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I. Introduction

A. About the Team

The Assessment Team (A-Team) is comprised of faculty, staff, and managers who are interested in learning about and actively participating in assessment-focused outreach and creating assessment-focused professional development for their peers. The team meets approximately twice a month to plan assessment outreach and professional development opportunities, and to engage in conversations about current practices and trends in student learning assessment. In 2017-18, the Assessment Team included four full-time faculty, three part-time faculty, and two managers.

B. CLO Coordinator

Lane’s Core Learning Outcomes (CLO) Coordinator is responsible for assisting faculty in professional development around the integration of Lane’s CLOs into the classroom, curriculum, and assessment practices. The coordinator primarily works one-on-one with faculty interested in assessment work, with a strong focus on providing support to faculty currently engaged in Assessment Projects and Fellowships funded by the Assessment Team. The coordinator also serves as co-chair of Lane’s Assessment Team, and in this capacity sometimes participates in the creation and delivery of workshops that provide group-based faculty support in addition to the one-on-one support that’s at the heart of this position.

II. Goals and Planning

A. 2017-18 Goals

1. **Rebrand A-Team**: Strengthen assessment professional development opportunities, outreach, and support of faculty efforts to build knowledge of assessment practices and create structures to ensure continuous improvement of teaching and learning within academic programs and disciplines. *(The focus on professional development and outreach diverges from prior A-Team efforts to perform outreach and also take ownership of institutional and general-education assessment processes. Such institutional-wide efforts are beyond the capacity and capability of this small team.)*

2. **Revise Project and Fellowship models**: Promote increased use of evidence and analysis in the faculty assessment Fellowship program

3. **Support Academic Program Review (APR)**: Strengthen integration of assessment of student learning in Academic Program Review

---

1 A-Team goals were submitted to the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) in October 2017 as part of the annual planning cycle and the IEC’s work to evaluate institutional planning processes and recommend improvements.
Assessment Team Goals, Achievements, and Challenges 2017-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOALS</th>
<th>ACHIEVEMENTS</th>
<th>CHALLENGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Rebranding</strong></td>
<td>Hosted assessment plan conversations in spring 2017 and co-authored an assessment plan in summer prior to the NWCCU Mid-Cycle visit in fall 2017.</td>
<td>Despite initial campus conversations, the institutional assessment plan was written with no input from broader stakeholder groups, was not discussed by these groups, and plan drafts were never shared with governance councils. The plan has been effectively tabled and no mention of it made after the NWCCU visit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Support the Institutional Assessment Plan and promote a culture of continuous improvement in teaching and learning through outcomes-based, evidence-informed, and learning-centered professional development opportunities. Assessment Team will continue to strengthen professional development by: | - Defining a recommended assessment development path  
- Providing assessment readiness workshops/outreach designed to advance understanding of assessment and pre-assessment work  
- Continuing support and funding for faculty Assessment Projects  
- Continuing support and funding for faculty assessment Fellowship program  
- Articulating and communicating the assessment professional development "pipeline" with colleagues to foster an understanding of the connection between their work and assessment across the institution | We have a small team and difficulty recruiting new FT faculty members, so there is limited capacity to offer multiple workshops each term. |
| | - Hosted assessment plan conversations in spring 2017 and co-authored an assessment plan in summer prior to the NWCCU Mid-Cycle visit in fall 2017.  
- Developed and hosted a series of workshops focused on topics relevant to assessment, including workshops on: learning outcomes, rubrics, and assignments.  
- Collaborated with ASA admin on better ways to track funding and pay faculty.  
- Collaborated with an IT project manager to complete work on version 2.0 of the Curriculum Mapping System (CMS), developed in Filemaker Pro and intended to allow faculty to show how CLOs are mapped with approved course learning outcomes (in Banner). Hosted three open sessions for faculty to learn more about the system and test it. | Restrictions placed on 2017-18 funding to limit Fellowships and projects to eliminate curriculum mapping as a funded activity beyond workshop attendance by part-time faculty. |
| | - Despite initial campus conversations, the institutional assessment plan was written with no input from broader stakeholder groups, was not discussed by these groups, and plan drafts were never shared with governance councils. The plan has been effectively tabled and no mention of it made after the NWCCU visit. |
| | - We have a small team and difficulty recruiting new FT faculty members, so there is limited capacity to offer multiple workshops each term. |
| | - Restrictions placed on 2017-18 funding to limit Fellowships and projects to eliminate curriculum mapping as a funded activity beyond workshop attendance by part-time faculty. |
| | - CMS challenges arose when importing course learning outcomes from Banner into the system. To ensure outcomes pull into the CMS, they must be formatted correctly in Banner. A report from IT indicated hundreds of learning outcomes in Banner needed formatting in order to pull correctly. The assessment and curriculum coordinator/A-Team chair spent many hours working on formatting outcomes for courses, focusing only on courses that might be mapped soon. Additionally, there is an issue of timing with curriculum changes and ensuring the most current course info is pulled into the CMS when faculty enter their maps. |
| **2. Revising** | Collaborated with institutional research to increase use of evidence/analysis among faculty fellows.  
- Improved Fellowship report templates and online report form to better capture CLO connections, analysis of | Capacity limitations in the Institutional Research office, which is being asked to provide more data, analysis, and support for an increasing number of stakeholders across campus. |
| Enhance support structures and promote increased use of evidence and analysis practices in the faculty assessment Fellowship program. The Assessment Team will enhance the Fellowship program through: | - Collaborated with institutional research to increase use of evidence/analysis among faculty fellows.  
- Improved Fellowship report templates and online report form to better capture CLO connections, analysis of | Funding limitations mean balancing Fellowships, project funding, and workshop funding, thus allowing approximately 4-5 Fellowships per |
| | - Collaboration with institutional research to develop support, guidance, and reporting structures for faculty Fellowships |  |
(including design of tools, measures, assessments, data collection, and data analysis)

- Collaboration with institutional research to develop tools and measures for determining Fellowship goals and professional development growth

assessment work, creation of assessment tools, use of direct and indirect evidence, and links to faculty assessment goals.

- New expectations for funding (eliminate CLO mapping and assessment funding must lead directly to assessment of student work) hindered some progress. Based on prior teams’ work, it takes faculty teams approximately 2-4 years of projects and Fellowships to establish regular assessment tools and practices.

3. Supporting

Strengthen integration of assessment of student learning in Academic Program Review. The assessment team will support Program Review teams with their assessment- and CLO-related inquiries and implementation strategies through:

- Collaboration with the Academic Program Review Oversight Committee (APROC) to ensure better integration of student learning assessment within the Program Review structure
- Collaboration with APROC, Institutional Effectiveness Committee, and college leadership to determine appropriate financial and human resource structures for ensuring adequate support for sustainable institutional assessment

- Collaborated with APROC leads and director of planning to consider ways of integrating CLO assessment and A-Team support for assessment of student learning into the five-year Program Review cycle (starting 2018-19).

- The Program Review process is faculty-created and faculty-led and open for interpretation by program-review teams. The level of emphasis on student learning assessment varies by program.
- Discussions of sustainable student learning assessment practices did not occur at the institutional level in 2017-18.

B. 2018-19 Goals

1. Re-envision role/scope of A-Team

   a) Enhance outreach and development opportunities

   Building on the successful development of workshops in 2017-18, the A-Team plans to collaborate with Academic Technology Center faculty to develop online content, such as modules, tutorials, or other just-in-time training materials. The A-Team also plans to co-facilitate in-person and/or virtual workshops with the ATC to better align online course development practices with assessment strategies.

   b) Alignment with Academic Program Review

   Both the A-Team chair and CLO Coordinator have desired a stronger and more intentional connection between the A-Team and the Academic Program Review Oversight Committee (APROC). In 2017-18, with the help of the Director for Strategy and Planning, we have been able to make some progress in aligning the work of these two groups.

   As more programs complete the APR process and move on to implementation, and as the college has continued to grapple with NWCCU’s recommendations and warnings, it has become increasingly clear that there needs to be systematic approaches to assessment and APR that are in alignment with each other. This is necessary not only to
ensure that assessment is being thoughtfully and meaningfully integrated into Program Review, but also to ensure the sustainability of work in both areas moving forward.

The A-Team Chair and CLO Coordinator, anticipating this need at an earlier time, have been working to carefully create a “pipeline” of assessment work through the Assessment Projects and Assessment Fellowships intended to help guide programs in building, implementing, and revising research-based assessment practices as part of the planning for continual improvement within their programs.

In 2017-18 we began to work with the individual Fellows/Project Teams who had been approved for funding and had either just completed APR in 2016-17 or were actively involved in APR this year to help them see/improve alignment between the assessment work they were doing and their APR process/implementation plans. We were able to do this work with four programs—Art History, Music, Writing, and Communications in 2017-18. It is our hope that, as a result of some of the groundwork we laid this year, we will be able to work directly with most or all of the groups who commit to APR in 2018-19.

For the 2018-19 academic year and in the future, the number of assessment funding applications tied to Program Review is expected to increase as Program Review teams include more goals related to student learning assessment and CLOs. Since Program Review is meant to eventually supplant department planning and is intended to serve as the primary means for aligning resource allocation with planning efforts, the A-Team will prioritize funding applications from faculty who have identified assessment work as part of their Program Review implementation plans.

c) Move CLO Curriculum Mapping forward

The A-Team Chair and CLO Coordinator worked in conjunction with a project manager in the IT Department to try to move CLO Curriculum Mapping forward this year so we can begin to create heat maps or other visuals indicating where specific CLO dimensions are being directly aligned in courses and programs across the college. To capture CLO mapping, we are working with the project manager to build out the nascent Curriculum Mapping System (CMS). This project was delayed for six months in 2017-18 due to a variety of unforeseen issues, but is on track for 2018-19. This work aligns with Lane’s Core Theme 3: Quality Educational Environment (Objective 3: Lane’s curricula are designed with intention to support discipline-level/program-level, and college-level outcomes).

One-on-one help: For 2017-18, part of this work was offering one-on-one help (provided by CLO coordinator) to faculty who had already done some work with the CLOs in their curriculum to begin creating course-level CLO maps wherein they mapped the outcomes of specific courses to dimensions of the Lane CLOs. The goal is to eventually map a significant number of courses to CLOs, which will allow us to see if/where specific CLO dimensions are being engaged, especially in our General Education courses. This will help us to ensure that we’re providing students with ample opportunities to meet the CLOs before graduation/transfer.

Restoration of funds for CLO mapping: In 2017-18, funding provided to the A-Team was contingent upon removal of project funding for CLO mapping. Due to this contingency, it was much more complex to engage faculty in this work this year than in previous years, especially since mapping work is most meaningfully and effectively done...
in project teams rather than by single faculty members. Curriculum mapping and review of learning outcomes is often a necessary first step in determining an assessment path. The A-Team will restore the CLO Mapping to Project Funding in 2018-19 to try and address this issue.

**CLO mapping guide:** Another thing that the CLO Coordinator began working on this year was creating materials to help support faculty already somewhat familiar with the CLOs (and eventually CLO Coaches) in engaging in CLO mapping when not able to work directly with the CLO Coordinator. An example of such a resource is the Brief Guide to Mapping Course Outcomes to CLOs. The CLO coordinator will continue developing more materials to support this work in the 18/19 academic year, hopefully with the input of members of the A-Team interested in becoming CLO Coaches in the future.

d) **Future of CLO Coordinator Position**

Since the creation of this position much has changed at Lane. While the CLOs were brand new and unknown to most faculty/students when the position was created, this is no longer the case. Many faculty have integrated CLOs into their teaching and assessment practices and an increasing number of students are aware of the CLOs and their importance due to the deeper integration of the outcomes in their learning experiences. Additionally as part of the work done across campus to address the recommendations and warnings of our NWCCU accreditors, the A-Team chair and CLO coordinator have done a significant amount of work over in 2017-18 to more closely align assessment work, Academic Program Review (APR), and institutional effectiveness.

As awareness of and direct engagement with Lane’s CLOs continues to increase and key areas of the college begin to more closely align, the position of CLO Coordinator must be revisited and likely rethought.

**Increase capacity:** What will be needed as the college moves forward will be an increase in capacity/scale to work with individual programs and project teams to support their work. Since the APR process at Lane is deeply individualized for each program, it isn’t really possible to create structures that would enable the CLO coordinator to increase focus on group work with faculty and decrease one-on-one work that is focused specifically on the needs of a single program/group of faculty. This means that it will be, at best, difficult for a single coordinator to support all the CLO-related work that will be moving forward due to the increased alignment with assessment work and APR.

As we scale the work once supported by the CLO coordinator across the college, there will be an increase in workload each year over the next several years as we reach a point where all programs are involved in either the review or implementation stages of APR. Given this reality, we must rethink what the coordination of CLO-focused work will look like in order to ensure the sustainability of the college’s support of this work.

**Develop A-Team coaching model:** As such, the current CLO Coordinator and A-Team Chair have been actively rethinking the position of CLO Coordinator as it was originally framed. It is our goal over the next one to two academic years to eliminate the CLO Coordinator position as it currently exists. Once this is done, we will reallocate the funding used from the Assessment Team budget to cover reassignment time for the
single faculty member who has traditionally held this position to pay a larger number
of A-Team members to work as “CLO Coaches” with APR teams to help them assess their
current integration of CLOs and devise or revise their approaches to integrating CLOs
and their assessment more deeply into each program. This change is part of a
thoughtful, strategic plan to ensure the sustainability of support for faculty engaged in
this work as it is scaled across the entire college.

Before the current CLO Coordinator position can be dissolved, the current CLO
Coordinator will need to work in conjunction with A-Team members to develop a train-
the-trainer model. In stage one of this work the current CLO Coordinator will begin to
train other interested A-Team members in areas that will allow them to confidently step
into roles as CLO Coaches. The second stage of this work (which may take a second
academic year depending on college exigencies in the 2018-19 academic year) will be
for the CLO Coordinator to work with the faculty now trained to be CLO Coaches to
create curricular materials possibly including OERs, a Moodle shell, and online modules
that would allow additional faculty members to be “trained” for the position of CLO Coach
without the need for a CLO Coordinator in place to do this training.

e) Revise A-Team Charter
In 2016-17, the A-Team chair led efforts with the faculty union leadership, Learning
Council Chair, and then-VP of Academic and Student Affairs to revise the charter and try
to link A-Team outcomes and goals more closely to governance and other planning
groups on campus. However, the scope of this new charter (linked here), has proven too
complex and expansive for the A-Team members to carry out given the team’s size and
capacity to take on additional work. In addition, the charter language overlaps with
responsibilities of the Coordinator of Student Learning Assessment and Curriculum
Development, who is also the chair of A-Team, but should have a clear role that goes
beyond the scope of the A-Team’s purview. Thus, given the A-Team’s revised emphasis
on assessment professional development, move to improve alignment with APR, and
goal to move toward an assessment coaching model, the charter should be revised to
reflect this future vision.

2. Recruit new members
The A-Team has struggled to recruit FT faculty members for two academic years. Due to a lack
of FT faculty applicants, the A-Team leads made a decision to allocate additional funds for PT
faculty participants. Instead of one PT faculty member, the team accepted three and will
continue this in 2018-19. These new members were key to the success of A-Team workshops,
and without their eagerness and dedication, outreach would have been minimal due to limited
capacity for planning and creating workshops. The team has begun recruiting for 2018-19,
gaining one new FT faculty. One of the current part-time members recently accepted a full-time
position, so the team will have six FT faculty and two PT faculty, with plans to recruit again in
the fall.

3. Redesign Assessment Website
In 2016-17, the assessment website was redesigned, but it was not redesigned in such a way
as to provide a fully functional assessment toolkit and support for faculty to self-serve. As
Academic Program Review becomes the means for planning and for integrating assessment of
student learning, the website should function as a space where faculty can locate the guidance,
tools, and templates necessary for developing and carrying out program assessment plans. The
A-Teams efforts to better align with Program Review and to establish assessment coaches should be reflected on the website.

III. Assessment FPD/Support

A. Workshops/Tutorials

Over the course of the year, A-Team members offered a variety of workshops/tutorials to faculty. Workshop participants included faculty from multiple departments such as: ABSE, Academic Technology, ALS, Art, Business, Counseling, ESL, First Year Experience, HS Connections, LLC, Math, Social Science, Science. Information about each of these can be found below.

Producing and facilitating these workshops would not have been possible if we had not had PT faculty members who were eager and willing to help develop and lead these sessions. The A-Team paid a total of 42 hours for PT faculty members to help develop workshops. Members’ enthusiasm to continue developing and facilitating workshops and other professional development opportunities is critical to assessment program sustainability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2017-18 Workshop Overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workshop name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningful, Measurable, Manageable Course Learning Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Core Learning Outcomes (CLOs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubric Fundamentals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go Deeper with Rubrics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspired Assignments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Engaging Learning Outcomes Workshop

On Friday, January 19, 2018, the A-Team offered a 2-part workshop on Learning Outcomes.

- **Meaningful, Measurable, Manageable Course Learning Outcomes:** In this session, participants engaged with course learning outcome language, discussed the role of course learning outcomes in developing course curriculum, and had the opportunity to work on revising their course outcomes.
  - **Participants:** 20 overall; 8 PT faculty; 11 FT faculty; 1 manager

- **Introduction to Core Learning Outcomes (CLOs):** In this workshop we answered the following questions through discussion: What are the Lane CLOs, and how can we effectively incorporate them into our courses and programs? Participants discussed the role of Core Learning Outcomes, how Lane's CLOs are structured/intended to be used, and their importance to ensuring students leave Lane prepared for a complex, diverse, and changing world.
  - **Participants:** 19 overall; 8 PT faculty; 10 FT faculty

Rubrics Rock Workshop

On Friday, March 2, 2018, the A-Team offered a two-part workshop focused on developing and using rubrics effectively.

- **Rubric Fundamentals:** In this session, participants engaged with the why, what, and how of rubrics. Why do rubrics matter in the college classroom? What types of rubrics are there? How do you create a rubric that aids in both teaching and learning? How do you connect rubrics and assignments? Through a combination of group discussion, active learning, and mini-lecture, participants had the opportunity to strengthen their rubric-building knowledge and skills.
  - **Participants:** 25 overall; 13 PT faculty; 11 FT faculty; 1 manager
- **Go Deeper with Rubrics**: In this session, participants analyzed what makes a rubric useful and considered what to do when the rubric isn't working. Through guided discussion and examples, participants gained a deeper understanding of rubrics and how to use them to create transparency and coherence in their classrooms.
  - **Participants**: 18 overall; 10 PT faculty; 8 FT faculty
- The slides and notes from this workshop can be found [here](#).

**Inspired Assignments Workshop**

On Friday, May 18, 2018 the A-Team hosted a workshop focused on crafting/revising effective assignments

- This was an intermediate-level workshop focused on refining and strengthening alignment between course outcomes and assignments. Each participant brought an assignment they had created for a course they teach that is aligned with one or more course outcomes for the class. Assignments were discussed in small groups using a "charrette model," which was defined/discussed in the workshop. Participants worked in small groups using a facilitated peer-review and feedback process that is the key component of the charrette model and then engaged in a large-group discussion, based on the small group workshop, about which assignment practices help ensure strong alignment between course outcomes and assignments.
  - **Participants**: 7 overall; 2 PT faculty; 5 FT faculty
- The slides/notes from this workshop can be found [here](#).

**Assessment Discussion Workshop -- to be offered Fall 2018**

A-Team attempted to host an Assessment Discussion Workshop of Friday, June 1, 2018. However (likely because it was so close to the end of the year) only a small number of faculty registered. So we decided to cancel the workshop and offer it again during Fall Inservice 2018, with the hopes that more faculty will be able to attend at that time. The workshop description can be found below.

- Please join us for a guided discussion on student learning assessment. We will consider how our understanding of assessment is shaped by our experiences as both students and teachers, analyze the ways in which we use the articulation of our goals for student learning to shape the forms of assessment we use, and share our ideas on the most effective ways to implement assessment of student learning in our broad array of disciplines and contexts.

**CLO Mapping Tutorials -- to be offered as needed 2018-19**

- While we had hoped to offer some of these tutorials to groups of faculty this year, there were a variety of obstacles that prevented that plan from being effective. So, for the 2017-18 year, these tutorials were provided by the CLO Coordinator to faculty per request. Next year, when our CMS is ready to be used by faculty, the CLO Coordinator will schedule/facilitate group tutorials to prepare faculty to use the CMS.
- The CLO Coordinator created a [Brief Guide to Mapping Course Outcomes to CLOs](#) this year to support these tutorial, and will create additional materials next year to further support this work as we move toward a train-the-trainer model.

**B. Projects**

Each year the A-Team provides Lane faculty teams with an opportunity to apply for funding for Assessment Projects, specifically ones that engage Lane’s CLOs. Each team may apply for funding for one or more projects. These projects are intended to support groups of faculty who teach the same course(s) or teach in the same program/discipline in developing, refining, and implementing high-quality assessment practices that help them gain insight into student learning across their courses/program and revise pedagogical practices based on their findings.
This year we put out an initial RFP in Fall 2017 and, with remaining funds, put out a second RFP just prior to the start of spring 2018. The RFP provides faculty with a list of criteria and considerations for project funding and asks project teams to document the way in which the project(s) they are proposing fit into their larger assessment practices/plans within their program/discipline. The A-Team works together to vet submitted proposals and approve funding to teams based on proposal quality.

**Approved Projects 2017-18 (11)**

**Music for one project**
- Revision of previous CLO mapping work

**Earth and Environmental Science for three projects**
- Development of a Signature Assignment
- Development of CLO Rubric
- Development of Supplemental Materials

**ABSE for one project**
- Development of CLO Rubric

**Communications for one project**
- Artifact Assessment for COM 218

**Art History for one project**
- Artifact Assessment for Art History courses

**Math for one project**
- CLO Rubric Development (program level)

**Chemistry for two projects**
- Development of Signature Assignment
- Development of Supplemental Materials

**Physical Therapy for one project**
- Development of CLO Rubric (PTA 101L)

1. **Projects Completed (10/11)**

   While the A-Team co-chairs do our best to support Project Teams in completing projects for which they’ve received funding, it is not always possible for Project Teams to complete their projects for a variety of reasons, often connected to issues of workload, department understaffing, or lack of support.

   This year Project Teams were able to complete nearly all of the projects approved for funding. The CLO Coordinator speculates that this may be a direct result of increased understanding of and support for assessment work among managers and administration that has resulted from recent feedback and recommendations from our accreditors. This rise in understanding may have allowed some faculty to see an increase in support from their deans to engage in assessment work that may not have previously been present. Also for this academic year there were several newly hired deans in place who possessed a deeper understanding of and willingness to support assessment work than in previous years.

   **Music**
   - Revision of previous CLO curricular materials
Earth and Environmental Science
- Development of a Signature Assignment
- Development of Supplemental Materials

ABSE
- Development of CLO Rubric

Communications
- Artifact Assessment for COM 218

Art History
- Artifact Assessment for Art History courses

Math for one project
- Development of CLO Rubric (program level)

Chemistry
- Development of Signature Assignment
- Development of Supplemental Materials

Physical Therapy
- Development of CLO Rubric (PTA 101L)

2. Faculty participation: This year twenty-five faculty across eight Project Teams participated in Assessment Projects.

3. Observations and trends across Assessment Projects
   - One of the most significant and exciting trends in Assessment Project work this year was an increasing clear alignment between Assessment Projects and either APR or larger program-level assessment goals. One of the struggles with Assessment Projects in the past has been that when projects were done in isolation from larger program-level work or visions they often were either known of/useful in only one small area of a program where faculty on the Project Team taught, or the materials created in the project were not actually used again in the future by any faculty in the program. Increasing alignment
of Assessment Projects with APR and program-level assessment goals means that the work done during the project is more likely to engage a larger number of faculty across the program, be used in the future to help with program assessment, and be sustainable within the program.

- For Project Teams who were building on previous Assessment Projects/Fellowships or APR the process of engaging in and completing their projects seemed to be more smooth, streamlined, and efficient. This suggests that once we have an assessment “pipeline” in place, engaging in assessment work will be more productive and efficient and perhaps require less resources and time to achieve similar goals.
- Assessment Projects (and Fellowships) are beginning to intersect in interesting and useful ways as more Project Teams engage in assessment. There has been an increase in the similarities/parallels between and across Assessment Projects this year.
- Faculty engaged in Assessment Projects are beginning to more often and more clearly articulate how the assessment work they are engaging in is beneficial not only to their program and students but also to helping to acclimate future faculty hires to their programs. Many feel being able to share assessment work with new colleagues will allow them a way to help their new colleagues see the shared values and strategies of faculty within the program as well as provide them with a sense of how students enrolled in classes within the program have performed in the past.
- Having access to funding for Assessment Projects is allowing more programs to partially or fully integrate a range of PT faculty in programmatic conversations about assessment. Faculty feel this is, in turn, improving the consistency and cohesion of teaching across courses/sections.
- Assessment Projects have allowed many Project Teams to have vital conversations about Course Outcomes/Goals for specific courses. These conversations have improved shared understanding of these outcomes (and in some cases revisions of the outcomes) that will likely serve to increase consistency of student experience across various sections of a course and/or across a sequence of courses.
- An increased number of teams used part of their Assessment Project funding this year to support their ability to engage in research processes that supported their own Assessment Projects. This allowed many Project Teams to see their assessment work in a broader perspective that was inclusive of much more than the knowledge and experiences of those on the Project Team.

4. **Observations of CLO Coordinator**

- This year there seemed to be more support from deans for faculty wanting to engage in assessment work, as well as a higher expectation from the college that faculty be willing to participate in meaningful assessment work (which likely had some impact on dean support). While, on the one hand, this seemed to make faculty who are resistant to assessment work more likely to re-entrench in this position, on the other hand this support allowed more Project Teams than ever before to complete their goals/projects and to feel supported by their deans/programs while doing so. This marks the beginning of a significant and necessary shift in the understanding of the role and importance of assessment as faculty work.
- Many Project teams expressed in their Project Reports and/or in their work with the CLO Coordinator a desire and need for the assessment work in their programs to be continued and supported in the future.
- Many of the challenges faced by Project Teams were beyond the scope of their control including issues such as resistant colleagues, lack of time to work on assessment, or
difficulties created by the silos and lack of clear, functional systems at Lane to help streamline expectations and processes.

- Building flexibility into assignments/rubrics seems important to faculty, especially in ensuring buy-in for and sustainability of assessment work within their programs.
- Participation in Assessment Projects seems to have increased interest among faculty on Project Teams about their colleague’s approaches to curriculum development/assessment and to foster new collaborations between faculty—sometimes within the same program and sometimes across programs. This will help to create an important foundation for buy-in and collaborative efforts as we work to increase systematic assessment at Lane.
- PT faculty often express wanting to be more engaged in assessment practices. However their competing teaching duties at other institutions as well as their limited time on campus/interactions with colleagues often negatively impact their ability to participate.
- Many of the Project Teams used their Assessment Projects in part as a place to help them collaborate to figure out what skills/abilities are part of their programmatic expectations and which are more unique to distinct courses. For many teams this helped them to better “map” when/where learning takes place in their program and what skills and abilities they really need to focus on helping students transfer from one context/course to another.
- As more Project Teams engage in assessment, there has been an observable increase in faculty expressing their awareness of (and in many cases comfort with) the need for increased consistency/cohesion across sections of the same course and/or courses within a sequence. Given the long-standing discomfort with and often rejection of the importance of any kind of “consistency,” this marks what will hopefully be the start of a significant shift in faculty openness to conversations about and strategies for increasing consistency and cohesion in students’ learning experiences.
- Identifying differences in approach/instruction to specific courses has allowed many faculty to have deep, rich, meaningful discussions about pedagogy and assessment. These conversations have allowed faculty to better understanding the pedagogical approaches of their colleagues, and in many cases, offered faculty a chance to hear about and try new approaches/styles in their own classrooms.
- Funding Assessment Projects is often vital to creating space within programs who also have to adhere to external, national standards to align their national standards with both their Course Outcomes and Lane’s CLOs

A. Fellowships
Fellowships are for faculty who have previously participated in Assessment Projects or assessment work in their department or division or have identified student learning assessment goals as part of department planning or as a part of Academic Program Review. Fellows commit to leading work that creates a clear pathway to artifact assessment at the division, discipline, department, or program level. Assessment Fellows lead colleagues in creation of assessment tools and development of processes for regularly assessing courses and programs.

Fellows receive guidance and support from A-Team leads and institutional research, including help with goal-setting, timelines, feasibility, identification of direct and indirect evidence, and reporting/analysis of results. Full-time faculty fellows receive the equivalent of a 4-credit course release, while part-time faculty fellows receive 100 hours at rate of pay. As of 2017-18, Fellowships carry an additional 40 hours for each fellow to distribute to team members.
This year, we revised the Fellowship Application to include the specific steps needed to develop the application. View the revised application here. Additionally, we added an online report submission form and report templates for Level 1 and Level 2. The online submission form can be viewed here. Our goal is to structure the reports so that they are useful to the fellows and can be added to a program’s or department’s repository of assessment documentation.

**Level 1 Mapping and Tools Creation:** Under this Fellowship model, faculty generally map course or program outcomes to Lane’s CLOs and create assessment tools (e.g. a rubric) to assess student proficiency with course/program learning outcomes aligned with CLOs. This Fellowship model is intended to prepare a division, discipline, department, or program to apply for the Artifact Scoring Fellow Model the following academic year.

**Level 2 Artifact Scoring:** Under this Fellowship model, faculty assess a set of artifacts using the assessment tools that clearly assess course/program learning outcomes aligned with CLOs or directly assess student proficiency with CLOs. This model requires consultation with an institutional researcher, who helps the faculty fellow to ensure reliability and validity of the Assessment Project.

1. **Awards**

   In 2017-18, the A-Team awarded five Fellowships to faculty in the following departments:

   **Level 1 Awards**
   - **Art History:** Started Winter Term, estimated completion Summer Term. Faculty fellow and team member completed goals as stated and were able to complete multiple rounds of artifact assessment and subsequent rubric revisions. During each round, an institutional researcher provided comparative data and analysis of scoring to help faculty determine inter-rater reliability.
     - Goal 1: Establish program mission statement, goals and principles
     - Goal 2: Update course learning outcomes, course descriptions, and master syllabus.
     - Goal 3: Create shared assignment and assessment tool
     - Goal 4: Apply CLO-based rubric for grading and artifact assessment
   - **ESL:** Started Spring Term, estimated completion Fall 2018. The primary objective of this Fellowship is to collect information about course outcomes, assignments, and instruction in transfer writing courses (primarily those that ESL Level F students will transfer into after completing the ESL program) in order to better prepare students for future coursework and better align courses within the context of the writing sequence. Because this work requires collaboration with faculty in at least two other departments, the fellow was unable to make as much progress as anticipated. However, this Fellowship will extend through Fall Term, with the ultimate goal of revising course tools and assessments. The ESL fellow participated in the Writing fellow’s work, which was helpful in establishing the ESL Fellowship goals.
     - Goal 1: Meet with WR 93, 97, 115, 121, and 122 instructors
     - Goal 2: Observe classes and review course outcomes, syllabuses, and signature assignments
     - Goal 3: Obtain information about how students are doing after leaving program
     - Goal 4: Survey and interview relevant students and faculty
Goal 5: Meet again with ESL faculty and dean to discuss future directions and implications of findings
Goal 6: Collaborate with ESL faculty and dean to make changes to existing documents

Music: Half of Fellowship completed Winter Term, with other half to be completed Fall 2018 Term. The primary goal is to collaboratively design a music capstone assignment and CLO-based assessment rubric.
  - Goal 1: Revise course outcomes for all music courses
  - Goal 2: Develop Capstone Assignment and Grading Rubric for first year, spring term music core courses
  - Goal 3: Introduce Capstone Assignment and Grading Rubric into coursework for first year music core courses in Spring 2019

Writing: Fellowship completed Spring Term, with some goals completed and plans to continue this work as an Assessment Project in the Fall. Initially, the writing fellow aimed to work with faculty in all departments that teach writing (LLC, ABSE, ALS, ESL) to develop checklists to assess student readiness for WR115 and, possibly, WR 121. However, given the number of departments and faculty involved, Fellowship goals needed to be revised to allow time and space for faculty involved to better understand and discuss specific course content and writing sequences. Thus, “the group focused on trying to use CLO language and concepts to create rubrics that could be used across the span of classes leading into and surrounding the WR 115 cusp (PASS Lane, ABSE College Ready, WR 93, WR 97, and ESL Level F)” (from Writing Fellowship final report to the A-Team).

Level 2 Award
- Communications: Started in Spring Term, with final data analysis to be completed collaboratively with institutional researcher in Summer. With more than four years of experience with student learning assessment, and having a well-established process for developing tools and assessing artifacts for high-enrollment courses, the Speech and Communications Studies fellow completed all goals as stated.
  - Goal 1: Administer the signature assignment for COMM 218
  - Goal 2: Assess sample of student artifacts using common rubric
  - Goal 3: Discuss results as a group during Fall In-Service week

2. Observations and trends across Fellowships
- Alignment with APR: Four of the five Fellowships awarded (Art History, Communications, Music, Writing) were connected with the Academic Program Review process, either resulting from goals set during the implementation planning phase (Art History and Music) or completed in conjunction with the self-study phase (Communications and Writing). This trend is expected to continue as the Assessment Team and APROC strengthen collaborative efforts to better integrate student learning assessment and Program Review. The fifth Fellowship (ESL), did not result from an APR process, but the nature of this Fellowship prompted questions about ESL student enrollment and retention that went beyond typical assessment questions, indicating ESL might be ready to undertake APR.
- Collaboration with Institutional Research: Most Fellowships included the need for support from an institutional researcher, whether to help set up data collection and analysis or offer other support such as consultation on scoring tools and survey development. Fellows have found IR support to be a valuable asset.
• **The connection to APR** is beginning to move faculty toward more programmatic and systematic approaches to assessment. Through APR and the self-study phase, some assessment fellows identified a need to look holistically at learning outcomes at the course and program level and consider the types of assessments best suited to helping students achieve these outcomes. For these faculty fellows, revision of outcomes and development of new assessments were inspired by program self-study.

• **Goal setting**: This year, the A-Team leads held orientations during the first week of Winter and Spring term for faculty fellows. The purpose was to help fellows launch their work for the term, by helping them establish goals and a timeline for Fellowship completion. Fellows were asked to create a goal chart, noting the tasks completed on the way to goal attainment. A-Team leads were available as needed, but set two required check-ins for each fellow to ensure they had the support needed to continue making progress on their goals.

• **Need for program assessment planning**: After working with fellows this year and reviewing Fellowship reports, it is clear that more guidance is needed on long-term assessment planning and helping faculty connect assessment planning with Program Review and department planning structures. As the college moves toward improving alignment of planning and resource allocation, assessment plans and long-term assessment goals should be embedded in these processes.

• **Time, support, and funding**: As with project teams, the fellows appreciated having time and funding to do this work, as well as support from A-Team and others. This level of assessment work and leadership would not be possible without A-Team funding, particularly for teams such as Writing that require multiple faculty across departments to accomplish their goals. As one fellow stated: “The assessment system that has been developed ... over the years, has involved a great deal of time from faculty, A-Team members, and various technological resources such as the ATC and IRAP. ... The mapping and tools creation support along with the assessment Fellowship support have been invaluable.”

• **Sustainability**: As IR is called upon to provide more data and analysis support for APR and assessment, there may be an issue with capacity and ability of this department to adequately fulfill data requests. Additionally, capacity for A-Team leads and members to provide the level of coaching and guidance needed for faculty participating in Program Review could be stretched beyond what the team can provide.
IV. Appendices

A. CLO Engagement by Dimensions

Starting in 2016-17, the Assessment Team began tracking Core Learning Outcome (CLO) engagement. In the context of fellowships and projects, "engagement" indicates thoughtful consideration of the CLOs, which are Lane's general education learning outcomes. Engagement with CLOs is not equivalent to curriculum mapping, which is a process of aligning learning outcomes across multiple levels, such as at the course, program, or institutional level.

Percent of CLO Engagement by Fellows and Program Projects from 2016-17 to 2017-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLO</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLO 1: Think Critically</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLO 2: Engage with diverse values</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLO 3: Create ideas and solutions</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLO 4: Communicate effectively</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLO 5: Apply learning</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Percent of Assessment Fellowships and Projects engaged with CLOs
Comparison of 2016-17 and 2017-18 Assessment participants’ engagement across CLO dimensions and integration of CLOs into assessment work

1. Identify and define key issues
2. Determine information need, find and cite relevant information
3. Demonstrate knowledge of the context and complexity of the issue
4. Integrate other relevant points of view of the issue
5. Evaluate supporting information and evidence
6. Construct appropriate and defensible reasoning to draw conclusions

2.1 Recognize and clarify personal values and perspectives
2.2 Evaluate diverse values and perspectives of others
2.3 Describe the impact of diverse values and perspectives on individuals, communities, and the world
2.4 Demonstrate knowledge of democratic values and practices
2.5 Collaborate with others to achieve shared goals
3.1 Experiment with possibilities that move beyond traditional ideas or solutions. Embrace ambiguity and risk mistakes
3.2 Explore or resolve innovative and/or divergent ideas and directions, including contradictory ideas
3.3 Utilize technology to adapt to and create new media
3.4 Invent or hypothesize new variations on a theme, unique solutions or products; transform and revise solution or project to completion
3.5 Persist when faced with difficulties, resistance, or errors; assess failures or mistakes and rework
3.6 Reflect on successes, failures, and obstacles

4.1 Select an effective and appropriate medium (such as face-to-face, written, broadcast, or digital) for conveying the message
4.2 Create and express messages with clear language and nonverbal forms appropriate to the audience and cultural context
4.3 Organize the message to adapt to cultural norms, audience, purpose, and medium
4.4 Support assertions with contextually appropriate and accurate examples, graphics, and quantitative information
4.5 Attend to messages, check for shared meaning, identify sources of misunderstanding, and signal comprehension or non-comprehension
4.6 Demonstrate honesty, openness to alternative views, and respect for others’ freedom to dissent
5.1 Connect theory and practice to develop skills, deepen understanding of fields of study and broaden perspectives
5.2 Apply skills, abilities, theories or methodologies gained in one situation to new situations to solve problems or explore issues
5.3 Use mathematics and quantitative reasoning to solve problems
5.4 Integrate and reflect on experiences and learning from multiple and diverse contexts
2017-18 Program Projects engaged with CLOs

2017-18 Assessment Fellowships mapped to CLOs
B. Faculty Survey and Preliminary Results

In 2017-18, the A-Team leads collaborated with an institutional researcher on a survey of faculty knowledge, beliefs, and perceptions held by individuals across campus around two areas: the assessment of student learning and institutional assessment. We decided to test the survey with a small group that included A-Team members and faculty who were approved for projects or Fellowships. After testing the survey and making changes, we aimed to distribute it more widely to larger groups on campus, such as faculty and classified staff. However, the feasibility of doing this, along with possible issues of survey fatigue among these groups, has meant pausing this work while we determine whether it will be useful in the future.

Aggregated results here only represent 12 participants and represent an initial pilot of the measure and must not be taken out of context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Potential Responses based on a 1 to 10 Range</th>
<th>Weighted Average</th>
<th>Range of Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Extremely Unfamiliar--Extremely Familiar</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>6-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree--Strongly Agree</td>
<td>7.91</td>
<td>6-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Extremely Unconfident--Extremely Confident</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>6-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Extremely Unaware--Extremely Aware</td>
<td>8.36</td>
<td>6-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree--Strongly Agree</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>4-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree--Strongly Agree</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>4-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree--Strongly Agree</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>4-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree--Strongly Agree</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree--Strongly Agree</td>
<td>9.55</td>
<td>8-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree--Strongly Agree</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree--Strongly Agree</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>6-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree--Strongly Agree</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>2-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree--Strongly Agree</td>
<td>9.45</td>
<td>8-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree--Strongly Agree</td>
<td>9.55</td>
<td>9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree--Strongly Agree</td>
<td>9.45</td>
<td>8-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Never--Always</td>
<td>9.10</td>
<td>7-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Never--Always</td>
<td>8.91</td>
<td>7-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree--Strongly Agree</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>7-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Never--Always</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>7-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree--Strongly Agree</td>
<td>9.55</td>
<td>9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree--Strongly Agree</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>7-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Never--Always</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>7-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>My students can see connections between course outcomes and student learning assessments in my classroom.</td>
<td>Never--Always</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I can clearly define institutional assessment.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree--Strongly Agree</td>
<td>7.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I understand the difference between assessment of student learning and institutional assessment.</td>
<td>Definitely False--Definitely True</td>
<td>7.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>My immediate colleagues understand the difference between assessment of student learning and institutional assessment.</td>
<td>Definitely False--Definitely True</td>
<td>6.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>I believe college management (including deans, directors, administrators, and managers) understand the difference between assessment of student learning and institutional assessment.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree--Strongly Agree</td>
<td>6.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>I understand the role of the assessment of student learning in the larger scope of institutional assessment.</td>
<td>Definitely False--Definitely True</td>
<td>8.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>I am aware of some of the research-based institutional assessment practices used in higher education.</td>
<td>Extremely Unaware--Extremely Aware</td>
<td>7.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>I believe that institutional assessment plays an important role in mission fulfillment at the college.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree--Strongly Agree</td>
<td>8.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>My immediate colleagues appear to believe that institutional assessment plays an important role in mission fulfillment at the college.</td>
<td>Definitely False--Definitely True</td>
<td>6.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>I believe that the college administration (including deans, directors, administrators, and managers) and Lane's Board of Education has a clear understanding of institutional assessment.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree--Strongly Agree</td>
<td>6.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>I perceive the college management (including deans, directors, administrators, and managers) and Lane's Board of Education to be actively engaged in meaningful institutional assessment as a way to determine institutional effectiveness.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree--Strongly Agree</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>I feel empowered to participate in institutional assessment at the college.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree--Strongly Agree</td>
<td>7.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>I believe that decision-making processes at the college are clearly and meaningfully linked to institutional assessment practices.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree--Strongly Agree</td>
<td>4.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>I believe that the college is working toward building systems and structures to more effectively measure institutional assessment.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree--Strongly Agree</td>
<td>7.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>I understand the connection between the responsibilities and duties I carry out in my job at Lane and institutional assessment.</td>
<td>Definitely False--Definitely True</td>
<td>7.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>I understand that there is a connection between the college's Mission, Core Values, and Core Themes and institutional assessment.</td>
<td>Definitely False--Definitely True</td>
<td>8.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>I believe that the college leadership has made clear, meaningful connections between methods of institutional assessment and the college's Mission, Core Values and Core Themes.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree--Strongly Agree</td>
<td>5.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Assessment Plan Rubric

In an attempt to more deeply integrate and align assessment work and Department Planning/APR Implementation Processes, the A-Team co-chairs developed a list of guiding questions to help each department create an Assessment Plan as part of the Department Planning work and/or Program Review goals related to assessment. Along with these guiding questions, the co-chairs also developed a rubric that could be used to provide departments feedback on Assessment Plans.

Guiding Questions

- What assessment work are you already doing?
  - Evidence analyzed (direct and indirect)
  - Course/program outcomes reviewed and updated
  - Making learning outcomes clear to students (How do students interact with the learning outcomes?)
  - Discussion and refinement of shared syllabi, assignments, rubrics, etc.
  - Self-reflection pedagogy and classroom practices
  - Annual reports on assessment of student work or accomplishments
  - What do you want to accomplish/work on this year?
- What is your plan for the future assessment work at the program/discipline/division/department level?
- To what degree have you infused CLOs into your assessment practices?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area being assessed</th>
<th>At the EXEMPLARY level:</th>
<th>At the PROFICIENT level:</th>
<th>At the DEVELOPING level:</th>
<th>At the BEGINNING level:</th>
<th>At the THRESHOLD level:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previous Assessment Work</td>
<td>Faculty have actively and collaboratively engaged in a wide range of program-level assessment projects, including assessment of student artifacts. Faculty have actively revised multiple areas of their curriculum based on what the results of their assessment projects have told them about how student learning might be improved in their program.</td>
<td>Faculty have actively and collaboratively engaged in program-level assessment project(s). Faculty may have talked about revising or made revisions to one or more areas of their curriculum based on what the results of their assessment projects have told them about how student learning might be improved in their program.</td>
<td>Faculty have discussed program-level assessment options and are in the planning stages for engaging in one or more assessment project that involves multiple sections of one course and/or multiple courses within the program.</td>
<td>Faculty have begun to formalize their conversations about program-level assessment and are beginning to consider program-level assessment projects.</td>
<td>Faculty have engaged in some informal conversations about program-level assessment; most of the assessment discussion is currently focused on course-level classroom assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Assessment Plans</td>
<td>Faculty have developed and implemented a long-term assessment plan for their program which includes clear benchmarks and a timeline for accomplishing them.</td>
<td>Faculty have worked together to develop a long-term assessment plan for their program which includes clear benchmarks and a timeline for accomplishing</td>
<td>Faculty have begun to discuss what a long-term assessment plan might look like for their program.</td>
<td>Faculty understand what a program-level assessment plan is and understand why they need to create one for their program.</td>
<td>Faculty are beginning to/have already begun to engage in conversations to help them understand the content and purpose of a program-level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of Lane’s Core Learning Outcomes (CLOs) in Assessment Work</td>
<td>Faculty have deeply integrated the CLO dimensions into their courses and programs in ways that allow students to see the CLO dimensions in courses and course materials across the program. Faculty have engaged in one or more program-level assessment projects that allow them to assess at least one CLO dimension in multiple sections of one course and/or in multiple courses within their program.</td>
<td>Faculty have worked collaboratively to integrate CLO dimensions across the program; they have mapped the learning outcomes of a wide variety of courses in the program to the CLO dimensions and have mapped their program-level outcomes to the CLO dimensions. They have created a plan to assess one or more CLO dimensions in multiple sections of one course and/or in multiple courses within their program.</td>
<td>Faculty have begun to systematically and meaningfully integrate the CLO dimensions into their classes and course materials across the program. Faculty have mapped the course outcomes for one or more courses in the program to the CLO dimensions.</td>
<td>Faculty understand the CLOs and the role of the CLO dimensions in assessment. Faculty may have begun to integrate the CLO dimensions into their individual course sections.</td>
<td>Faculty are beginning to/have already begun to engage in conversations to help them understand the significance of the CLOs and their dimensions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>