

Bergen Community College's Framework for Assessment

This document outlines a framework for assessment. It addresses assessment at the institutional, department or program, and course levels, and explains what must be done without being overly prescriptive. The overall goals of assessment are to improve student learning and improve College services. The framework described herein guides the College in meeting accreditation standards.

Assessment activities must be systematic, on-going, and organized. All academic departments as well as specified administrative departments participate in assessment activities. The academic departments focus mainly on the assessment of student learning while the administrative departments focus on the services the College provides to students. The Center for Institutional Effectiveness (CIE) facilitates and supports assessment efforts in both the academic and administrative areas by providing training and guidance for assessment activities.

I. Institutional Assessment

- The College's Strategic Plan delineates its major goals and objectives (sub-goals). The intended outcomes of all assessment plans are required to be related to one or more objectives of the College's Strategic Plan.
- The goals listed in the annual plans of academic and administrative departments are required to be related to some facet of the Strategic Plan.
- Institutional Research develops Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for each major goal of the Strategic Plan and tracks them through the College's Dashboard.
- The Center for Institutional Effectiveness, in conjunction with Institutional Research, reports the results of institutional assessment on a regular basis to senior management.

II. Assessment by Administrative and Educational Support (AES) Departments

- The assessment cycle for AES departments is one academic year, that is, 2011-2012, 2012-2013, etc.
- Intended outcomes are to be related to one or more objectives of the Strategic Plan. Certain units, such as those in Student Services and the Cerullo Learning Assistance Center, may also be able to relate the intended outcome to one or more of the general education proficiencies.
- Proposed assessment plans are reviewed by the immediate supervisor of the AES department and by CIE.
- Completed assessment reports are sent to the immediate supervisor and CIE.
- The Assessment Report Form used by AES departments is effectively the same as that used by academic departments.

III. Assessment by Academic Departments

- It is the responsibility of the Learning Assessment Committee of the Faculty Senate to provide faculty oversight on the processes for assessing student learning outcomes at the course, program, and institutional levels, and to advise on college-wide policy and best practices in learning assessment.
- The assessment of student learning by academic departments will be guided by the "Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan" developed by the Learning Assessment Committee and approved by the Faculty Senate in April 2012. (See Appendix A below)

- The Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Report form developed by the Learning Assessment Committee and approved by the Faculty Senate in April 2012 will be used for all assessment reports beginning Fall 2012. (See Appendix B below)
- The assessment cycle for academic departments will have a length of two years (four semesters). This will allow those departments/programs that need more time to collect meaningful data to do so. It also provides the flexibility for some departments/programs to complete their assessment of student learning in three semesters.
- The academic departments will operate on an asynchronous schedule of assessment cycles. Departments offering career (AAS) programs will have two-year, odd-year cycles, i.e. 2011-2013, 2013-2015, etc. Departments offering transfer programs (AA, AS, and AFA), English Basic Skills, and Developmental Mathematics will have two-year, even-year cycles, i.e. 2012-2014, 2014-2016, etc.
- As intended outcomes of assessment plans must be related to one or more program goals, departments that have not yet developed program goals for each degree they offer will need to do so.
- Assessment of student learning at the program level will, of necessity, involve the overall assessment of learning across appropriate courses.

Appendix A

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan

As part of fulfilling its mission, the Center for Institutional Effectiveness (CIE) will work with faculty to provide support, training and workshops, and guidance for assessment activities.

Four Semester Assessment Sequence

Semester 1: Create the Assessment Plan

- a) Identify one intended outcome that will be assessed.
- b) Identify a program goal to which the intended outcome relates.
- c) Identify one or more General Education Requirements to which the intended outcome relates.
- d) Identify at least one objective (sub-goal) of the current Strategic Plan to which the intended outcome relates.
- e) Identify the means of assessment for the intended outcome. (For example: essays, examinations, quizzes, standardized tests, research projects, artistic performances and products, capstone projects, licensure/certification pass rates, etc. The use of rubrics for grading is recommended.)
- f) Discuss assessment plan with academic department chair and dean.

Semester 2: Develop Assessment Strategy

- a) Develop any required assessment tools, as needed and appropriate. (These may include such items as rubrics, surveys, test questions, etc.) A copy of the assessment tool(s) used should be included in the report.
- b) Develop the desired result.
- c) Develop a plan for data collection.
- d) Identify resource needs and discuss same with academic department chair and dean, as appropriate.
- e) Revise assessment plan, if necessary, based upon available resources.
- f) Assign, as appropriate, responsibilities.
- g) Submit assessment plan to CIE for record keeping.

Semester 3: Implement Assessment Plan and Strategy

- a) Collect assessment data using chosen assessment tools.
- b) Analyze and interpret assessment results.
- c) Complete Section 4 of the Assessment Report (Summary of Results).

Semester 4: Recommendations and Actions Taken (Closing the Loop)*

- a) Discuss assessment results with department and program faculty.
- b) List recommendations for modification. (For example: any changes to courses or programs, changes in instructional methods, changes in evaluation instruments, etc.).
- c) Identify actions taken based on recommendations. This is an opportunity to indicate what was actually done as a result of the recommendations, and prepare for the next assessment cycle, which will assess the impact of these changes or actions.
- d) Make assessment report available to the department.
- e) Submit Assessment Report to CIE for record keeping. (Complete Sections 5 & 6 of the Assessment Report and submit the entire report.)

*A significant part of the cycle occurs in Semester 4 when findings are discussed and departments/disciplines use the findings to make adjustments/changes in curriculum, etc. for implementation in the next assessment cycle, using the same intended outcome. The iteration of the same intended outcome will allow the department to determine if the changes do improve student learning. This is “closing the loop”.

Appendix B

Bergen Community College

ASSESSMENT REPORT FORM FOR ACADEMIC PROGRAM

Assessment Period:

Department/Program:

Department Chair:

Department Assessment Liaison:

Date Submitted:

❖ Program Description or mission/goal statement of the Department/Program:

❖ Program Learning Goals/Outcomes:

SEMESTER 1: CREATING PROGRAM-LEVEL ASSESSMENT PLAN

1. Program Learning Goal(s) or Outcome(s) to be assessed (from the above section):

2. Means of Assessment:

▪ Feedback from Dean:

SEMESTER 2: DEVELOPING ASSESSMENT TOOL (s) and TIMELINE

3A. Describe or attach assessment tool (s), including sources of data, timeline for data collection and how data will be analyzed.

3B. Desired results faculty would like to see.

- Feedback from CIE:

SEMESTER 3: COLLECTING AND ANALYZING DATA

4. Summary of Results (attach aggregated data table, survey tool, etc., to support the summary)

5. Recommendations for Improvement:

- Feedback from Dean:

SEMESTER 4: CLOSING THE LOOP AND SHARING KNOWLEDGE

6. Use of Results:

- **Feedback from CIE:**

Bergen Community College

ASSESSMENT REPORT FORM ADMINISTRATIVE AND EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT

Assessment Period:

AES Department:

Department Head:

Department Assessment Liaison:

Date Submitted:

❖ Mission/goal statement or description of the Department:

❖ Department's Core Objectives/Outcomes:

SEMESTER 1: CREATING A DEPARTMENT-LEVEL ASSESSMENT PLAN

1. Department's Goal(s) or Outcome(s) to be assessed (from the above section):

2. Means of Assessment:

▪ Feedback from Vice President:

SEMESTER 2: DEVELOPING ASSESSMENT TOOL (s) and TIMELINE

3A. Describe or attach assessment tool (s), including sources of data, timeline for data collection and how data will be analyzed.

3B. Desired results department and Vice President would like to see.

- Feedback from CIE:

SEMESTER 3: COLLECTING AND ANALYZING DATA

4. Summary of Results (attach aggregated data table, survey tool, etc., to support the summary)

5. Recommendations for Improvement:

- Feedback from Vice President:

SEMESTER 4: CLOSING THE LOOP AND SHARING KNOWLEDGE

6. Use of Results:

- **Feedback from CIE:**

Formative Rubric for Outcomes Assessment Plan

[To be used primarily by Deans, Vice Presidents and Assessment Fellows]

| CRITERIA | CRITERIA ACHIEVED | SUGGESTIONS/COMMENTS |
|---|-------------------|----------------------|
| Semester 1 | | |
| 1. Does the goal/outcome to be assessed flow logically from the stated program/department description or mission statement? | | |
| 2. Is the goal/outcome clearly written to enable assessment? | | |
| 3. Is the means of assessment appropriate for evaluating the performance of this goal? | | |
| Semester 2 | | |
| 4. Is the plan for assessing and collecting data feasible? | | |
| 5. Does the criterion for success exemplify sufficiently high standards? | | |
| 6. Is there evidence of collective conversation within the program/department? | | |
| Semester 3 | | |
| 7. Was data collected and analyzed according to the assessment plan? | | |
| 8. Is the plan for program improvement consistent with the results of the assessment? | | |
| 9. Is there evidence of collective conversation around the assessment results and recommendations for improvement? | | |
| Semester 4 | | |
| 10. Is there sufficient evidence/documentation of using the results to improve the program? | | |

SUMMATIVE RATING RUBRIC FOR OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT REPORT

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| <i>Incomplete</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did not follow through with the program’s assessment plan • No evidence that assessment data were collected • Submitted an incomplete assessment report |
| <i>Below Satisfactory</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not clear as to what outcome (s) was/were assessed • Assessment method did not link well with the outcome being assessed • Minimal effort was given to assessment • Did not show any evidence of faculty/staff dialogue regarding assessment results |
| <i>Satisfactory</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Showed evidence that the program’s assessment plan was followed through • Assessment method was appropriate for assessing the stated program learning goal/outcome • Showed some evidence of faculty/staff dialogue regarding assessment results |
| <i>Exemplary</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to being <i>SATISFACTORY</i>- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Employed a validated assessment tool or rubric developed by faculty group ○ Focused on assessing program-level outcome ○ Showed strong evidence of faculty/staff dialogue regarding assessment results and application of the results |