic programs submit their annual update using the online form.
 - After April 15 – AAC members will review the annual update submissions and provide feedback on the programs’ assessment activities
 - June – UAS sends AAC’s feedback on the annual updates to academic programs.

Table 5. PRAAP/Annual Update Timetable

Year	Activity
1	PRAAP
2	Program review self-study
3	Program review self-study reviewed
4	Year after program review
5	Annual Update
6	Annual Update
7	Annual Update
8	Annual Update

Other improvements to the PRAAP and annual update processes included:

- Collaborating with the associate provost on the development of Academic Program Profiles. This will provide data on an annual basis and will provide a broader overview of all programs at ISU.
- Using Select Survey to streamline the collection of annual updates. Rather than using a PDF form, programs can now enter their information in an online form.
- Continue to evaluate the assessment plan rubric.
- Update assessment plans to include more historical information, including dates.
- Incorporate more professional development activities for faculty and staff.

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

UAS will continue to evaluate the results of the alumni survey and make changes after consulting the evidence and appropriate leadership and governance entities. Most of these changes were articulated on the previous page (section 1.4).

Major FY16 Objectives (from the FY16 Planning Document)

Objective 1.1 – Continue to use the results of the Assessment Academy project on reviewing academic plans to identify improvements in the PRAAP process and implement in FY 2015 and beyond.

Objective 1.2 – Evaluate the results of the changes to the alumni survey and continue to identify methods for increasing response rate and other methods of obtaining data.

Objective 1.3 – Complete the ISU Graduate Salary and Labor Market (IDES) study, including the development of a strategy for data analysis and reporting.

Objective 1.4 – Implement three engagement surveys: FSSE-G (3/15), BCSSE (8/15), and NSSE (3/16)

Goal 2. Work with other units to increase cooperation and coordination of assessment on campus and serve as partners on select assessment projects.

Table 6. UAS Goals and Major Activities & Accomplishments for Goal 2

Major Activities & Accomplishments	FY 15 Objectives	FY 16 Objectives
2.1 Council for General Education (CGE) 2.2 Academic Advisory Council (AAC) 2.3 Academic Planning Committee (APC) 2.4 Foundations of Excellence (FOE) 2.5 International Strategic Planning Committee (ISP) 2.6 Writing Across the Curriculum team (WAC) 2.7 Civic Engagement Task Force 2.8 University College Program Council 2.9 Online Survey Working Group	Objective 2.1 – Develop a governance or organizational structure that accommodates the Assessment Academy Team. Objective 2.2 – Consult the FOE transition team on an assessment plan for the FOE process.	Objective 2.1 – Partner with the Provost office in the continued improvement and implementation of Academic Program Profiles

Major Activities and Accomplishments for Goal 1

2.1. 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 assessment plan was completed in summer 2014 and implemented in fall 2014.

An update for the 2014-15 academic year was compiled and submitted to the associate provost for undergraduate education on 2/18/2014 by the UAS assistant director and is highlighted below:

2014-2015 Academic Year The established review cycle for the General Education program indicated that the course syllabi and student artifacts (any type of coursework) from the United States Traditions (UST) and Individuals and Civic Life (ICL) course categories would be collected for review after the spring 2015 semester. Faculty who taught a course in these categories received a letter/memo through campus mail and a reminder email within the first weeks of both semesters, asking them to provide their course syllabi and to volunteer to provide student artifacts from their courses. University Assessment Services coordinated the collection of these materials.

Seven courses (three of them cross-listed between departments) compose the UST category; they are ENG/HIS 131, FCS/HIS/SOC 112, GEO 142, HIS 135, HIS 136, HIS/SOC 111, and SOC 109. Five courses compose the ICL category; they are ANT 176, CJS 102, PHI 104, POL 101, and POL 106.

Fall 2014 At least one section of each UST course was offered, with a total of 26 course sections. Of these, the instructors of five sections of three courses provided student artifacts. Six instructors, teaching three courses, provided their course syllabi (one of these was a cross-listed course, with course syllabi provided from two of the three departments). At least one section of each ICL course was offered, with a total of 13 course sections. Of these, the instructor of one course provided student artifacts. Two instructors, teaching two courses, provided their course syllabi.

Spring 2015

At least one section of each UST course is being offered, with a total of 22 course sections. At this time, the instructor of one course has volunteered to submit student artifacts. Four instructors, teaching three courses, have provided their course syllabi.

2.2. 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 also provides guidance and recommendations to UAS staff in its service to the institution on related matters.

There were two noteworthy changes to the AAC in the last year. First, the UAS assistant director assumed responsibility as chair of the AAC. This was to reflect the increasing responsibilities of the position. Second, it was decided that the AAC would review annual updates to assessment plans on an annual basis. The goal of this change was to provide more feedback to academic departments and reflect the increasing focus on professional development and support from UAS. These changes are highlighted in the revised PRAAP document² and are described in more detail in Goal 1 (1.1 PRAAP).

The AAC generally meets on a monthly basis (except for summer and holidays). Meeting topics include:

- Regular updates about general education assessment.
- Review of assessment plans for PRAAP/annual updates.
- General updates about UAS activities and projects (consultations, surveys, etc.).
- General updates about HLC-related matters.
- Presentations relating to student engagement data through BCSSE/NSSE/FSSE.

2.3. 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 assistant director served as the UAS representative on the APC, attending 9 meetings and reviewing 15 self-studies, including the program assessment plans for each of the programs under review.

2.4. Foundations of Excellence (FOE)

The UAS 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

² This document was distributed to the AAC at the February 2015 meeting. The current document is online on the UAS website: <http://assessment.illinoisstate.edu/program/>. When the AAC has completed their review of the document, the revised version will be uploaded to the website.

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.

2.5. International Strategic Planning Committee (ISP)

2.6. Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC)

The WAC team began meeting in spring 2014. The UAS director will continue to work with WAC team members on the development of an assessment plan for writing.

UAS has not been involved in the work of the WAC task force or other WAC efforts in the past year. This activity will be removed from the FY 16 Planning Document as a major activity.

2.7. Civic Engagement Task Force

2.8. University College Program Council

2.9. Online Survey Working Group

The UAS director serves on the Online Survey Working Group. The goal of the group is to investigate new online survey options for ISU.

Status of Major FY15 Objectives

Objective 2.1 – Develop a governance or organizational structure that accommodates the Assessment Academy Team (AAT).

Nearly all of the activities and objectives of the AAT's projects have been incorporated into university governance and processes.³ More information about the results of the AAT's work are included in Appendix A (HLC Assessment Academy Impact Report), objective 1.2 (pgs. 11-12), and section 2.1: CGE (p. 14).

Objective 2.2 – Consult the FOE transition team on an assessment plan for the FOE process.

The UAS director served on an FOE transition team during. Many of the outcomes of the FOE process and related activities continue to be implemented and institutionalized. It is assumed that UAS will continue to consult and serve in regard to activities that were the result of the FOE process.

Major FY16 Objectives (from the FY16 Planning Document)

Objective 2.1 – Partner with the Provost office in the continued improvement and implementation of Academic Program Profiles

³ See appendix A for the HLC Assessment Academy Team *Impact Report*. The report is also available online: <http://assessment.illinoisstate.edu/HLC-Academy-Impact-Report-5-1-2014-Illinois-State-Univ.pdf>.

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

Table 7. UAS Goals and Major Activities & Accomplishments for Goal 3

Major Activities & Accomplishments	FY 15 Objectives	FY 16 Objectives
3.1 Specialized Accreditation Support 3.2 Institutional Accreditation Support 3.3 HLC Assessment Academy*	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 2015 and beyond. Objective 3.2 – Complete participation in the Assessment Academy Team.	Objective 3.1 – Identify academic programs due for specialized accreditation FY 16 and FY 17.

*Participation in the HLC Assessment Academy concluded in June 2014. This will be removed in the FY 2016 Annual Report as an activity.

Major Activities and Accomplishments for Goal 3

3.1. Specialized Accreditation Support

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 assistant director has worked with the coordinator of academic programs and policy to develop and update a comprehensive list of the specialized accreditations that units/programs receive. This list was completed in June 2013 and is online in the at the Provost website: Provost website, Accreditation on-line listing: <http://provost.illinoisstate.edu/academic/accreditation/>

In October 2014, UAS staff met with the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET) in preparation for the department's specialized accreditation.

3.2. Institutional Accreditation Support

UAS also provided institutional accreditation support through leadership and service on the Assessment Academy Team and HLC Re-Accreditation teams 3 and 4. See sections 2.5 and 2.6 for more information.

3.3. HLC Assessment Academy

ISU's participation in the HLC Assessment Academy concluded in June 2014. More information about ISU's concluding participation in the Academy is below.

Status of Major FY15 Objectives

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 2015 and beyond (also FY15 Objective 1.2).

See Status of Major FY15 Objective 1.2 for more information.

Objective 3.2 – Complete participation in the Assessment Academy Team.

Participation in the HLC Assessment Academy concluded with a Results Forum, held in St. Charles, IL on June 27-29, 2014. The forum was attended by the Associate Provost, Director of University Assessment, and Coordinator of Academic Programs and Policy. The results of the work of the Assessment Academy and the Assessment Academy Team were articulated in the HLC Assessment Academy Impact Report. The Impact Report is included in Appendix A and is available online on the UAS webpage.

Major FY16 Objectives (from the FY16 Planning Document)

Objective 3.1 – Identify academic programs due for specialized accreditation FY 16 and FY 17.

Goal 4. 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 4

Major Activities & Accomplishments	FY 15 Objectives	FY 16 Objectives
4.1 Staff & Unit Consultations 4.2 Survey design, analysis, and/or consultation 4.3 Data analysis/support 4.4 Professional development for ISU faculty & staff	Objective 4.1 – Revise the professional development component of the UAS website (specifically, Assessment Tutorial site). Objective 4.2 – Work with CTLT on professional development opportunities.	Objective 4.1 – Continue to develop and refine professional development curriculum for assessment in Academic Affairs.

Major Activities and Accomplishments for Goal 4

4.1. Staff and unit consultations

UAS has worked with individuals across all four divisions of the university. Between March 2014 and February 2015, UAS staff provided consultations for 17 units on assessment-related matters. For example, UAS staff met with University College staff to consult about a program evaluation design for academic advising. As another example, UAS staff met with the Honors Director in April about an evaluation plan and survey.

4.2. Survey design, analysis, and/or consultation

UAS staff met with faculty and/or staff from 6 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. Between March 2014 and February 2015, UAS staff met with 6 units to discuss survey design and administration and administered 23 surveys on behalf of 10 units. Some of the surveys that UAS provided administered during the past year include:

- Open House Surveys, Campus Information Sessions Survey, Redbird Reception Evaluations, Redbird Day Survey, and Red and White Day Survey (spring 2014, summer 2014, and fall 2015) for the Office of Admissions
- Geography Exit Survey (spring 2014, summer 2014, and fall 2014) for the Department of Geography-Geology
- Academic Advising Survey (spring 2014) for Assessment Committee of the Academic Advising Council
- Off-Campus Services Survey (spring 2014) for the Dean of Students Office

In addition, UAS conducted or provided support in the design, implementation, and/or analysis of the following institution-wide surveys in FY 15.

- Alumni Survey, summer 2014
- Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE), spring 2014

4.3. Data analysis and support

UAS staff received 11 requests for data and/or assistance analyzing and interpreting data collected for assessment purposes. Units requesting these data or assistance included the Career Center, Office of the Provost, Athletics, and Planning, Research, and Policy Analysis.

4.4. Professional development for ISU faculty and staff

One of the results of participation in the HLC Assessment Academy was a need for more professional development and training in assessment and evaluation for faculty and staff. As a result, UAS implemented a professional development series based on the PRAAP rubric in fall 2012 and offered these sessions in fall 2014. These sessions included:

- Writing goals and learning outcomes
- Direct measures of assessment
- Indirect measures of assessment
- Using results

UAS also implemented an “assessment toolbox” series in spring 2015. These sessions included:

- Survey design
- Curriculum mapping
- Using rubrics

The session content was uploaded to the UAS conferences and presentations website:

<http://assessment.illinoisstate.edu/about/workshops/>.

Status of Major FY15 Objectives

Objective 4.1 – Revise the professional development component of the UAS website (specifically, Assessment Tutorial site).

UAS staff worked with Web and Interactive Communications in the re-design of the online assessment tutorial. The tutorial was completed in summer 2014. The tutorial is based on the rubric used for PRAAP. Web services staff provided input in terms of the flow and end-user experience. The tutorial is located at this site: <http://assessment.illinoisstate.edu/tutorial/>

Objective 4.2 – Work with CTLT on professional development opportunities.

Now that UAS is in the ITDC, a closer working relationship with CTLT will be fostered. UAS discussed NSSE/FSSE results at a January 2015 Teaching-Excellence Series Presentation, *Competing Perceptions of Interaction*.

Major FY16 Objectives (from the FY16 Planning Document)

Objective 4.1 – Continue to develop and refine professional development curriculum for assessment in Academic Affairs.

Goal 5. Serve the campus by engaging in outreach activities.*Table 9. UAS Goals and Major Activities & Accomplishments for Goal 4*

Major Activities & Accomplishments	FY 15 Objectives	FY 16 Objectives
5.1 Progressive Measures (Newsletter) 5.2 UAS website 5.3 Assessment Initiative Award 5.4 Presence at Campus Events	Objective 5.1 – Increase visibility and awareness of the AIA. Objective 5.2 – Work with LEAP Forward group in researching Business Intelligence options for data reporting and analysis.	Objective 5.1 – Develop and implement an online business intelligence component for the UAS website, potentially piloting with NSSE data. Objective 5.2 – Develop a list of assessment contacts by program or department.

Major Activities and Accomplishments for Goal 5*5.1. Progressive Measures Newsletter*

FY 2015 is the tenth 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>

5.2. Website Communications

The UAS website is the primary vehicle for assessment information and archive for documents and other materials. Both the assistant director 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.

This past year, UAS worked with the Web and Interactive Communications unit in redesigning the UAS website in order to be more consistent with university branding. This next year, UAS will work on making the website more functional (see objectives 4.1 and 5.2).

5.3. Assessment Initiative Award

Every year, UAS awards three 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, 3 proposals were submitted, with 2 being selected for funding:

- Proposal from the B.S. in Environmental Health program in the Department of Health Sciences
- Proposal from the Pre-Licensure sequence of the B.S.N. in Nursing program in the Mennonite College of Nursing

Copies of the award applications are on file in UAS. Recipients are required to write an article for *Progressive Measures* and present their project (such as at the CTLT Teaching-Learning Symposium) detailing the results of their project.

5.4. Presence at Campus Events

UAS often conducts outreach by making a presence at campus events. Between March 2013 and February 2014, these included:

- Table presentation at Founder's Day (2/19/14)
- New Faculty Orientation (8/11/14)
- Grad Finale (10/16/2014)

Status of Major FY15 Objectives

Objective 5.1 – Increase visibility and awareness of the AIA.

UAS received six and three Assessment Initiative Award (AIA) proposals in FY 14 and FY 15, respectively. Two programs received AIA awards in FY 15. The programs received the awards this year:

- Environmental Health program, for a project designed to assess student technical communication skill (oral and written), professional knowledge, and critical thinking disposition and skills.
- Mennonite College of Nursing program, for a project that seeks to research, pilot, implement, and use student portfolios.

Recipients of the AIA are required to submit an article to *Progressive Measures* and give a presentation at the CTLT Annual Symposium.

Objective 5.2 – Work with LEAP Forward group in researching Business Intelligence options for data reporting and analysis.

The LEAP Forward project has many priorities. At this point, UAS is going to explore other opportunities for presenting data online and using business intelligence in order to create a culture of evidence. This past year, UAS purchased a Tableau module. The module will be piloted in the spring.

Major FY16 Objectives (from the FY16 Planning Document)

Objective 5.1 – Develop and implement an online business intelligence component for the UAS website, potentially piloting with NSSE data.

Objective 5.2 – Develop a list of assessment contacts by program or department.

Goal 6. Maintain a level of expertise in higher education assessment through staff development.*Table 10. UAS Goals and Major Activities & Accomplishments for Goal 6*

Major Activities & Accomplishments	FY 15 Objectives	FY 16 Objectives
6.1 Conference and meeting attendance 6.2 Internal and external presentations 6.3 Internal and external publications 6.4 Training and professional development	None	None

Major Activities and Accomplishments for Goal 6*6.1. Conference and meeting attendance (March 2014-February 2015)*

- Higher Learning Commission Annual Conference, Chicago, IL (April 2014)
- Higher Learning Commission, Assessment Academy Results Forum, St. Charles, IL (June 2014)
- ISU Annual International Conference, Normal, IL (November 2014)

6.2. Internal and external presentations (March 2014-February 2015)

- Presentation at General Education workshop with CTLT, May 14, 2014
- Presentation to AAC about the NSSE/FSSE results on February 17, 2015
- Herrmann, D., & Smith, R. (2015, January). *Comparing Student and Faculty Perceptions of Student Engagement: What Next Steps Can We Take?* Online:
<http://ctlit.illinoisstate.edu/downloads/symposium/2015/Herrmann%20%20Smith%20-%202015%20TLS.pdf>
- Discussion of NSSE/FSSE results at the CTLT Teaching-Excellence Series, Session 1: *Competing Perceptions of Interaction*, January 20, 2015. Online:
<http://ctlit.illinoisstate.edu/events/teachingexcellence/>

6.3. Internal and external publications (March 2014-February 2015)

- Herrmann, D. (2014, Spring). A Longitudinal Examination of First-Year Student Engagement at Illinois State University. *Progressive Measures*, 9 (2), pp. 16-19. Online:
<http://assessment.illinoisstate.edu/downloads/Spring2014Volume9Issue2.pdf>

6.4. Training and Professional Development (March 2014-February 2015)

All UAS staff have completed the CITI online training.

The UAS assistant director is currently enrolled in the doctoral program in the School of Teaching and Learning.

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

The UAS director participated in the ISU Leadership Initiative through the Office of the Provost.

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

I. Internal Reallocations and Reorganizations in FY15

- 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.

A goal for the remainder of FY 2015 and in FY 2016 is the creation of a plan to change the duties and responsibilities of the Office Manager position in UAS. The rationale behind this plan is the following:

- As the office and university continue to evolve, consistency with UAS strategy and goals.
- To move some functions from the graduate assistant and assistant director to the Office Manager. This will streamline some office functions and be more efficient in terms of staffing costs.
- To capitalize on the skills and knowledge learned by the current Office Manager in the three years the position has been staffed.

- B. Describe how the unit used additional funds to enhance accomplishments and productivity. Additional funds include: Enhancement funds, Instructional Capacity funds, Summer Session funding, external funding, Foundation funds, variance dollars, external contracts, and technology tuition dollars, or other special funds provided with general revenue dollars.

Accountability Reports

- A. FY15 PE Statement Accountability Report- Word Template uploaded to your Budget Docs Drive: Working Folder. **Final Submission submitted through the *Select Survey* uploaded to your Budget Docs Drive: FINAL Folder– Due March 16, 2015**
- B. FY15 SBC Statement Accountability Report- Word Template uploaded to your Budget Docs Drive: Working Folder. **Final Submission submitted through the *Select Survey* uploaded to your Budget Docs Drive: FINAL Folder– Due March 16, 2015**
- C. FY15 IC_Gen Ed Accountability Report- *Template uploaded to your Budget Docs Drive: Working Folder – Due September 5, 2015 to the Budget Docs drive: FINAL Folder*
- D. FY15 Supplemental Travel for Field Supervision Accountability Report - *Template uploaded to your Budget Docs Drive: Working Folder – Due September 5, 2015 to the Budget Docs drive: FINAL Folder*

Appendix A: HLC Assessment Academy Impact Report

Also available online: <http://assessment.illinoisstate.edu/>



HLC Assessment Academy

Impact Report

HLC Assessment Academy Team

1. Describe your Academy project(s) as developed at the first Roundtable. Be as detailed as possible about the issues it was intended to address as well as the content and strategies of the project itself.

Projects at First Roundtable

Illinois State University attended the first HLC Assessment Academy Roundtable in spring 2011. As a result of that roundtable, the institution embarked on two projects.

1. Student learning outcome plans to improve learning in all degree programs (Program Assessment)
2. Strategic assessment of student learning in general education (General Education Assessment)

Reasons for Joining the HLC Assessment Academy

Illinois State University joined the HLC Assessment Academy for three reasons.

1. *Program Assessment.* First, it was felt that while most faculty and staff attitudes towards assessment were fairly positive, in 2011 it was realized that many academic programs do not utilize assessment plans for ongoing program improvement. While nearly all academic programs had an academic assessment plan on the University Assessment Services (UAS) website, there was wide variability in how programs used the plans. Through the annual evaluations of assessment plans by the Assessment Advisory Council, it was clear that many programs used assessment in a meaningful way, while others updated assessment plans on a more intermittent basis, usually in conjunction with the eight-year program review cycle. As a result, the goal of the program assessment project was to determine what programs and resources were needed to encourage more meaningful and sustained assessment in all degree programs.
2. *General Education Assessment.* The second reason for joining the Assessment Academy was that Illinois State University was embarking on a revision of general education, including general education assessment. The revision included the establishment of a General Education Task Force (GETF). One of the subcommittees of the GETF focused on general education assessment, with support from the Assessment Academy Team, was charged with revising or developing a new general education assessment plan.
3. *Accreditation.* The third reason for participating in the Assessment Academy was to fulfill the institutional requirement as a Pathways Pioneer institution. Specifically, participation in the HLC Assessment Academy fulfills the quality initiative component of the Open Pathway to accreditation.

Degree to Which the Reasons for Joining the Academy Have Been Dealt With

In our estimation, the reasons for joining the Academy have been addressed throughout the projects' life cycle. Illinois State University has made adjustments to processes related to program-level assessment, including a heightened focus on the professional development aspects of assessment and incorporating more systematic elements into assessment and program review, such as the annual review of assessment plans and the academic program profiles project.

The issues of general education have been addressed through the work of the GETF and continuing work of the Council on General Education (Council on General Education), and in particular the transition to a revised Institutional Artifact Portfolio (IAP) process for general education assessment.

2. Describe any changes that you made to the project(s)—or that had to be made to it—other than personnel changes. What were the reasons for these changes? Did the changes improve the project?

Program Assessment Project Changes

There were some minor changes made to the program assessment project, but they were not substantial enough to alter the general substance of the project in a significant way. A primary change was reliance on the assessment audit and survey, as opposed to conducting interviews, in order to gain feedback about program assessment at Illinois State University. There were practical considerations in regard to conducting interviews, including resources, time, and Institutional Review Board (IRB) concerns. As a result, we decided to include open-ended response options to a survey and spend extra time in terms of coding the responses and using them to develop narratives about program assessment.

General Education Project Changes

1. *Suspending the IAP process.* In spring 2011, the Council on General Education decided to suspend the IAP process. There were several reasons for this.
 1. The main reason for suspending the process had more to do with the relevancy of the results than with the process itself. UAS was responsible for collecting and analyzing data, while the Council on General Education representatives were responsible for reporting and making decisions based on the data. The problem was a lack of clarity in terms of interpreting the data and making it meaningful.
 2. Another reason for the suspension was that general education underwent substantial changes as a result of the work of the GETF in the 2011-12 academic year. It was recommended that assessment be suspended until certain structural and curricular changes were made to the general education program.
2. *New general education assessment plan.* As a result of the work of the GETF Assessment Subcommittee and the new position, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education, a new assessment plan has been developed. The most significant change is the development of faculty panels. The panels are groups of faculty in the disciplines who will be responsible for assessing general education artifacts using LEAP or modified LEAP VALUE rubrics. The decision to create faculty panels was made for several reasons.
 1. Faculty serving on the panels bring disciplinary expertise to the assessment process and can adapt the VALUE rubrics to the specific needs of Illinois State.
 2. They teach in the general education program and know the curriculum and pedagogies of their specific category thoroughly.
 3. They can serve as “champions” within their discipline and reach out to colleagues in ways that a central administrator cannot.

4. They can help to close the assessment feedback loop with colleagues teaching courses in the specific General Education categories, a necessary step that was largely lacking in the program-level assessment conducted previously.
 5. They can assist with ongoing professional development activities and bring others “into the fold.”
3. *Attendance at Council on General Education meetings by UAS staff.* In order to enhance collaboration and communications, it we decided that UAS staff would attend all Council on General Education meetings as non-voting members, starting in the 2012-13 academic year.

3. What have you achieved as a result of your work in the Academy? Consider the range of these achievements, from the very specific (development of a rubric) to the more general (outcomes-based curriculum approval processes). To what degree have these achievements been institutionalized?

Program Assessment Project Achievements

1. *Assessment Audit.* One of the results of participation in the Assessment Academy was an assessment audit of academic programs using the Illinois State University program assessment rubric.

In 2011-12, members of the Assessment Advisory Council and Academy Team reviewed all academic program assessment plans using the program assessment rubric. Programs with assessment plans scheduled to be reviewed as part of the Process for the Review of Academic Assessment Plans (PRAAP) were reviewed by the Assessment Advisory Council, while other programs not scheduled for review were audited by the Academy Team. A total of 79 graduate and undergraduate programs were reviewed, 48 by the Assessment Advisory Council and 31 by the Academy Team. The Assessment Advisory Council annual reviews of academic assessment plans are conducted by two team members in order to ensure reliability of ratings. Academy Team members took the same approach.

In regard to the rating of all 79 academic assessment plans, the results show that the great majority of Illinois State University programs have established learning outcomes and are developing or have established systematic assessment methods (direct) and systematic feedback from stakeholders (indirect). However, it was not obvious from the assessment audit whether programs are using assessment for improvement (or “closing the loop”). These results are highlighted in Table 1.

One issue that arose during Academy Team conversations was that some programs may be using assessment results but are not making it obvious in their assessment plans. As a result, the Academy Team provided an overall evaluation of the plans based on the rubric and an evaluation of the overall level of use, with the results shown in Tables 2 and 3, respectively.

Table 1. Rating of Academic Assessment Plans Using the Illinois State University Academic Assessment Program Rubric

Plan Component	Undeveloped		Developing		Established		Exemplary	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Program goals and intended student learning outcomes	1	1.3	24	30.4	35	44.3	19	24.1
Systematic assessment of student learning	5	6.3	29	36.7	24	30.4	21	26.6
Feedback from key stakeholders	16	20.3	35	44.3	15	19.0	13	16.5
Analysis of results/feedback mechanisms and response	28	35.4	26	32.9	18	22.8	7	8.9

Note. This rating was provided by members of the Academy Team and Assessment Advisory Council (n=79).

Table 2. Overall Evaluation of Academic Assessment Plans Using the Illinois State University Academic Assessment Program Rubric

	Underdeveloped		Developed		Established	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Overall Evaluation	16	51.6	8	25.8	7	22.6

Note. This rating was provided only by the Academy Team members (n = 31).

Table 3. Evaluation of the Level of Use for Academic Assessment Plans

	Unknown		Not Used		Used	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Level of Use	13	41.9	8	25.8	10	32.3

Note. This rating was provided only by the Academy Team members (n = 31).

2. Survey of Department Chairpersons. During the summer of 2012 the Academy Team administered an online survey to all department chairpersons and the dean of the Mennonite College of Nursing to examine degree program assessment. They were asked to complete the survey and/or to solicit input from others in their unit who have responsibilities for assessment-related activities. Of the 34 individuals invited to complete the survey, 24 individuals from 19 different units responded, for a 56 percent unit response rate. The data were condensed (including the removal of all identifying information) and were coded by UAS staff individually. UAS staff then came to a consensus for each of the categories that they individually developed as well as the frequencies of those categories.

Summaries of the responses to some of the questions are included in Tables 4 through 6. Some of the common challenges or barriers to assessment included time, culture of assessment, lack of knowledge and/or experience with assessment, lack of models/standards/resources, and using valid and feasible assessments. Respondents also indicated that assessment needs to be part of the culture, that they would like more resources for assessment activities, and that the benefits of assessment need to be better recognized.

Table 4. What are some of the challenges or barriers to developing, maintaining, and implementing assessment plans in your department?

Category	Frequency
Collecting/organizing/maintaining data	4
Culture	7
Detracts from other responsibilities	3
Interest	4
Lack of knowledge/experience	7
Lack of models/standards/resources	5
Lack of student involvement	3
Meeting requirements	2
Time	9
Valid and feasible assessments	5

Note. n = 24.

Table 5. Do you see evidence of resistance to and/or disinterest in assessment within your department? If yes, what is that evidence?

Category	Frequency
No	8
Not resistance but disinterest	1
Not sure	4
Yes	11
• Lack of collaboration/consensus	2
• Lack of knowledge	7
• Not full participation/refusals	3

Note. n = 24; the additional information included under 'Yes' do not sum to 11 because some individuals provided more than one piece of evidence.

Table 6. Do you see evidence of support of and/or interest in assessment? If yes, what is that evidence?

Category	Frequency
No	2
Somewhat	4
Yes	18
• Meeting requirements	4
• Participating in assessment	8
• Understanding importance/value/need	7
• Using the results	2

Note. n = 24; the additional information included under 'Yes' do not sum to 18 because some individuals provided more than one piece of evidence.

3. Incorporation of professional development activities. As a result of the survey findings, UAS decided to implement a professional development series based on the rubric used in the Process for the Review of Academic Assessment Plans (PRAAP) process. The series format and presentations were uploaded to the UAS website: <http://assessment.illinoisstate.edu/about/workshops/>. In the next year UAS is planning a move to the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Technology (CTLT) building. It is hoped that this will spur increased professional development in the areas of assessment and evaluation.

Another professional development example is the Assessment Initiative Award (AIA) program. The program awards small grants to faculty and staff for assessment projects selected by the Assessment Advisory Council. In 2013-14 five programs or units were awarded grants totaling \$5,500. Examples included an evaluation of a counseling program, an electronic artifact archive for the English department, and a student professional preparation evaluation.

4. Incorporating more continuous feedback about assessment plans. Historically, academic programs only received feedback about their assessment plans as part of the PRAAP cycle, which was every eight years. The assessment survey and audit results, along with anecdotal information from faculty communicated to UAS staff, revealed that faculty wanted more continuous feedback on their annual updates. As a result, UAS and the Assessment Advisory Council decided to provide annual feedback to programs that were not going through the PRAAP process but had submitted an annual update.

The annual feedback for academic assessment plans will coincide with another project out of the Provost's office, the *Academic Program Profiles Project*. The Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE) mandates that academic programs be reviewed every eight years. This has presented two problems.

1. First, eight years is a long time between reviews. While many academic programs approach assessment and review in a systematic manner (particularly those that are accredited), several others conduct reviews on a more sporadic basis due to the eight-year review cycle.
2. Second, the eight-year cycle means that only a sampling of programs are reviewed. It is difficult to view all programs as a whole, engage in institution-wide planning, and make decisions based on only a sample of programs.

Thus, the decision was made to continue with the eight-year review cycle but to also develop profiles of academic programs on an annual basis. Each profile includes academic program inputs (e.g., enrollment, ACT scores, and student and faculty characteristics), program productivity measures (e.g., student-faculty ratios, grade point averages, and persistence rates), and program outcomes (e.g., graduation rates and time-to-degree). The data is intended for use by program faculty in ongoing program assessment and improvement. The first edition of the profiles was disseminated to programs in March and April 2014.

5. Streamline annual update submissions for academic programs. Historically, academic programs have submitted annual assessment updates via an online .pdf form. This form can be cumbersome to work with and may discourage academic programs from providing annual updates to UAS. Thus, it was decided to implement a simple web form that can be completed in a web browser. Another advantage of this is that it makes it easier for UAS staff to analyze annual updates.

General Education Project Achievements

1. General Education Task Force Assessment Subcommittee. As part of the review of general education at Illinois State University, the Assessment Subcommittee was charged with the following questions.¹

1. Do our current assessment practices provide the information required by administrators, faculty members, and the student services staff to gauge the impact of the General Education program on students and make changes as needed?
2. If not, what additional information is needed and how might that information be collected?
3. What resources, if any, might be needed to support a revised assessment process?

In regard to question 1, the GETF Assessment Subcommittee met for approximately one hour per week throughout the 2011-2012 academic year. At these meetings, the subcommittee critically examined current General Education assessment practices at Illinois State University and alternative processes detailed as best practices in the literature. The subcommittee also consulted with key stakeholder groups on campus, including the Council on General Education, the other GETF subcommittees, the Assessment Advisory Council, the Academy Team, and attendees at the open fora and symposium presentations.

In terms of assessment methods examined, the subcommittee evaluated the relative merits various options. Based on these data sources the GETF Assessment Subcommittee concluded that the current IAP system is a good fit for Illinois State University because it provides a direct level of assessment, the campus community is familiar with the process, and it is non-intrusive and faculty-friendly.

In regard to question 2, the GETF Assessment Subcommittee recommended an assessment system that incorporates direct and indirect measures, including an IAP process, a periodic syllabus audit, and using survey data, particularly from the NSSE and Alumni Surveys. It also recommended using assessments that already exist in academic programs.

In regard to question 3, the GETF Assessment Subcommittee recommended that an administrator be tasked with responsibility for general education assessment and serve out of the Provost's office. The recommended role of this administrator is to coordinate all aspects of the program, including assessment and its interpretation, and to coordinate with other units to efficiently manage the whole system. The GETF Assessment Subcommittee also recommended that the general education goals be re-written with a focus on assessment and clarity, that increased professional development opportunities be made available, and that the general education program adopt a new name.

2. Development of faculty panels with responsibility for general education assessment.

The "Critical Inquiry" faculty advisory panel has been in place since 2006-07 and serves to coordinate the first-year curriculum in oral and written communication as well as information literacy. Communication, English, and Library faculty have successfully collaborated on curriculum, shared vocabulary, pedagogy, instructor training and development, and assessment strategies throughout this

¹ More information is included in the *GETF Final Report*: <http://gened.illinoisstate.edu/taskforce/>

time. This panel served as a model for the creation and activities of the newly-formed advisory committees organized around groups of general education categories as follows.

- Fine Arts
- Humanities (Humanities and Language in the Humanities categories)
- Mathematics (Mathematics and Quantitative Reasoning categories)
- Sciences (Natural Sciences and Science, Mathematics, and Technology categories)
- Social Science (Social Science and Individuals and Civic Life categories)
- United States Traditions

In collaboration with the Council on General Education, the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Studies sought nominations and convened panels in fall 2013 and provided the panels with an agenda and materials. In this academic year, the panels have been asked to review category learning outcomes under the Illinois State University general education structure; review LEAP VALUE rubrics mapped to their categories (with the understanding that rubrics may be added or deleted in future as we gain experience); and to “unpack” or “translate” the VALUE rubric language and adapt the rubrics as appropriate to Illinois State, its curriculum, and the general education structure. The deadline for this work is May 2014. The modified VALUE rubrics will be used to evaluate samples of student work as part of the IAP.

The panels are making good progress, and samples of adapted rubrics (reading and writing) were shared with the Council on General Education at its meeting on February 25, 2014. As of April 2014, rubrics in most disciplinary areas have been developed and are in advanced draft form.

4. What effect has your time in the Academy had on institutional commitment to the assessment of learning on campus? How broad is that commitment? How has institutional capacity for assessing student learning changed?

In terms of broad commitment, we do know that participation in the Assessment Academy has acted as an incentive to engage in activities that do lead to commitment to the assessment of student learning (like meta-assessment and increased professional development activities). We hope to periodically evaluate our assessment processes and faculty engagement with assessment by conducting another audit and survey. Hopefully, the results will show movement in a positive direction in terms of commitment to the assessment of learning on campus.

Participation in the Assessment Academy has broadened institutional capacity for assessment in three ways. First, there is more emphasis being placed on assessment as a vehicle for faculty engagement. From our participation in the academy, we learned that assessment is, by its nature, a collaborative activity that is about sharing, dialogue, and ultimately use in decision-making. This is different from “traditional” notions about assessment, which are more oriented towards compliance, research design, and methodological processes.

An example of this is an institution-wide assessment workshop conducted in March 2013. The workshop included presentations by UAS staff, a panel discussion led by faculty colleagues, and interactive table activities, including review of program assessment plans using the Illinois State University PRAAP rubric. Thirty-two faculty and staff attended the half-day workshop, 13 of whom were chairs of academic departments. Between March 2013 and February 2014, UAS staff met with 24 academic and non-

academic programs and departments for consultations, presentations, and training related to assessment and evaluation. UAS also had 18 meetings with units to consult on evaluation and assessment surveys during the same time period.

Second, we learned the importance of sharing and collaboration as a result of our participation in the academy. As mentioned previously, Illinois State University has a strong tradition and history of shared governance. Coupled with the size of the University in terms of student and faculty/staff populations, this can present challenges for collaboration and information-sharing. Thus, we learned it is best to be intentional about sharing and communications and to ensure that the various governance groups that have a stake in assessment communicate with each other and have overlap in terms of membership. Although not directly related to the academy project, there has been progress in student affairs with their adoption of Campus Labs as an assessment and planning tool for the entire division.

Third, resources have been devoted towards general education assessment. The senior position of Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education was created to coordinate the general education program and to implement the revised assessment plan. Faculty panels were created. The Office of the Provost has committed significant ongoing funds, beginning with summer 2014, to provide professional development for faculty.

5. What effect has your Academy work had on student learning?

At this point we are working on developing methods for gauging the direct impact of academy work on student learning. There are two reasons for continuing work in this area. First, we are just implementing many of the projects that were a result of participating in the academy. Measuring the direct impact will take years. A second problem is developing a methodology for gauging the direct impact of academy work on student learning. We will continue to develop methods for making those linkages more explicit.

As a result of our focus on increasing faculty engagement (through professional development and faculty panels) and more systematic assessment approaches (through the academic program profiles project), we are confident that our academy work will indirectly have a positive impact on student learning. For example, it is hoped that the creation of faculty panels will enhance advocacy for general education by creating awareness and putting more control and responsibility for assessment in the hands of faculty. Additionally, the use of LEAP rubrics will make faculty and students more aware of general education outcomes and expectations, hopefully enhancing learning for students. Another opportunity for indirect assessment could be using data from the academic program profile reports and correlating or comparing that data with engagement data from NSSE.

6. What concrete evidence do you have to demonstrate the effects you described in questions 3-5?

Participation in the HLC assessment academy has had a very positive impact in terms of our institutional commitment to the assessment of learning. This is reflected by the following.

- Increased focus on faculty engagement and professional development in the area of assessment (see question 2). UAS has worked with individuals across all four divisions of the University. Between March 1, 2013 and February 28, 2014, UAS staff provided consultations for 24 units on assessment-related matters and for the program review process.
- More focus on systematic, annual approaches to assessment, as reflected in the academic program profiles project (see question 2).

- Increased attention paid towards evaluating the assessment process itself, as reflected in the assessment audit and survey. This has led to meaningful dialog about assessment, leading us to congratulate ourselves for positive work and to identify areas that need improvement.
- Increased resources, attention, and commitment to general education assessment, as demonstrated through collaborations between UAS staff and the Council on General Education, along with the hiring of an Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education with responsibility for assessment.
- More faculty input and involvement with general education assessment, as reflected in the development of faculty panels.
- Implementation of the GETF Assessment Subcommittee recommendations, as reflected in the current version of the assessment plan for general education.
- The CTLT has developed a series of outcomes for professional development and, in collaboration with the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education, has developed summer workshops for general education faculty, with stipends for participating faculty members provided by the Provost's Office.

7. What do you see as the next logical steps for continuing the work you have begun in the Academy? In particular, what new student learning initiatives do you see developing from your Academy work, and how will you sustain the energy and momentum of your Academy work?

Program Assessment Project Next Steps

In regard to program assessment, the next logical steps include the following.

Moving forward with increased faculty engagement activities. As a result of our participation in the academy, we have learned that faculty engagement is crucial. Moving to the same building as CTLT will provide increased opportunities for collaboration. Additionally, UAS has included this as an objective in their annual report (see: <http://assessment.illinoisstate.edu/about/>).

We intend to develop a list of faculty responsible for assessment by program. What we learned from the assessment survey is that there is variability in terms of assessment planning, coordination, and use by program. Developing a list of contacts will help UAS and CTLT with faculty engagement and professional development activities.

Continuing to provide more continuous feedback to faculty about their assessment plans. We plan on providing more continuous and systematic feedback to faculty about their assessment plans. This will be enhanced by the development of the academic program profiles project. Anecdotally, UAS staff has heard from several faculty who have expressed an interest in this. Hopefully, this will continue to change and reflect an assessment culture where faculty feel that the purpose of submitting assessment plans and updates is for development and improvement, as opposed to compliance.

General Education Project Next Steps

Faculty Panels. The panels will have completed alignment of LEAP rubrics with general education goals and outcomes. Pilot assessments will be conducted in spring 2014 in oral communication (Communication 110) and critical thinking in the sciences (Geology 102 for critical thinking in the sciences). To be established in fall 2014 is an advisory panel on the co-curriculum as it relates to general

education. Some general education goals are mapped to the co-curriculum where we will be able to build on the Campus Labs tool already implemented in Student Affairs.

Faculty panel members and other faculty in related disciplines will be involved in assessment of student work, in analysis of results of the assessment, and in providing feedback to the Council on General Education. It is expected that panel members will provide formal and informal feedback to colleagues in the disciplines.

General Education Assessment Professional Development. The Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education and the director of the CTLT have collaborated on a set of outcomes for professional development. They have also planned summer workshops for general education faculty with financial support (stipends) provided by the Provost's Office.

New Student Learning Initiatives

We see several new student learning initiatives arising from our participation in the academy.

Alumni and Senior Surveys. After our participation in the academy concludes, we would like to research the current use and applicability of our alumni survey. We have had issues with response rates and it may be time to re-examine some of the questions. We would also like to examine the possibility of an exit or senior survey.

Foundations of Excellence. Illinois State University is a participant in the Foundations of Excellence (FoE)² project through the Gardner Institute. Participation in the "refresh" concluded in spring 2013. An FoE Implementation team has been tasked with implementing many of the recommendations from the project, including developing assessment strategies for first-year and transfer students.

Sustaining Energy and Momentum

We have several ideas for sustaining the energy and momentum of our academy work.

1. Incorporating some of the academy's ideas and work into the UAS annual report and planning processes could help institutionalize some of the work of the academy.
2. Communicating ideas and results of the academy's work to the Assessment Advisory Council would help energize the primary governance entity responsible for assessment.
3. Working with CTLT in developing professional development opportunities for assessment.
4. Conducting another survey or assessment audit to evaluate the results of our efforts in making assessment more useful and focused on student learning.
5. Continuing to be more systematic with assessment, particularly in regard to annual updates and the academic program profiles project.
6. There are several important initiatives that will further focus attention on general education and its assessment.
 - The University has developed a new strategic plan for internationalization of the curriculum. Related to that will be a discussion in 2014-15 whether to retain the current non-western studies requirement for general education and graduation or whether to expand it to a more broadly-defined international requirement that could be satisfied through study

² For more information, see: <http://provost.illinoisstate.edu/faculty/foe.shtml>

- abroad, foreign language study, or other means in addition to current coursework in global studies.
- Faculty development programming beginning in summer 2014 will continue with leadership from CTLT, the Council on General Education, and faculty advisory panels.
 - The rotating assessment schedule of general education will begin in earnest in fall 2014, combining direct and indirect measures.
 - The college deans will consider implementation of an exit survey including questions on general education to be administered to seniors in their last semester. While the current alumni survey provides indirect measures, an exit survey can be expected to have a much greater response rate.