



ILLINOIS

May 11th, 2015

To: Ilesanmi Adesida, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Provost
Charles Tucker, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and Innovation
Lauren Goodlad, Provost Fellow for Undergraduate Education

From: Kelly Ritter, Professor of English and Chair, Committee on Student Learning Outcomes

Re: Committee Final Report and Recommendations

In December 2014, our committee was charged by the Office of the Provost to create a set of campus-wide Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) that would be achievable by every student earning a baccalaureate degree from the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign. Committee members were 15 faculty and staff representing all colleges on campus:

Jennifer Amos, Senior Lecturer, Bioengineering
Karen Carney, Associate Dean, Liberal Arts and Sciences
Susan Cole, Associate Professor, School of Social Work
Matthew Ehrlich, Professor, Journalism
Brooke Elliott, Associate Professor, Accountancy
B. Christine Green, Professor, Recreation Sport and Tourism
Jessica Greenberg, Assistant Professor, Anthropology
Jonathan Inda, Chair and Associate Professor, Latina/Latino Studies
Erhan Kudeki, Professor, Electrical and Computer Engineering
Soo-Yeun Lee, Associate Professor, Food Science and Human Nutrition
Julia Makela, Associate Director, Career Center
Rosa Milagros Santos Gilbertz, Professor, Special Education
Gabriel Solis, Professor, School of Music
Kristi Kuntz, Office of the Provost, *ex officio*
Staci Provezis, Office of the Provost, *ex officio*

The SLOs that our committee was charged to create were to:

- a. Reflect the broadly-held sense of our campus commitment to our students and their education which was articulated in the *First-Round Report*'s "Vision of the Illinois Student";
- b. Be defined independently of the courses, experiences, or pedagogies through which they might be achieved;
- c. Be useful for evaluating the effectiveness of pilot programs, guiding the development of curricula and general education requirements, reviewing the performance of academic programs, supporting campus (re)accreditation efforts, and articulating the value of an Illinois education;
- d. Be amenable to assessment, in the sense that individual student achievement can be captured in some meaningful way.

This report outlines our efforts to achieve each of these four necessary characteristics in our final SLOs, and subsequently ensure that they become a key component of conversations regarding undergraduate education taking place in the future within various units, programs, and centers on the Illinois campus. It additionally articulates our response to the charge that the SLOs “think of learning outcomes first and foremost as an expression of the education that a world-class university with a land-grant mission should provide.”

As background information, we were made aware that the process of creating and implementing SLOs on this scale had not taken place to date on our campus, so the work we were doing was ground-breaking by design for Illinois. Further, we understood that we would need to have a full set of working SLOs in place, and be engaged in campus-wide assessment of those SLOs, by the time our institution is up for re-accreditation in 2019. Thus, these SLOs must be designed not only to reflect and represent the values and ideals we already hold in the teaching of all undergraduates on campus (and, more broadly, the mentoring and pre-professional development of those undergraduates outside the classroom proper) but also be readily assessable toward this re-accreditation in the years to come.

In the pages that follow, we outline (1) our process; (2) our main points of consideration when creating the SLOs themselves; (3) our final draft SLOs and recommended framing language for these SLOs (as a means of disseminating to the campus community and explaining them to stakeholders); and (4) our recommended general process for assessing these SLOs once they are in place on campus (with the acknowledgment that our committee has not been charged to design or lead said campus assessment of the SLOs).

1. Process

Our committee met in 90 minute sessions approximately every other week between January 22nd, 2015 and May 11th, 2015 in order to collaborate in creating a set of SLOs that would meet the requirements set forth by the Provost’s office and also present therein a vision of the Illinois student that would stand out amongst other similar SLO constructions already crafted on other university campuses. We talked extensively in committee about how we should strive to represent the values our campus faculty already promote in their teaching and mentoring, and also how to highlight the ways in which some of those values are unique to the Illinois experience. We also discussed the principles of SLO construction: that each SLO should be something that can be measured through a student work product or similar tangible piece of evidence, and further, that a SLO should represent something overall measurable by a student work project or other completed task/activity/initiative (rather than be reflective of a general attitude or point of view internal to the student him/herself).

We began our committee’s discussion of process with some consideration of the stakeholders involved in the eventual dissemination and implementation of the SLOs—with the assumption that the SLOs would be unveiled and/or put into place in Fall 2015. We acknowledged a number of groups that could be partially responsible for seeing that the SLOs were known to and eventually embraced by programs, units, and colleges on campus. We further acknowledged that while in many ways, it would be ideal to have preliminary input from these groups, the logistics of involving a wider group than the committee representatives made such input likely very

difficult. To that end, we agreed to be in regular communication with our own home departments and look in the future to hopefully engaging the following bodies in the larger discussion of implementation of the SLOs: Unit Executive Officers, Associate Deans, the Council of Undergraduate Deans, Teaching Academy members, the Student Affairs Committee, and other campus councils (such as the Humanities Council) and advisory boards. We also agreed that undergraduate students should ideally have some role in leading the campus toward embracing the SLOs, and that students should be encouraged to take ownership of their learning through an understanding of where and how the SLOs might engage with the courses, projects, and experiences they have chosen to engage in during their time at Illinois.

With these different campus stakeholders in mind, we began our work by reviewing in detail both the First-Round Report of the Campus Conversations on Undergraduate Education (hereafter C-CUE) (from March 5th, 2014) and the campus-wide SLOs that are currently in place at the following institutions—some of which are peers, and others of which simply had what we felt were worthwhile models to consider in drafting our own SLOs for the first time. These were the University of Nebraska, University of Wisconsin-Madison, University of Minnesota, University of Michigan, Cornell University, St. Olaf College (MN), Daytona State College (FL), Augustana College (IL), Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis, Brandeis University and DePaul University.

First, in discussing the C-CUE report, we noted a variety of both aspirational and observational elements of teaching and learning articulated by the participants in those multiple conversations, which took place during the 2013-2014 academic year. Among the recommendations from participants that made it into our final SLO document, many came from the “Vision of the Illinois Student” (pages 2-3 of the C-CUE report), including:

- Core competence in a broad matrix of skills and knowledges
- Interdisciplinary learning
- Critical thinking skills
- Ability to lead as well as collaborate and work as a member of a team
- Strong ethical orientation, including respect for difference and appreciation of cultural diversity
- Responsible citizenship at local, state, national, and global scales

We also noted the valuation of three general categories of learning (page 4): civic, practical/professional, and creative/productive, as well as the elements of an Illinois education that contributed to its ability to offer “World-class resources” and a world-class reputation to students, namely Illinois’ “high value on academic excellence and rigor”; its access to high-quality resources for research; and its identity as a “land grant institution with [a] strong civic commitment” (page 7). In addition, C-CUE participants noted Illinois’ emphasis on interdisciplinary learning, creativity and experimentation in learning, and team-oriented learning across courses, programs, and colleges. This is augmented by an additional emphasis on principles of leadership and socially engaged learning experiences that span both campus and off-campus opportunities, including global/international engagement (for example, Study Abroad) and appreciation of an increasingly “diverse, global student body” (page 8). Each of

these emphases, as noted in the C-CUE report, contributes to Illinois' core mission as a "world-class university with a land-grant mission and global impact" (page 9).

In general, we agreed that the SLOs we create should rely significantly on the principles outlined in the C-CUE report, and that in turn, the principles voiced in the report seemed to match the values that we had heard expressed in our home departments and programs and in our intra-departmental and other campus work, including that which encompassed non-classroom learning spaces and other sites of student campus engagement.

Second, regarding the SLOs that we reviewed from other institutions, we noticed a number of emerging commonalities in design. While each campus clearly designed their SLOs to reflect local values and ideals, as we aimed to do with our own document, some themes emerged across SLOs. These included the valuation of diversity/multiple perspectives as well as intercultural and global understanding, an emphasis on communication skills, a desire for students to have demonstrable morals or ethics, a push for civic engagement, a desired aptitude for discovery and creation as well as passion/curiosity, some meaningful engagement with critical thinking and production, a knowledge of human cultures and the physical and natural world, the ability to synthesize and apply various types of knowledge and skills, and overall, a desire for integrative learning experiences across the curriculum. We further were able to taxonomize these various learning goals as roughly fitting into the four broad areas of knowledge/skills, practical and professional competencies, habits of mind, and opportunities for innovation and design.

When reviewing these SLOs from other institutions, we also kept at the forefront our observations of what made these SLOs "local," if anything. For example, at institutions such as DePaul, which follows a Jesuit mission as part of its overriding campus principles, we observed an emphasis on social justice. In contrast, at other large R1 public institutions, we observed a slightly less tailored set of SLOs toward mission; an extreme example of this would be the SLOs from the University of Wisconsin, which essentially follows the model from the AAC&U. In general, we discussed these comparative models in terms of how "original" their goals seemed; how relevant their goals were to our own; and how much their overall framework for the SLOs highlighted their particular campus mission, or the strengths of their particular campus communities. One significant take-away from this comparative study was our decision to have a brief framing statement of 3-4 sentences that would precede our Illinois SLOs, as this seemed to be a common feature on many other campuses and a good opportunity for our committee to introduce and position to readers (students, parents, faculty, staff, and other community members) our Illinois SLOs in the context of our own mission and local conditions. Such language, we felt, would be especially important in venues such as our institutional web site, where many non-campus community members will encounter the SLOs.

As a comparative with these SLOs from other institutions, we also had at our disposal existing SLOs in place within colleges and centers on the Illinois campus, i.e., specific to various undergraduate degree programs and resources. Those included SLOs from Aerospace Engineering, Social Work, the College of Business, and Student Affairs. We were mindful of the fact that while our institution does not yet have campus-wide SLOs for all undergraduate students, there are places on campus where the design and subsequent implementation of SLOs is longstanding; we therefore sought to design SLOs relevant to our charge that neither

countermanded nor duplicated these existing SLOs in various colleges and units. In general, we see our campus-wide SLOs as over-arching in nature, rather than at all specific to any one degree program, unit, or college, and hopefully complementary to those already in place more locally across campus.

2. Main points of consideration in constructing our SLOs

This preliminary study and review process took up the first four to six weeks of our committee work. At the conclusion of this preliminary work, we had decided to construct 4-5 broad SLOs that would serve as umbrella statements for more specific language (what we would come to call in committee our “pull-down” language) about each SLO that would both accentuate the unique experience an Illinois undergraduate can have through achievement of the SLO, as well the variety of means by which a student might achieve this experience across various programs, units, and colleges—and outside traditional learning spaces (i.e., classrooms and course projects).

To get an assessment-based perspective on both the recommendations in the C-CUE report and the SLOs already in place at other institutions across the country, we also reviewed national guidelines for the construction of SLOs (including Bloom’s Taxonomy of Action Verbs and Bloom’s and Anderson’s Taxonomies of Educational Objectives) as well as broad models, such as the general principles for constructing student learning outcomes as articulated by the National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment, which notes that SLOs “clearly state the expected knowledge, skills, attitudes, competencies, and habits of mind that students are expected to acquire at an institution of higher education. Transparent student learning outcomes are specific to institutional level and/or program level; clearly expressed and understandable by multiple audiences; prominently posted at or linked to multiple places across the website; updated regularly to reflect current learning outcomes; and receptive to feedback or comments on the quality and utility of the information provided.” We also had at our disposal the AAC&U Value Rubrics as general models for design and language choice; these rubrics are categorized into the areas of Civic Engagement; Creative Thinking; Critical Thinking; Ethical Reasoning; Global Learning; Information Literacy; Inquiry and Analysis; Integrative Learning; Intercultural Knowledge and Competence; Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning; Oral Communication; Problem Solving; Quantitative Literacy; Reading; Teamwork; and Written Communication. Our committee noted the various category markers of competency (benchmark), mastery (milestones), and measurable achievement (capstone) that characterize these sixteen rubrics as one large-scale model for our own drafting.

Through this secondary brainstorming and study phase of our committee work, we articulated (and regularly re-articulated, to keep our agreed-upon principles at the forefront of our discussion at each meeting) several governing principles for the actual construction of the SLOs themselves, which also took into account principles of future implementation. These were that:

1. **No one program, unit, or college should be held responsible for being able to provide the consistent opportunity for its students—or other students on campus outside that program, unit, or college—to fulfill any particular SLO.** That is, there

would not be, as an example, a “Humanities SLO,” or an “Engineering SLO,” or any readily identifiable pairing of this kind that any one unit, program, or entire college would be expected to provide.

2. **The final SLOs would be conceivably achievable across any number of programs, units, colleges, or experiences, including extra-curricular or non-classroom based learning experiences.** That is, a student should be able to see ways to achieve a particular SLO across any number of experiences during his or her time to degree. Similarly, a faculty member should be able to envision how his or her advisee or student within an academic program might achieve one or more of the SLOs either inside or outside the student’s major program of study.
3. **The SLOs would not prioritize any particular trajectory of learning, such that General Education curricula, major coursework, and other campus learning experiences outside the traditional classroom would hold potentially equal and balanced value in the achievement of the SLOs as a whole.** That is, a student might achieve one SLO in a Gen Ed course, another in a course in his or her major field of study, and yet another through a cross-disciplinary learning experience or a non-classroom based learning experience. We specifically made each SLO broad enough such that there would be room for students to achieve the SLOs as a whole across all four years of study (or total time to degree) and possibly through multiple experiences at once. We felt it was important to articulate this as part of our deliberative process because on some other campuses, SLOs are, for example, General Education specific, or do not specifically call out non-classroom based learning experiences in their construction.
4. **No one program, unit, or college would be responsible for providing opportunities for its students to achieve *all* of the drafted SLOs.** In other words, the SLOs are not a comprehensive, master document for each unit, program, or college to be held responsible for following or implementing as part of their annual metrics. The committee does not expect any one area of campus to be able to provide opportunities for its students (or any students on campus) to achieve *all* of these SLOs—an expectation with which we believe the Provost’s Office agrees. So, for example, while a student *could* theoretically achieve all of the SLOs through work within any of our college’s offerings and overall learning opportunities, we do not expect that he or she will or must do so. On a smaller scale, we do not expect that any one unit in any college would be able to offer opportunities for students to achieve all the SLOs drafted here.
5. **The assessment of these SLOs should not be tied to any particular unit’s course offerings, wider curricular structure(s), or general viability or value to the campus. Rather, to assess these SLOs, the campus will need to construct a means for reviewing students’ overall achievements on campus at the time of degree completion, and will need to recognize the interrelated value of all colleges, units, and programs in comprising a student’s undergraduate experience at Illinois.** This is to say that the SLOs are designed to be competencies that *students should be able to demonstrate*. They are not designed to be tests of program effectiveness or efficiency, or faculty competence. Ideally, the SLOs should bring our campus together in a

conversation fueled by common language about undergraduate student learning, not divide it.

6. **The SLOs do not prioritize the offerings of any program, unit, or college over another, and are not designed to elicit competitive measurements for resources. Additionally, the responsibility for measuring SLO's should not fall on departments, but should instead be a broader campus responsibility.** These are not SLOs which will, in their assessment, assess *faculty or programs*. Instead, they are designed to reflect what we already value as faculty and what we want our students to have achieved by the time they receive an undergraduate degree from Illinois. The assessment will come in the form of how well students are able to achieve these SLOs *as* students.
7. **The SLOs should help our students better understand the rich experiences offered to them through an undergraduate education at the University of Illinois specifically, and through the process of learning at a Research I Land Grant institution generally. The SLOs should be a means by which students (and parents) can understand what undergraduate learning means at Illinois.** In other words, we understood these SLOs to be a highly public set of principles that would guide discussions of undergraduate learning both on campus and off, and would be the primary means by which students would come to understand the value of an Illinois undergraduate degree over other options at other institutions, in consultation with both campus and other community stakeholders in their educational experiences.

3. Our Recommended SLOs and Framing Language

Following this background study, discussion of core principles, and discussion of principles shaping the written construction of the SLOs, the second half of our committee work was spent drafting and refining the SLOs for delivery to the Office of the Provost. To streamline this task, we set about in the following manner:

Initial Drafting—Conceiving of a set of governing SLOs

In late February, each committee member came up with a graphic representation of the SLOs that he or she thought best represented the various principles in play on our campus and their relationship with (or similarity to) those that have been implemented on other campuses, and in national documents noted above. After we realized that visualizing these SLOs in some fashion—as some kind of comprehensive graphic—made it easier to articulate the relationship between the various SLOs proposed, each committee member submitted a visual representation of his or her ideal SLOs for full committee discussion. This resulted in several visual representations of anywhere from four to six SLOs total. Common among these was the desire for an over-arching statement that would bring the SLOs together as a grouping, and more clearly explain the larger principle that threaded them together. That larger principle was agreed to be “Integrative Learning,” which appears as the center of our framing statement, as follows. Further, our visual representations most commonly included five SLO categories of varying

nature; we agreed to settle on this number for our final document, and have included our settled-upon visual representation of the SLOs as the cover of this report.

We then proceeded to hammer out the actual larger outcomes that each of the five areas would ask students to work in during their undergraduate degrees at Illinois. This took almost two full meetings, plus email communication between those meetings, and a good deal of collaborative writing (and revising) in order to finally agree upon the following:

SLO 1: Intellectual Reasoning and Knowledge

Definition: *Illinois students will acquire broad and deep knowledge across academic disciplines and fields.*

SLO 2: Creative Inquiry and Discovery

Definition: *Illinois students will apply knowledge to promote inquiry, discover solutions, and generate new ideas and creative works.*

SLO 3: Effective Leadership and Community Engagement

Definition: *Illinois students will build and sustain productive relationships to respond to civic and social challenges at local, national, and global levels, creating positive change in their communities.*

SLO 4: Social Awareness and Cultural Understanding

Definition: *Illinois students will develop a critical and reflective orientation toward such social and cultural differences as race, indigeneity, gender, class, sexuality, language, and disability.*

SLO 5: Global Consciousness

Definition: *Illinois students will discover how complex, interdependent global systems—natural, environmental, social, cultural, economic, and political— affect and are affected by the local identities and ethical choices of individuals and institutions.*

In particular, we wanted these five SLOs to represent the different, yet equally important, areas within which students would come to craft the experiences that constitute their own Illinois undergraduate education. We were further desirous of a distinction between *acquiring* knowledge (SLO 1) and *creating* knowledge through further inquiry and making (SLO 2), as well as a distinction between cultivating and demonstrating leadership and collaborative capabilities (SLO 3) and using those leadership and collaborative capabilities to effect change in particular systemic arenas both locally and globally (SLO 5) and in light of cultural and social differences that affect the implementation of any kind of acquired or created knowledge (SLO 4). We also felt that there were overlapping values across the five SLOs, which we believe allows them to work well together as a set for students to achieve.

To that end, we formed sub-committees to develop further language that would extend the articulations of each of the above SLOs to the campus community, and beyond. This language would come in two parts. First, we would explain *what* students will be able to do as a result of achieving the larger SLO category. Second, we would explain *how* students might accomplish these SLOs on a local level, through not only coursework or other similar means, but also

through other campus learning experiences (and in some cases, off-campus learning experiences both locally and internationally). The sub-committees submitted draft documents of their assigned SLO, and the full committee further defined and refined these documents in order to create the following full set of SLOs.

As a final step in this constructive process, committee members provided draft language for the framing statement about Integrative Learning. Prior to doing so, the committee brainstormed the principles that should inform this statement, pulling again from principles found in the C-CUE report, the summary language from the SLOs themselves, and our own university mission statement.

The resulting framing language, below, is what we propose as the header for the SLOs that follow on the next five pages:

As a preeminent public land grant university, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign serves society and transforms lives, producing leaders who value excellence, innovation, inclusivity, stewardship, and accountability. Through a uniquely Illinois experience that takes place both inside and outside the classroom, our graduates are broadly educated yet have expertise in specific fields of study. They are intellectually curious, having the ability to think critically and imaginatively. They exhibit a consciousness of global connectedness and interdependencies, possess a critical appreciation of social and cultural communities, and participate knowledgeably and responsibly in civic life. Ultimately, our graduates understand how to employ knowledge in order to generate new ideas, discoveries, and solutions, and are adept in building and sustaining productive relationships in order to create positive change.

SLO 1: Intellectual Reasoning and Knowledge

Definition: *Illinois students will acquire broad and deep knowledge across academic disciplines and fields.*

For example, students will be able to:

- Develop broad intellectual curiosity and explore a wide range of knowledges, including science and mathematics, social sciences, humanities, history, languages, and the arts.
- Acquire a systematic and deep understanding of a disciplinary or interdisciplinary academic field of study, with its particular methods, styles of thinking, and modes of expression.
- Develop proficiency to think critically and imaginatively, including scientific and qualitative reasoning, problem solving and decision-making, effective communication and collaboration, aesthetic and social reasoning, and information, media, and technological literacy.
- Recognize connections between an area of specialized knowledge and other fields and be capable of integrating knowledge.

Students can develop these abilities through experiences such as:

- Completing an academic major, minor, or concentration.
- Completing general education courses in the humanities, social sciences, math and natural sciences, fine and applied arts.
- Participating in a Grand Challenge track.
- Attending lectures, engaging in workshops, or participating in dialogues offered by groups including but not limited to the Illinois Program for Research in the Humanities (IPRH), the LGBT Resource Center, the Unit for Criticism, the Center for Advanced Study, or The Career Center, among others.

SLO 2: Creative Inquiry and Discovery

Definition: *Illinois students will apply knowledge to promote inquiry, discover solutions, and generate new ideas and creative works*

For example, students will be able to:

- Organize and synthesize evidence and knowledge from a variety of sources in order to reveal insightful patterns toward a novel inquiry.
- Respond critically to artistic, humanistic, and scientific works.
- Use quantitative, qualitative, and scientific methods to investigate the natural world.
- Generate new ideas and hypotheses that lead to the design, performance, and/or exhibition of original and creative intellectual works.

Students can develop these abilities through experiences such as:

- Completing a capstone experience/distinction project/senior or honors thesis.
- Completing an internship or field placement.
- Conducting independent undergraduate research under the guidance of a research advisor(s).
- Utilizing the resources found within the University Library, such as the Scholarly Commons or the Writers Workshop.
- Presenting at the Undergraduate Research Symposium or a professional conference.
- Working for an organization or office that requires creativity or problem-solving, including but not limited to University Housing, the Illinois Student Senate, the Illini Media Company, the Illinois Business Consulting Program, or the Technology Entrepreneur Center.
- Participating in a dance or music performance, theatre production, or artistic exhibition.
- Creating a design, media production, or illustrative application using resources such as the Champaign-Urbana Community Fab Lab, the Media Commons, or the CITES Digital Media Services and DIY Media, among others.
- Applying for an entrepreneurial grant or research grant.

SLO 3: Effective Leadership and Community Engagement

Definition: *Illinois students will build and sustain productive relationships to respond to civic and social challenges at local, national, and global levels, creating positive change in their communities.*

For example, students will be able to:

- Understand the responsibilities and challenges of participation in a democratic society.
- Communicate clearly and effectively to a wide range of audiences.
- Integrate a variety of perspectives into problem solving and decision making.
- Explain how inclusivity and active listening can inform community action.
- Facilitate effective teamwork.

Students can develop these abilities through experiences such as:

- Completing I-programs at the Illinois Leadership Center.
- Pursuing volunteer opportunities in the community through the Office of Volunteer Programs.
- Participating in student government or other governing bodies on campus.
- Holding a leadership position in a Registered Student Organization.
- Engaging in experiential education such as student teaching, internships, or service learning projects.
- Working for campus media or other media outlets.
- Participating in education outreach to local P-12 students.
- Participating in organized team sports on or off campus.
- Taking a course in leadership development or theory.
- Participating in collaborative projects in classroom settings.
- Participating in Alternative Spring Break or other programs that have a community development focus, including but not limited to Habitat for Humanity, Engineers Without Borders, or ACES Without Borders.

SLO 4: Social Awareness and Cultural Understanding

Definition: *Illinois students will develop a critical and reflective orientation toward such social and cultural differences as race, indigeneity, gender, class, sexuality, language, and disability*

For example, students will be able to:

- Exhibit knowledge of the histories, experiences, and contributions of different social and cultural groups.
- Reflect on their own cultural positionality, show an openness to multiple perspectives, and engage thoughtfully and respectfully with others.
- Demonstrate an understanding of power and privilege—of the ways that categories of difference have been socially constructed and used to rationalize inequality and marginalization.
- Practice informed, responsible, and ethical citizenry within a racially, culturally, linguistically, and socially heterogeneous society.

Students can develop these abilities through experiences such as:

- Taking classes that focus on cultural understanding, including but not limited to American Indian Studies, Latina/Latino Studies, Gender and Women’s Studies, Special Education, or Speech and Hearing Science.
- Attending events sponsored by cultural centers or resource centers, including but not limited to the Asian American Cultural Center, the LGBT Resource Center, the Bruce Nesbitt African American Cultural Center, the Division for Rehabilitation and Education Services (DRES), or the Chez Family Foundation Center for Wounded Veterans in Higher Education.
- Residing in a living-learning community, for example, Intersections.
- Volunteering via the Office of Volunteer Programs in community events and activities.
- Participating in an I-Connect Diversity and Inclusion Workshop or completing a Lens Diversity certificate program.
- Completing a Diversity and Social Justice Dialogue Course, or a Peer Facilitator Training Course, through the Office of Inclusion and Intercultural Relations.

SLO 5: Global Consciousness

Definition: *Illinois students will discover how complex, interdependent global systems—natural, environmental, social, cultural, economic, and political—affect and are affected by the local identities and ethical choices of individuals and institutions*

For example, students will be able to:

- Understand the historical and contemporary roles, interconnections, and differential effects of human organizations and actions on global systems within the human and the natural worlds.
- Distinguish between perspectives on ethical and ecological power relations across the globe and within individual societies.
- Identify current and future global challenges using interdisciplinary perspectives, either independently or collaboratively.
- Evaluate the global impact of one's own and others' specific local actions and decisions on the natural and human world.
- Exhibit awareness of global inequity and justice through analysis of an issue, problem, or debate.

Students can develop these abilities through experiences such as:

- Participating in student organizations concerned with global consciousness and awareness, including but not limited to the Student Sustainability Committee, Sigma Iota Rho (the Honor Society for International Studies), and the International Student and Scholar Services Volunteer Group.
- Attend lectures, symposia, seminars, or performances offered by groups including but not limited to the Institute for Sustainability, Energy, and Environment (ISEE), the Prairie Research Institute, The Krannert Center for the Performing Arts, The Lehman Institute for Brazilian Studies, the Title VI Centers, or The Cline Center for Democracy.
- Take courses in the humanities, social sciences, science and mathematics, or fine arts that focus on globalization, sustainability, global consciousness, environmental awareness, or language acquisition.
- Complete an internationally-focused internship or participate in a teaching-learning experience abroad such as Volunteers for Peace or World Teach.
- Participate in study abroad for academic coursework, advanced language study, or research experience.
- Complete a major or minor program of study offered by the School of Earth, Society, and Environment or LAS Global Studies, or complete a certificate in International Development Studies or Global Business Culture.

4. Our recommended general process for assessing these SLOs

We understand that our final charge is to recommend a process by which these SLOs can be assessed, once in place on our campus. We further understand, however, that our campus has had no such SLOs in place previously, and therefore a campus-wide implementation of the SLOs may be very much a process, first, of inculcation *to* Student Learning Outcomes as a concept, at least as applicable to *all* undergraduates on our campus.

Therefore, we recommend the following general process—which involves, significantly, an open dialogue with stakeholders about what SLOs mean to the Illinois campus, and how they can be useful to our students, faculty, and programs. We feel this dialogue will be critical for maximum buy-in from these stakeholders, who will include students (as currently enrolled students help to inform and guide new cohorts of admitted students through their campus learning experiences). To that end, in addition to the general suggestions below for faculty and staff, we also encourage the Provost’s office to measure in some way (perhaps through random sampling) students’ current perceptions of the principles in these SLOs, as this could inform future assessment plans.

A. Pilot Programs

In using the SLOs to address pilot programs, we recognize that the above SLOs written by the committee attempt to address the self-identified values and combined learning goals for the university community. Since these outcomes were vetted across multiple units, they represent the broad aims of an Illinois education. Pilot programs which hope to attract and expose students to enhance student learning should accomplish several, if not all, of these outcomes. Further, by defining example activities for reaching each outcome, we provide a benchmark of the existing programs helping Illinois students achieve these goals, so pilot programs should further enhance reaching these goals with minimal overlap.

B. Workshops/Education on Learning Outcomes

Beyond pilot program assessment, for the campus-wide community we propose that CITL conduct a series of workshops on learning outcomes and how to align existing assessment processes or create new assessment processes with the new outcomes. We also propose that either the faculty retreat or a separate retreat be held on assessment practices taking place on campus. Leadership for this retreat should be selected from faculty and staff already familiar with the use and value of SLOs—whether within individual units or across multiple programs within a college—and participants should represent as many areas of campus as possible, including those outside academic (i.e., degree or certificate-granting) units who are responsible for teaching and mentoring students outside traditional classroom learning spaces. In addition, the formation of a separate standing committee on Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes would be useful as an advisory group to the Provost (distinct from the organically grown working group on assessment already in place, co-chaired by CITL).

C. Unit Plans/Engagement with EOs

To follow up on these workshops and the proposed retreat, we recommend that the Provost’s office work closely with campus Executive Officers (perhaps in several small-group sessions) to devise plans that address which of the SLOs their respective units feel the most closely aligned with, in terms of curricular and extra-curricular delivery, and help these EOs to articulate

strategies for maximizing resources in their units to promote these SLOs as part of their role in an Illinois undergraduate education. One such place to begin these conversations might be the existing Provost Leadership Seminar series for new and continuing EOs. To be clear, these conversations should not, in our estimation, be about vying for competitive resources; rather, they should be about following up on larger conversations about the SLOs themselves taking place in the workshops and retreat(s), and should be an opportunity to highlight unit strengths to students who will be seeking to fulfill these five SLOs in some fashion prior to graduation. Units might, for example, compare the SLOs to their own goals for degree programs and see where overlap and further articulation might occur, and work with representatives from the Provost’s office in highlighting and/or incorporating some of this articulation in their mission statements or five-year plans.

D. Modeling

Finally, we suggest that the Provost’s office represent early and often, clear and public examples of how individual units, programs, and colleges can help students to fulfill these SLOs. We additionally suggest that units might make up representative models of their own, where appropriate, as a means for thinking through their relationship with the SLOs. We offer here one graphic representation of how this might be done, using two sample major fields of study (and General Education pathways) as aligned with SLO completion:

SLO 1: Intellectual Reasoning and Knowledge <i>Definition: Illinois students will acquire broad and deep knowledge across academic disciplines and fields.</i>	Example 1 Major: Economics Minor: Leadership	Example 2 Major: Dance Grand Challenge Track
SLO 2: Creative Inquiry and Discovery <i>Definition: Illinois students will apply knowledge to promote inquiry, discover solutions, and generate new ideas and creative works</i>	Internship RA position for dorm	Public performance Student senate
SLO 3: Effective Leadership and Community Engagement <i>Definition: Illinois students will build and sustain productive relationships to respond to civic and social challenges at local, national, and global levels, creating positive change in their communities.</i>	Minor: Leadership Volunteer activities at local K-12 schools	Grand Challenge Track Student Senate
SLO 4: Social Awareness and Cultural Understanding <i>Definition: Illinois students will develop a critical and reflective orientation toward such social and cultural differences as race, Indigeneity, gender, class, sexuality, language, and disability</i>	RA position at dorm Leadership Minor	Grand Challenge track
SLO 5: Global Consciousness <i>Definition: Illinois students will discover how complex, interdependent global systems—natural, environmental, social, cultural, economic, and political—affect and are affected by the local identities and ethical choices of individuals and institutions</i>	Language courses Global project in courses for major	Grand Challenge Track Kranert events in cultural dances