

# Monitoring Report

to the  
Middle States Commission on Higher Education  
from  
**Bergen Community College**



**Dr. B. Kaye Walter**

Chief Executive Officer at submission date of monitoring report

**Dr. Jose Adames**

Chief Executive Officer during preparation of monitoring report

**Joann Marzocco**

Accreditation Liaison Officer



[www.bergen.edu](http://www.bergen.edu)

Monitoring Report to the  
Middle States Commission on Higher Education  
From  
Bergen Community College  
Paramus, NJ 07652

Dr. B. Kaye Walter  
Chief Executive Officer at submission date of monitoring report

Dr. Jose Adames  
Chief Executive Officer during preparation of monitoring report

Joann Marzocco  
Accreditation Liaison Officer

September 1, 2012

Subject of the Follow-Up Report:

At its session on November 17, 2011, the Middle States Commission on Higher Education acted:

“To accept the Periodic Report and to warn the institution that its accreditation may be in jeopardy because of insufficient evidence that the institution is currently in compliance with Standard 7 (Institutional Assessment) and Standard 14 (Assessment of Student Learning). To note that the institution remains accredited while on warning. To request a monitoring report, due September 1, 2012, providing evidence that the institution has achieved and can sustain compliance with Standard 7 and 14, including but not limited to (1) evidence of a comprehensive, organized, and sustained process for the assessment of institutional effectiveness with evidence that assessment information is used in planning and allocating resources (Standard 7); and (2) evidence of systematic and sustained assessment of student learning outcomes at the course and program levels, including general education (Standard 14). To direct a prompt Commission liaison guidance visit to discuss the Commission’s expectations for reporting. A small team visit will follow submission of the report. To note that the date of the next evaluation will be established when accreditation is reaffirmed.”

Date the PRR Was Submitted:

June 1, 2011

## Table of Contents

Preface.....	i
Introduction .....	1
Institutional Context .....	1
Progress to Date and Current Status .....	3
Part 1 - Response to Standard 7 - Institutional Assessment.....	4
PRR Reviewers' Report Recommendation #1.....	4
PRR Reviewers' Report Recommendation #2.....	7
Standard 7 Examples.....	8
Part 2 - Response to Standard 14 - Assessment of Student Learning.....	16
PRR Reviewers' Report Recommendation #6 & #3 .....	16
PRR Reviewers' Report Recommendation #5.....	18
PRR Reviewers' Report Recommendation #4.....	21
Standard 14 Examples at the Course Level.....	21
Standard 14 Examples at the Program Level .....	25
Assessment of Bergen Programs by External Agencies .....	27
Conclusion.....	29
Acknowledgements.....	30
Appendices.....	32

## Preface

After receiving the November 17, 2011 Middle States Commission on Higher Education's letter placing Bergen Community College on Warning, the College marshaled the entire community to participate in producing a thorough, transparent, and inclusive report. After the December 2011 visit by Bergen's staff liaison to Middle States, the College began to gather the evidence that showed Bergen was in compliance with Standards 7 and 14. Over thirty meetings were held between the Interim Coordinator for Assessment and Strategic Planning, the Dean of each School, the Academic Department Chair, and the assessment liaison of each department in which the parties reviewed all assessment reports since 2005. Short narratives were then written describing specific examples of the assessment of student learning. A similar approach was taken with the various Administrative and Educational Support (AES) units. The narratives for the AES departments demonstrated the use of assessment to affect planning, allocation of resources, and improve student services. A first draft of the report was compiled and sent to the Board of Trustees and the College community. Feedback on the draft was gathered through open forums and emails sent to the Interim Coordinator for Assessment and Strategic Planning. Appropriate revisions were made. The report was endorsed by the Faculty Senate in May 2012, and approved by the Board of Trustees in July 2012. The involvement and contributions of so many have given the faculty, staff, and administration a feeling of ownership regarding this report.

As the pages to follow will demonstrate, Bergen Community College does have a comprehensive, organized, and sustained process for assessment in Academic and Administrative and Educational Support areas. That process is faculty driven, and in both areas, the results of assessment have been used to effect positive change across the College.

## **Introduction**

Bergen Community College was established by the County Board of Chosen Freeholders in 1965. The first classes were offered in September 1968, on the 167-acre campus in Paramus to an initial enrollment of 1,454 students. Today the College offers a wide variety of high quality degree programs, as well as numerous certificate programs. As of Spring 2012, there were 50 transfer programs, 43 career programs, and 61 certificate-based programs. With a current enrollment of over 16,400 credit-seeking students, Bergen strives to be a college of choice, and to support its stated Mission: "Bergen Community College educates a diverse student population in a supportive and challenging academic environment that fosters civility and respect. The College offers a comprehensive set of accessible, affordable, high-quality credit and non-credit courses as well as degree and non-degree programs. Bergen provides life-long learning opportunities for all members of the community. The College responds to community needs through work force training and continuing education, and by developing programs for employers." (See Appendix 1 for BCC Vision and Mission)

For most of Bergen's history, the majority of classes have been held in the College's megastructure, more recently named the Pitkin Education Center. Within the last decade, however, Bergen has undergone considerable growth in facilities. Successive phases of construction in Paramus have added the Technology Education Building (2002); West Hall (2007), which houses Bergen's Educational Broadcast Center, Media Technologies, and Arts and Communications instructional facilities; and a science annex (2009), containing expanded and updated science laboratory facilities. Renovation and expansion of the Student Center was completed in September 2011.

Bergen Community College also operates several off-campus facilities. The Ciarco Learning Center, located in Hackensack, opened in 1970. It offers college-level courses as well as a GED attainment program and courses in English as a Second Language. A second off-campus site opened in 2008 in Lyndhurst. Known as Bergen Community College at the Meadowlands, this facility offers a wide range of college-level courses, Developmental Math, English Basis Skills classes, and workforce development courses. Two additional locations where credit and non-credit courses are offered are Mahwah and Fort Lee. Overall, Bergen Community College serves more than 32,000 students annually in degree and continuing education programs.

## **Institutional Context**

Since the submission of the Periodic Review Report in June 2011, significant changes have taken place at Bergen Community College. In July 2011, President G. Jeremiah Ryan left the institution by mutual agreement with the Board of Trustees. On July 19, 2011, the Board appointed Dr. Jose Adames, then the Academic Vice President, as Interim President and expressed "full confidence in the leadership of Dr. Adames," and their intention to "work with

him and his team to fulfill the mission of the institution." (See Appendix 2) In an effort to restore confidence and stability to the College faculty, staff, and student body, Dr. Adames took immediate action. His letter of July 20 to the College Community, delineated the core values that would guide his presidency (See Appendix 3), and, in the week following his appointment, Dr. Adames conducted a "question and answer meeting" open to the entire College Community. These two actions not only reflected the President's calm and steady leadership, but helped to restore employee morale and refocus the College's attention on better serving its students.

In September 2011, the Board of Trustees officially approved a series of organizational changes recommended by Dr. Adames. Both structural and functional in nature, these changes encompassed and would positively affect all areas of college activity, including admissions, planning, assessment, and community outreach. (See Appendix 4 for organization chart)

Student Services experienced the greatest degree of reorganization and institutional renewal. An Admissions Office was created and merged with the Recruitment Office. The Office of Dean of Enrollment Management was established to oversee the merged departments along with the departments of Athletics, Veterans, and the International Student Center. The position of Chief of Student Services was created to oversee all of the above activities as well as the Office of Specialized Services and Student Life and Judicial Affairs.

When the former Vice President of Research, Planning, Assessment, and Quality returned to the classroom, the responsibilities of that office were reassigned. To provide for more concentrated focus on quality, this responsibility was moved to Human Resources and combined with Process Improvement. The Chief Human Resources Officer, Quality and Process Improvement now supervises initiatives meant to enhance both the quality of work, in addition to the procedures and processes of the college. These initiatives will address quality and process improvements in both the administrative and academic areas of the College. Research, planning, and assessment activities have been placed under the direction of the Coordinator for Assessment and Strategic Planning, a newly-created position, allowing greater attention to be paid to assessment procedures. The assessment effort has now been refocused on the basics of assessment and assuring that the assessment of student learning is a faculty-driven process (See page 4 regarding the Learning Assessment Committee of the Faculty Senate). Dr. Adames called upon the senior faculty member who led Bergen's original assessment initiative between 2005 and 2008 as the then Faculty Coordinator for the Center for Institutional Effectiveness to serve as the Interim Coordinator for Assessment and Strategic Planning. He made this decision because during 2005-2008, the assessment process at Bergen made important strides, new Mission and Vision statements were developed, and the College gained reaccreditation from Middle States.

Since September 2011, the Office of the Academic Vice President has provided resources to the Judith K. Winn School of Honors. The School now occupies a suite of offices and has seen the number of Honors courses increase from nine, with a total student enrollment

of 129, in Fall 2005 to twenty-one, with a total student enrollment of 295, in Spring 2012. The responsibilities of the Executive Assistant to the President have been expanded and now include collaboration with the BCC Foundation on outreach to business, political, and community leaders; in addition to the existing responsibilities of advisement to the President, engagement with Community Advisory Boards, involvement with Civic Engagement activities, and development of community outreach programs. Well-experienced and long-time faculty members thoroughly familiar with the College have been appointed as interims to these positions. In addition, the position of Chief of Administrative Services has been created, with the College's Senior Financial Officer appointed as its interim leader.

In the twelve months since Dr. Adames began serving as Interim President of Bergen Community College, his administration has successfully refocused the institution on its core mission of teaching and learning. A positive working relationship has been established not only with the Faculty Senate, the four bargaining unions, the BCC Foundation, and the student government leadership but extends to the leaders and administrators (the County Executives, the Freeholders and other political and community stakeholders) of the county which Bergen Community College serves. Most recently, Bergen has learned that it is one of only 120 two-year institutions nationwide, and one of only three from New Jersey, selected by the Aspen Institute (<http://www.aspeninstitute.org/policy-work/aspen-prize/2013eligibleinstitutions>) as having demonstrated strong outcomes in three areas of student success:

- student success in persistence, completion, and transfer
- consistent improvement in outcomes over time, and
- equity in outcomes for students of all racial/ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds.

During Spring 2012, a search was conducted for a new president. That search reached a successful conclusion on August 7, 2012 when the Board of Trustees appointed Dr. B. Kaye Walter President of Bergen Community College effective August 13, 2012.

### **Progress to Date and Current Status**

Bergen Community College, in consultation with its staff liaison to Middle States, has structured the Progress to Date and Current Status section as follows: Part 1 - Response to Standard 7 and its associated recommendations (#1 and #2) from the PRR Reviewers' Report first and then Part 2 - Response to Standard 14 and its associated recommendations (#6, 3, 5 and 4) from the PRR Reviewers' Report. This will allow the College to describe the steps that have been taken to address the Reviewers' recommendations, and to address Middle States' concern regarding lack of sufficient evidence of compliance with Standards 7 and 14 by providing a variety of examples from 2005 to the present, with accompanying appendices as appropriate, that demonstrate compliance.

## Part 1 - Response to Standard 7 - Institutional Assessment

**On November 17, 2011, the Commission requested a monitoring report providing evidence of a comprehensive, organized, and sustained process for the assessment of institutional effectiveness with evidence that assessment information is used in planning and allocating resources.**

### **From the PRR Reviewers' Report, Recommendation #1**

Recommend more evidence of systematic and sustained programs reflecting institutional use of assessment to effect change as clearly stipulated in Standards 7 and 14.

Assessment activities at Bergen Community College began in 2005, have been continuous, and have always included both the academic and the Administrative and Educational Support (AES) areas. The academic areas focus mainly on the assessment of student learning; the AES areas, on the assessment of College services. The Center for Institutional Effectiveness (CIE or The Center) was established in 2005 and has facilitated, supported, and guided assessment activities since its inception. CIE and its liaison structure remain a positive and constant force that drives the College-wide process of assessment, especially that of student learning.

- **The Learning Assessment Committee (LAC) of the Faculty Senate** was established in May 2011. The committee “provides faculty guidance and oversight on the processes for assessing student learning outcomes at the course, program, and institutional levels, and considers and advises on college-wide policy and best practices in learning assessment.” Prior to the existence of the LAC, the responsibility for establishing assessment processes was assumed by CIE. Now the LAC provides guidance for those processes while CIE focuses on facilitating and supporting the actual implementation of assessment by both academic and AES areas. The establishment of the LAC has been a major step in assuring that assessment of student learning is a faculty-driven process. Members are elected by their departments. (A list of members by department will be available during the team visit.) The chair is the Interim Coordinator for Assessment and Strategic Planning, who also oversees the activities of CIE. The committee began its work in September 2011. Input was obtained from the faculty through a survey that committee members distributed to their departments. (See Appendix 5) The LAC’s recommendations for changes to the Assessment Report Form and the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan were presented to and approved by the Faculty Senate in April 2012 and by the Board of Trustees in July 2012. (See Appendix 6 for details of the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan) The revised Assessment



Report Form will now require assessment goals (intended outcomes) to be related to program goals in addition to the current requirement of being related to the College's Strategic Plan and to general education proficiencies. Curriculum mapping of program goals has already been completed for 40 degree, certificate, and developmental programs. (See Appendix 7 for a list of these programs.) To emphasize the very important step of "closing the loop," the last section of the assessment report has been made more definitive by requiring "Actions taken based on recommendations" to be listed. Follow-up actions can be added to the report at any point. (The revised Assessment Report Form is included in Appendix 6.)

- **The LAC is also a vehicle for evaluating the assessment process.** As a standing committee of the Faculty Senate, it meets three to four times each semester and, as stated above, has faculty elected members. Each year this committee will be receiving feedback from the faculty, including academic assessment liaisons, on how the assessment process can be improved. Bergen now has a mechanism in place for continuous quality improvement regarding assessment.
- **Academic departments**, each of which has an assessment liaison (granted released time or a stipend), operate cyclically under continuous two-year assessment cycles. Only the first assessment cycle at BCC was a one year cycle and occurred in 2005-2006. Since Fall 2006, academic assessment has occurred over two-year cycles. A reorganization of the academic area in 2008 increased the number of departments from eleven to thirty-three. After the 2008-2010 assessment cycle, in order to better manage this increase, the academic departments were divided into two groups in 2010 and put on asynchronous two-year cycles. Those departments on the even year, two-year cycle (transfer programs, Developmental Math, and English Basic Skills) started their most recent assessment cycle in Fall 2010. The Center's personnel worked with the assessment liaisons of these departments to ensure assessment reports were completed and submitted by Spring 2012. The departments that offer AAS (career) degrees began their first odd year, two-year cycle in Fall 2011. CIE provided guidance and support to the assessment liaisons as they worked with their departments to develop assessment plans in Fall 2011. The plans are in the implementation phase during 2012. (See Appendix 8 for a chart of Academic Assessment Reports)
- **The CIE Fellows program**, instituted in 2008, has continued with one academic and one AES Fellow. These Fellows (granted released time or a stipend), and the Interim Coordinator for Assessment and Strategic Planning have worked with academic assessment liaisons and AES leaders on all phases of the assessment process. CIE Fellows attended the CIE assessment workshops during the 2011-2012 academic year. Additionally, The Center has sponsored their attendance at the September

2011 MSCHE conference “Becoming an Assessment Facilitator”. (See page 16 for a discussion of workshops and conferences.)

- **AES departments** now operate cyclically under continuous one-year assessment cycles. Designated AES units developed their most recent assessment plans in Fall 2011. Implementation of the plans occurred in Spring 2012 and was followed by analysis and recommendations for improvements. Final assessment reports were submitted in June and July 2012. (These reports will be made available in the document room.) CIE has encouraged collaboration on assessment goals between AES departments and between academic and AES departments. During the 2011-2012 cycle, several departments within Student Services worked together; Financial Aid, which reports directly to the President, worked on assessment with the Admissions and Registration department of Student Services; the Library is continuing to work with the Composition/Literature department; and the Childhood Development Center (an AES area) is collaborating with the Education Department. CIE personnel have provided guidance and support throughout the process.
- **The College determined to use a Word document for assessment reports** instead of Tk20 (which cost totally since its inception \$57,000), a move supported by liaisons, department chairs, and deans. A Word document, very similar to that used during 2005–2010, was used during the 2011-2012 academic year. Beginning Fall 2012, the College will use the revised Assessment Report Form referred to above. A sub-committee of the LAC has undertaken the task of investigating various software programs for possible use in assessment reporting. Whatever decision is made will be one that reflects the preference of the faculty, making this consistent with assessment being a faculty-driven and owned process.
- **Assessment is publicized and featured at Bergen.** From the launching of the original initiative through today, the importance of assessment to the College has continued to be emphasized. CIE has presented at faculty conferences; most recently, assessment updates were given in Fall 2011 and Spring 2012; department leaders have provided time at department meetings for assessment activities and for updates by assessment liaisons; workshops, open to faculty and staff, are given throughout each academic year. All these activities keep assessment in the forefront. In support of this effort, the Faculty Development Committee’s magazine “Faculty Focus” included articles on CIE and assessment in its November 2011 and January 2012 issues. (See Appendix 9 for these articles) The CIE Newsletter has been revived with an issue published in May 2012. (See Appendix 10) The plan is to publish the newsletter at least once each semester.
- **The College’s Board of Trustees** was proactive in initiating assessment at BCC and has remained a strong supporter of the process. The Board is kept up to date on

assessment and strategic planning through monthly reports to its Strategic Planning Committee. These reports are provided by the Interim Coordinator for Assessment and Strategic Planning. Periodically, reports are presented to the entire Board at one of its scheduled meetings. Most recently, this occurred in February 2012. (See Appendix 11 for the BOT presentation)

The above documentation demonstrates that the College's assessment process is organized, systematic, ongoing, and has a structure in place to allow for continued evolution and improvement.

**From the PRR Reviewers' Report, Recommendation #2**

Recommend a review of the goals and objectives within the Strategic Plan as they relate to the mission and vision of the college as well as redefining measurable strategies reflecting outcomes for institutional change and renewal.

During Spring 2011 the College reviewed the goals and objectives within the original 2010-2013 Strategic Plan. The goals were reworded to better reflect phrasing used in assessment outcomes and to better align with the Mission and Vision of BCC. Some of the objectives were too narrow in scope because they required action from only one department or area. A college-level strategic plan requires objectives that are institutional in scope. For that reason, objectives were developed that multiple departments or areas throughout the College could address. It is worth noting that the results of the 2008 Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) figured prominently in the development of the original strategic plan.

- **The resulting objectives of the 2011-2013 Bergen Strategic Plan, which was approved by the Board of Trustees in June 2011, can be found in Appendix 12.** Revised goals and objectives were developed for the 2011-2012 academic year, but the timeline has been extended through June 2013, so that the College has more time to analyze how well they are being supported.
- **The intended outcomes of all assessment plans, from both Academic and Administrative and Educational Support (AES) areas, must be related to one or more aspects of the College's Strategic Plan.** The link between assessment plans and the goals and objectives of the Strategic Plan is reviewed by the Center for Institutional Effectiveness as the plans are developed to ensure appropriate alignment between intended outcomes and Strategic Plan goals and objectives.
- Distinct from assessment plans, **all academic departments and designated AES departments submit yearly annual plans, wherein goals of annual plans must also relate to aspects of the Strategic Plan.** Annually, CIE will produce and share with the

Board of Trustees and other stakeholders, a report that shows how well each goal and objective of the College's Strategic Plan was supported by both assessment plans and departmental annual plans. (This report will be available in the document room.)

- **The College has used Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) to help assess the various components of the Strategic Plan.** These KPIs were developed by the Center for Institutional Effectiveness for the objectives of the original 2010-2013 Strategic Plan and became part of the College's dashboard. CCSSE results from 2010 were used to help evaluate objectives in the 2010-2011 dashboard. When the Strategic Plan was revised, the KPIs were also revised and adopted by the Cabinet in Spring 2012. (See Appendix 13 for revised KPIs.) The KPIs, along with the above-mentioned report, will demonstrate how well the goals and objectives of the Strategic Plan are being met.

The College's Strategic Plan has been reviewed and modified as described above. There are KPIs, assessment plans, and departmental annual plans in place to evaluate to what degree the goals and objectives are being supported.

#### **Standard 7 Examples**

The examples below, from 2005 to the present, demonstrate how institutional assessment has affected resource allocation (facilities, faculty/staff, technology, and fiscal) and planning, and contributed to the improvement of services, thus indicating compliance with Standard 7.

**Dental Hygiene** – When the Commission on Dental Accreditation conducted a site visit of the Dental Hygiene Program in Fall 2005, the site team observed that, as a result of increased program enrollment, students in the radiology class and students in the clinic were competing to use the three X-ray units in the clinic. They recommended that additional X-ray units be available for use in a lab setting, separate from the Dental Hygiene Clinic. Perkins Grant monies were used to purchase new dental X-ray equipment, capable of both traditional imaging and digital technology, for both the new lab and the clinic. This new equipment, however, could not be accommodated in the space designated for the radiology lab.

Because of the importance of the Dental Hygiene Program to Bergen and the assessed need for additional space, the College administration committed the funding required (\$152,000) for the architect/engineer and construction of a new and larger radiology lab. The project was designed and constructed in 2006-2007, and resulted in a state of the art dental X-ray facility consisting of four dental X-ray rooms with adjoining instructional space. Now it is possible for X-ray instruction to take place at the same time students from the Dental Hygiene Clinic are taking X-rays as part of patient care. The College responded in a timely and

comprehensive fashion to the recommendation of the site team, thereby maintaining full accreditation status for the Dental Hygiene Program.

**Human Resources (HR)** - An intended outcome of the 2006-2008 assessment report for Human Resources was to determine how well new employees were being acclimated to the College. The objective was to introduce new employees to the College, provide accurate information on mission, values, policies, and procedures, and welcome new campus members into the College culture. The first Day One Orientation session was held in September 2007. Subsequent sessions occurred in January and April 2008. Evaluation forms were given to all participants at the end of each session for immediate feedback. The PACE (Personal Assessment of the College Environment) survey was used to assess employees' points of view about their working environment. The results were used to improve the Day One Orientation Program and to create a new-hire package containing pertinent information which is continually updated. The comments in evaluations from subsequent sessions stated how well-structured, professional, informative, and welcoming the Day One Orientation was. While the original orientation was just for new staff employees, Human Resources now includes new full-time tenure track faculty in this process.

An important outgrowth of the 2006-2008 theme of acclimating employees to the College was carried into the 2011-2012 assessment plan for Human Resources; this plan focused on adjunct faculty. A survey of adjunct faculty was conducted in Fall 2011. Based on the results of the survey, programs that address adjunct needs are being instituted. In January 2012 an Adjunct Recognition event was held. There is now a designated adjunct lounge which is equipped with desks, phones, and computers (\$30,000). A full time individual has been assigned to work with Adjunct Administration with assistance from HR. The first two issues of a newly-launched Adjunct Newsletter have been published and Professional Development sessions focusing on topics such as Using Technology in the Classroom have begun. (See Appendix 14a for both assessment reports.)

**Health Services (HS)** - The intended outcome of the 2005-2006 assessment report was that "The new facility for Health Services will be fully operational with all services available by January 3, 2006." While this goal was achieved, data was collected for the first two months of 2006 and compared with the same time period in 2005. Overall, there was a 50% increase in the patient population (977 versus 650), and the emergence of a different type of patient, one exhibiting social or personal issues. A request was made to hire an additional Registered Nurse who would be capable of handling cases involving every day and life threatening situations, and who also had skills related to personal issues. While monies were not immediately available to accomplish this, a budget line for a second full-time registered nurse was created and the nurse was hired in 2010.

As a follow-up, the 2006-2008 assessment report addressed the increase in students with multiple needs (social, personal, medical) through partnerships with Counseling and the

Office of Specialized Services. As an outgrowth of the assessment, two licensed full-time personal counselors were assigned to work out of Health Services in September 2009. Students were seeking counseling in increasing numbers for issues including anxiety, stress, relationship concerns, anger management, depression and suicidal ideation. It was recommended by the administration that the Health Services suite was a more appropriate and confidential setting for the personal counselors than their former location, which was on the opposite side of the building. This consolidation facilitates student/counselor dialogue and offers a private driveway access for ambulances in the event of mental health emergencies. Additionally, the College's Wellness Center, which focuses on a holistic approach to individual well-being, was also brought under the same departmental "umbrella" and the department's name was changed to The Center for Health, Wellness, and Personal Counseling in 2009. This reorganization makes possible the collaboration between the three areas and better serves the student body by providing a one-stop service facility that addresses the needs of the whole student. (See Appendix 14b for both assessment reports.)

**Student Services Reorganization** - In July 2011, data showed that enrollment for the Fall 2011 semester was down by 27% compared with enrollment for the Fall 2010 semester at a corresponding date in July 2010. Contributing factors were the non-existence of a college admissions office and the fragmentation of Student Services as a whole. The registration process was often burdensome and frustrating. New and returning students could only register on-line and would sometimes wait two weeks to see a counselor. To offset such difficulties, and to ensure a smooth enrollment and registration experience, Student Services was reorganized. An Admissions Office was created and merged with the Recruitment Office. To further enhance services for all students, a "one-stop" enrollment process was initiated for all admissions and registration-related issues. Prior to applying to the college, students can now meet with an admissions representative, either by appointment or on a walk-in basis, to discuss program selection and college offerings. A staff member placed in the center of the "one-stop" location is cross-trained in both areas and is thus able to answer general questions relating to both processes. All counseling and advisement services, including those involved in the US Department of Education Title V Grant initiatives, 1-2-3 Connect (\$3.2 million) and the STEM Grant (\$3.8 million), have been integrated into the newly-created Center for Student Success, which is conveniently located for both "one-stop" new students and for continuing students. All students can now meet with their counselors and/or advisors by either making an appointment or on a walk-in basis. The enrollment figures for Spring 2012 were encouraging; they exceeded the total enrollment for Spring 2011 by 332 students. Student Services will formally assess these changes during the 2012-2013 assessment cycle.

**BCC Foundation** - Assessment by the BCC Foundation has affected planning and allocation of human, fiscal, and technological resources. For the 2010-2011 assessment cycle, one intended

outcome was to work with a consulting firm to assess the Foundation's potential for success in a capital campaign. A feasibility study was conducted in Fall 2010 using interviews and an e-survey. The consultants also performed an internal assessment of the Foundation. Job functions and skill sets of the Foundation's staff were reviewed and revisions were recommended. As a result, all job descriptions were revamped with implementation taking effect in 2011-2012. Skill sets were realigned with more robust job functions in order to take on a capital campaign while running a more successful annual fund and special events schedule. A new prospect management/research position was created. An employee was reassigned from another department of the College to the Foundation in September 2011 to fill this need. Additionally, the Foundation's part-time accountant was moved from the Pitkin Education Center to the BCC Foundation building in Fall 2011, and during that time her daily job functions were expanded. This is now a full-time position.

Simultaneously, software needs were reviewed and various software options were investigated in order to become "campaign ready." An in-depth review of various software packages was undertaken in Spring 2011. The online software upgrade (Sage 50 Fundraising coupled with Sage Solutions) was ordered in June 2011 (\$9,000). Implementation and database training occurred in Fall 2011. The Foundation also invested in upgrades for the Sage 50 system as well as on-site staff training on the system and its latest upgrades. Prospect research software was ordered in February 2012. The most recent assessment report (2011-2012) for the BCC Foundation assessed the efficacy of these software changes. The Foundation's intended outcome was to increase the number of first-time donors and the dollar amount of first-time donations. The results showed that the first-time donors increased by 32% and the dollar amount of first-time donations by 47%. (See Appendix 14c for both assessment reports.)

**Continuing Education** - During the 2005-2006 assessment cycle, Continuing Education assessed its Corporate Training program. While the results were indeterminate, the data collected formed the basis of a plan for the growth and development in this area of Continuing Education. Changes in the leadership of Continuing Education delayed the development of a plan. However, by Fall 2011 funds were budgeted to increase human resources. A Business Development Manager was hired to liaison with businesses in Bergen County and to recruit them for corporate training. Additional personnel were assigned to the project to facilitate its implementation. This increase in personnel has allowed the "Bagels and Business" program, which brings in local business leaders on a monthly basis to discuss emerging issues and topics in business, to begin in earnest. (<http://www.bergen.edu/pages1/pages/8033.aspx>) To close the loop, the program was assessed this year (2011-2012) with the intended outcome being to increase attendance at the sessions over the course of the semester, that is, to grow the program. A "Bagels and Business" program was offered each month of the Spring 2012

semester, and has seen an increase in attendance from 61 at the January 2012 meeting to 90 at the May 2012 meeting. (See Appendix 14d for both assessment reports.)

**Enrollment Services** - In 2005, Enrollment Services recognized the need to provide better support services for applicants and improve record keeping. These became the intended outcomes of Enrollment Services' 2005-2006 assessment report. To provide prospective students with the ability to apply on-line, Liquid Matrix application software was tested. In conjunction with this effort, a comprehensive and interactive information website was launched with the help of the Office of Public Relations and the Office of Information Technology. During the testing phase, adjustments were made to improve data flow and eliminate discrepancies. Based on a request from Enrollment Services the College budgeted funds to purchase and implement the Liquid Matrix software (\$196,000). BCC applicants are now able to apply on-line for all degree and certificate programs as well as for non-degree seeking status, thus allowing for a unified application. The on-line processing of applications has changed and streamlined the processing of admissions applications, thereby reducing the time needed for general applicants to receive admission decisions. During 2006/2007, Liquid Matrix was interfaced with a new interactive Admissions webpage which allowed applicants to gather information based on their academic interests.

Record keeping had been done solely using paper documents, which could easily be misplaced or lost. As part of the 2005-2006 assessment report, document imaging systems were investigated. Again, based on the request from Enrollment Services the College budgeted funds to purchase a document imaging system, AppExtender, in 2006 (\$213,000). In conjunction with this purchase a new position, Document Manager, was created under the Information Technology Department. All offices within the Division of Student Services now use the system. More than half of the student documents have been scanned, and as new documents are received they are scanned daily. In June 2012 the Admissions Office began scanning high school transcripts. This new process will assist the Financial Aid Office in upholding new regulations, and allow Institutional Research and the Admissions Office to query Colleague regarding incoming students. Once documents are scanned, other areas that may need them easily retrieve them. An example of this is in the Office of Testing Services. With the scanning of transcripts, SAT, TOEFL, and other test scores, Testing Services no longer has to share paper documents with Enrollment Services, thereby eliminating the possibility of loss and misplacement. Student waivers now are more rapidly processed into the Datatel student information system, with beneficial results for students who receive quicker notification as to whether or not they require placement testing in order to register for their courses. (See Appendix 14e for the assessment report.)

**Criminal Justice (CRJ)** - As part of the 2006-2008 assessment report for Criminal Justice, a survey was developed by faculty and Institutional Research and sent to the Bergen County



Chiefs of Police to determine whether graduates of the Criminal Justice program had been successfully prepared for employment in the criminal justice field. One of the questions asked was, "How important is it that Homeland Security issues be included in the curriculum?" The overwhelming response (65 out of 70) rated it very important or somewhat important. These results identified an area where changes could be made to the then current program. The faculty began work on this project which culminated in the development of a Certificate of Achievement (COA) in Homeland Security. The Faculty Senate approved the COA in Spring 2009. Based on the passage of this program and the need for a faculty member to lead the program, the College budgeted the funds necessary for a full-time tenure track line for this specialty and a new faculty member was hired. This individual has been working on expanding the COA to a full AAS degree. In conjunction with the development of the COA, the Criminal Justice faculty successfully applied for Perkins Grant monies to purchase computers, software specific to criminal justice, and furniture. There is now a dedicated classroom where core courses for criminal justice can be held, as the use of the specialized software is integral to all CRJ courses. Analysis of the answers to the question, "Are there any ways we can improve the program?" led the CRJ faculty to develop and implement non-credit courses that address some of the suggestions. An application was made to BCC's Center for the Study of Intercultural Understanding (CSIU) for monies to accomplish this goal. A stipend was awarded to develop and deliver the program. A non-credit course in ethics and cultural diversity was developed in Fall 2009; in Spring 2010 officers from several police departments came to Bergen for the first delivery of the course. This concept has grown over the last several years such that an office at the Bergen County Law and Public Safety Institute in Mahwah, N.J. has been established for a full time faculty member of the CRJ department to administrate all BCC credit and non-credit courses offered in Mahwah. (See Appendix 14f for the assessment report.)

**Cerullo Learning Assistance Center (CLAC)**—The 2005-2006 assessment report for the Tutoring Center, one component of the CLAC, has continued to have a positive impact on the College and its students. The intended outcome, to increase the percent of remedial mathematics students attending the Tutoring Center by 5%, was achieved and led to a number of changes that affected resource allocation in the form of personnel and facilities. Recognizing that a continued increase in attendance for remedial mathematics would place additional demands on the Tutoring Center, other facets of remedial mathematics tutoring were examined. Funds were budgeted to hire a full time mathematics technical supervisor to address the increasing demands of mathematics tutorials. This supervisor's responsibilities included supervision of mathematics tutoring and providing mathematics retesting for BCC students. In 2009, when the retesting component was moved to the Office of Testing Services, the technical supervisor was able to devote all his time to being a mathematics technical supervisor within the Tutoring Center. The College continues to fund this position through the CLAC budget. In consideration of the increased demand for Math Walk-In tutorials, the facility was expanded and relocated in

Fall 2008. It was originally located in a classroom with 14 seats with no computers. As a result of the lack of space and greater demand, the Math Walk-In Center was relocated to a room where 40 seats were made available. The College budgeted the monies necessary to: 1) expand the facilities to include 20 computer stations with mathematics software, in addition to walk-in tutorial support, 2) assign more tutors to the Math Walk-In Center to aid walk-in requests for quick mathematics assistance, 3) hire more remedial mathematics tutors to meet the demands of this growing population. Normally only one mathematics faculty liaison had been assigned to the Tutoring Center, but increasing student demand resulted in an additional faculty liaison being approved for the area in Fall 2010. Currently, there are two Developmental Mathematics faculty members assigned to the Tutoring Center and two College Level faculty members were added in Spring 2011. (See Appendix 14g for the assessment report.)

**1-2-3 Connect** - The two intended outcomes of the 2006-2008 assessment report for English Basic Skills (EBS) were for students completing EBS to be successful in Composition I and in a General Education Course. One of the recommendations offered by the EBS faculty was to encourage students to use BCC's support services as they moved through their general education and writing courses. During this same time frame, faculty from Developmental Mathematics were researching best practices in developmental math. Using data from the EBS assessment report, data provided by the Hanover Group, CCSSE data, and the work of the math faculty, a project outline was written in 2009. EBS faculty, Developmental Mathematics faculty, and the Dean of the School of English became part of the proposal development team for 1-2-3 Connect, a project that was awarded \$3.2 million funding under the US Department of Education Title V category. This five-year grant focuses on enhancing student engagement and retention during students' first three semesters at Bergen. The College is currently in the second year of the grant. Several ways in which the grant has affected allocation of facilities, faculty, and staff are:

- The creation of a Math Hub with 48 computers for guided, self-paced, mastery instruction, and a separate Math Hub Annex with 24 computers that is open from 9:00am to 7:00pm for students to drop in and get help or to take proctored exams (\$78,000).
- A dedicated room for peer mentoring and academic advising of 1-2-3 Connect students.
- Reallocation of faculty to teach accelerated EBS classes and paired EBS/General Education classes.
- Specialized tutorial services for developmental students that include training and supervision of peer and professional tutors.

The grant has specific, built in evaluation requirements that will be used to assess this initiative. (See Appendix 14h for a list of these required evaluations.)

**Center for Instructional Research and Development (CIRD) - Korean Student Study** - In Fall 2008, data was collected that compared the pass rate of Korean and non-Korean students in the American Language Program (ALP). The data showed that Koreans had a lower pass rate than their non-Korean counterparts in two levels (Foundations and Level 3) of Writing and Speech. Two faculty members, one from Psychology and one from ALP Speech, applied for and received a College funded CIRD grant to study the data and devise appropriate solutions to address the disparity. This was an important project because there are over 700 native Korean students attending Bergen. Its implementation affected allocation of human and fiscal resources.

- An Intercultural Conversation Partner Program began in Spring 2011. ALP Speech, the Communications Department, and the Cerullo Learning Assistance Center collaborate to match ALP students with native speakers for conversation practice. Korean students now participate in English conversations with native English speakers to improve their listening and speaking skills.
- A bilingual Korean-English ALP faculty member was placed in the English Language Resource Center (ELRC) as the ALP Speech liaison. For the Spring 2012 semester, this professor received released time to conduct workshops for Korean students and to advise ELRC tutors on strategies for helping Korean students in the areas of pronunciation and class participation.
- A focus group was held in October 2010 and a survey of Korean students was conducted in Spring 2011. The students' request that more services be provided in Korean resulted in the recommendation that a bilingual student aide be hired as an advisor in the International Student Center.
- A roundtable discussion of ALP teachers was held in March 2011 to learn what the ALP instructors' experiences and challenges are in teaching Korean students. As a result of this discussion, workshops for faculty that focused on the differences between American and Korean classroom culture, and differences between the Korean and English languages were held. (For more details, see Appendix 15.)

Follow-up data will be collected in Fall 2012 to determine the effect of these activities on the pass rate of Korean students in the American Language Program.

**Additional examples that support Bergen's compliance with Standard 7 can be found in Appendix 16.**

## Part 2 - Response to Standard 14 - Assessment of Student Learning

**On November 17, 2011, the Commission requested a monitoring report providing evidence of systematic and sustained assessment of student learning outcomes at the course and program levels, including general education.**

An explanation of the systematic and sustained nature of assessment of student learning outcomes was included with the discussion of institutional assessment on pages 4 through 7 under Standard 7, Recommendation #1.

### **From the PRR Reviewers' Report:**

**Recommendation #6** – Recommend staff development, possibly in commissioning an outside consultant, to work with faculty and staff to develop measurable objectives. (Standards 7, 10, and 14)

**Recommendation #3** - Recommend the continuation of ongoing faculty development especially in the area of institutional assessment and student learning. (Standard 10)

Since its inception in 2005, the Center for Institutional Effectiveness has recognized the importance of and placed great emphasis on comprehensive education and training of faculty and staff regarding assessment, and specifically the assessment of student learning. The role of the Faculty Development Committee at Bergen has been to provide special orientation for non-tenured faculty members as well as programs designed to help improve the teaching skills of the faculty. The Committee and CIE have begun collaborating to engage faculty in assessment.

- **Workshops are coordinated to support specific tasks being done at specific times during the assessment cycle.** While some workshops are designed for assessment liaisons, most are open to all faculty and staff. Academic Department Chairs (some of whom are also assessment liaisons), Deans, and AES unit leaders are invited to attend these workshops. All participants are encouraged to share their knowledge with colleagues at department meetings. PowerPoint is used for the presentations and PDF version handouts are provided for attendees. As much as possible, hands-on experiences using real examples from various departments are the center of the workshops. Titles from this academic year have included **“Writing Learning Outcomes,” “Means of Assessment,” “Closing the loop,” “Documentation,”** and **“Using Surveys for Assessment.”** A total of 14 assessment related workshops have been offered during

2011-2012. (See Appendix 17 for a list of all assessment workshops since 2005.) To better serve the staff and faculty, Spring 2012 workshops were offered at two different times. In preparation for Fall 2012 assessment activities, the CIE fall workshop schedule has already been developed (See Appendix 18).

- **Beginning in September 2011, CIE has partnered with Faculty Development to present a special workshop designed to orient new faculty to assessment at BCC.** This partnership has continued into Spring 2012 with the result that all assessment-related workshops were co-sponsored by Faculty Development and CIE, allowing a broader audience to be reached. The collaboration between Faculty Development and CIE will continue into future semesters. All workshop presentations for the 2011-2012 academic year are available on the CIE website in both Power Point Show and PDF versions.
- **During Fall 2011 the Interim Coordinator for Assessment and Strategic Planning met with small groups of AES leaders** to discuss how to write outcome statements for AES departments and how to choose the types of measurement needed to assess the intended outcome. CIE personnel held numerous follow-up meetings with individual assessment liaisons and AES leaders to review the phrasing of intended outcomes and the appropriateness of the means of assessment.
- **To supplement the in-house assessment training, CIE sponsored attendance at external workshops.** Four faculty members and three staff members attended the Middle States' "Becoming an Assessment Facilitator" conferences, experiences they shared with colleagues. An administrative and CIE team attended the MSCHE Annual Conference in December 2011. Additionally, in February 2012, the Chair of BCC's General Education Committee, accompanied by a faculty member on that committee, attended the American Association of Colleges and Universities conference on "General Education and Assessment" in New Orleans.

The College, through CIE, has supported and will continue to support the assessment process through the training of faculty and staff via in-house workshops and external conferences.

Faculty Development is currently refining its multi-prong approach to continual development. There are lunchtime chats, the Partners in Learning program, workshops, and a program specifically for non-tenured faculty. (See Appendix 19 for a schedule of these activities.)

- **Lunchtime chats** offer faculty the opportunity to discuss ways to better their classroom teaching and are the most popular of the Faculty Development offerings. By creating a dialog in a pressure free environment, faculty members have a format for informal

presentations to their peers. This has also provided for cross-discipline sharing of ideas. Some meetings include student participation, and provide a valuable tool for informal feedback from students.

- **Faculty Development offers two to three workshops per semester on Faculty Development Tuesdays.** These sessions are a venue for not only classroom teaching topics but instruction regarding Student Services, and personal development. Workshops allow for in-depth explanations of the how and why of various administrative processes. Additionally, Faculty Development is a cosponsor with CIE of assessment workshops throughout the academic year.
- **Partners in Learning is a small program that pairs faculty members from different disciplines.** One activity involved is visiting each other's classes to observe teaching techniques. This opportunity to discuss and reflect on one's own teaching with a supportive partner is invaluable to the participants.
- **A special Faculty Development program has been designed for non-tenured faculty.** First year faculty receive 28 hours of required orientation. These orientations are in place of faculty advising hours. The fall semester of the program focuses on getting acclimated to the College; during the spring semester, the focus is on successful teaching and career mapping. This program is completing its third year and continues to evolve. Programs for second through fifth year faculty members focus on reappointment papers and career mapping although not to the degree of the first year faculty. The Faculty Development Committee is working to increase offerings to this group in the future.

In summary, training of faculty and staff in assessment activities has been ongoing since the inception of CIE in 2005. Both in-house and external workshops provide guidance, with reference materials available on the CIE website. Faculty Development is now collaborating with CIE in this endeavor in addition to sponsoring its other programs.

**From the PRR Reviewers' Report, Recommendation #5**

Recommend general education proficiencies be imbedded in all credit programs and that they be assessed regularly to ensure the improvement of student learning. (Standard 12)

In October 2008, the New Jersey Presidents' Council, which represents most New Jersey colleges and universities, approved a revised set of general education proficiencies for the various degree and certificate programs in New Jersey community colleges. A Faculty Senate

Ad Hoc Committee on Curricular Restructuring was appointed and charged with developing templates for the various Bergen Community College curriculums, so that there would be compliance with State requirements.

- **The templates for the AAS degrees at Bergen contain 20-22 general education credits, including English Composition I and II, and a choice of general education humanities, social sciences, science, and math courses.** (See Appendix 20 for AAS templates.) On page 9 of the Periodic Reviewers' Report it states, "The readers would like to emphasize that general education requirements are not merely for transfer programs but should also be imbedded within career programs," which may have been the motivation for the concern expressed in Recommendation #5. The AAS templates show that general education requirements are imbedded in career programs.
- **While the assessment of AAS programs may involve capstone projects, exams, artistic performances, and other means of assessment; general education requirements are also considered.** Indeed, all academic assessment plans, be they for transfer, developmental, or career programs, must relate the intended outcome (goal) to one or more of the general education requirements. This alignment of intended outcomes to, originally, core competencies and now to general education requirements has been part of the assessment report since the start of assessment activities at Bergen. As a specific example, a rubric used in the assessment of the AAS Accounting Program revealed that the weakest performance was on the component of the rubric that dealt with grammar. The accounting faculty have added a required course to the program that is writing intensive and provides students with instruction and practice in business writing. (See Appendix 23, Accounting Program example.)
- **As mentioned on page five of this report, curriculum mapping has been completed for 40 programs.** This mapping relates the student learning objectives in course syllabi to the program's goals, and to the general education requirements. Through the assessment of transfer, career, and developmental programs, Bergen is regularly assessing general education requirements. To show the extent to which this has occurred for the most recent set of assessment plans, see the first two columns of Chart 1 on page 20. Prior to 2010, intended outcomes of assessment plans were related to the College's Core Competencies, which are similar to the General Education Proficiencies. Refer to columns three and four of Chart 1 on page 20.

**Chart 1 – Assessment of General Education Requirements and Core Competencies by AAS**

Programs			
1	2	3	4
General Education Proficiency	Number of intended outcomes from the 22 AAS assessment reports for 2011-2013 addressing the Gen. Ed. requirement	Core Competency	Number of intended outcomes from the AAS assessment reports for 2005/6, 2006/8, and 2008/10 addressing the Core Competency
Written & Oral Communication	13	Communication	22
Mathematics	7	Quantitative Reasoning	13
Scientific Knowledge & Reasoning	3	Critical Thinking	45
Technological Competency	13	Civic Responsibility	9
Society & Human Behavior	2	Technological & Information Fluency	29
Humanistic Perspective	3	Personal Skills	7
Historical Perspective	0	Interpersonal Skills	14
Global & Cultural Awareness	1	Applied Knowledge	41
Ethical Reasoning & Action	4	Creativity & Aesthetic Appreciation	8

Bergen is currently assessing general education proficiencies through both its transfer and career programs in a decentralized manner, that is, by relating each intended outcome of all academic assessment reports to one or more of the general education proficiencies. In addition, the College plans to weave in centralized assessment of general education proficiencies that cross the boundaries of disciplines, such as information literacy and writing. During the summer of 2012, the Chair of the General Education Committee is developing a proposal to this effect. In Fall 2012, the Learning Assessment Committee of the Faculty Senate will consider the proposal. Implementation of the proposal will allow the



College to focus on one or two general education proficiencies in each assessment cycle, starting with information literacy in the 2012-2014 assessment cycle. The General Education Committee with help from Institutional Research can then analyze assessment results derived from this centralized approach.

**From the PRR Reviewers' Report, Recommendation #4**

Recommend more systematic and sustained evidence of assessment of student learning at the course, program and departmental level as outlined in the Assessment of Student Learning Plan. (Standard 14)

The examples below, from 2005 through the present, demonstrate sustained evidence of assessment of student learning outcomes.

**Standard 14 Examples**

**The examples below, listed by department, are illustrative of the assessment of student learning at the course level.**

**History** - In Fall 2010, the intended outcome was for students in 100 level history courses to be successful in writing an analytical essay using historical primary and/or secondary sources. A faculty-developed rubric was used for grading purposes. Students did not meet the History Department goal of seeing 60% achieve a score of 15 out of 20 on their analytical essay; 48% achieved the desired result. The desired result of achieving 3 or 4, out of 4, on each of the following components: introduction/thesis, documentation of evidence, and evaluation and analysis of information also was not met. The department discussed ways to improve student success rates. Possible reforms included requiring drafts of papers, periodic check of progress on papers, more in-class instruction in writing theses and documenting evidence, providing examples of exemplary past papers, use of the Writing Center and the Tutoring Center, and providing links/access to style manuals for documenting sources (MLA or Chicago style documentation of evidence).

In Fall 2011, a pilot study was conducted to help the department begin the process of selecting the recommendations for improvement it wished to implement. Three concrete changes were made for a History 101 class of 23 students. These changes were to provide: in-class instruction in writing thesis statements, in-class discussion of documenting evidence, and reading of drafts of thesis statements and introductions, the last being optional for students. These changes resulted in the number of students achieving the grade of 15 or higher on this assignment rising by 4% to 52%. These results were shared with all Department members in Spring 2012. For the next assessment cycle, 2012-2014, the entire Department determined to assess the effect of implementing in-class instruction in writing thesis statements, along with encouraging students to make use of The Writing Center. The same rubric will be used so that

the data gathered can be compared to that of 2010. (See Appendix 21a for the assessment report.)

**Literature/Composition** - For the 2006-2008 assessment cycle, the composition faculty decided to assess the students' ability to write the required argumentative research paper for English Composition 1 (WRT101). The faculty developed rubric was designed to assess the success of 1) The argument or thesis statement, 2) The topic sentences for each paragraph, and 3) The implementation of the MLA rules of citation. For each of these three areas the desired result was for 60% of the students to be successful. The actual results were 62% of the students for the thesis statement, 84% for the topic sentences, and 58% for the MLA citations.

To address the weak showing in use of MLA rules of citation, the Department determined that the 2010-2012 assessment study would focus on information literacy skills. In this study, a pre and post-test was given to gauge students' ability to research, navigate scholarly databases, employ outside sources and correctly implement their research into their writing. The average student score increased from 12.5 to 15 on the 20 question multiple choice survey; the improvement demonstrated that the purpose of introducing a research model coupled with class instruction and library instruction helped students improve their information literacy. However, the Department had hoped for a greater increase in student average scores. Therefore, the Department convened a committee on Information Literacy composed of faculty in the Composition area, librarians, and other faculty in the School of English. This committee has developed an eight-step research process along with resources for each of these eight steps. Currently, implementation of this eight-step approach by faculty is on a voluntary basis. (See Appendix 21b for both assessment reports.)

**Physical Sciences** - The intended outcome for the 2010-2012-assessment plan in Physical Sciences was to measure students' understanding of the scientific method. Laboratory reports from four sections of Introduction to Physics (PHY185) and three sections of General Chemistry 1 Lab (CHM141) were analyzed and graded according to a faculty-developed rubric. In both PHY185 and CHM141, students were required to write a laboratory report that included a succinct objective, a section on data collection and analysis, and a conclusion discussing background theory and results. The success rates for PHY185 and CHM141 were 78.4% and 75% respectively, very close to the 80% goal. During the Spring 2012 semester the chemistry faculty discussed how best to improve the error analysis component of the CHM141 laboratory reports and the physics faculty discussed the breadth and depth of PHY185. The physics instructors decided that individual strategies for improving student learning would be more effective than a blanket approach of changing the broad curriculum of PHY185. The particular strategies are: stressing the connection between the scientific method and the lab experiments during both lecture and lab, administering pre-lab quizzes to ensure that students come to lab prepared, and having students utilize graphing software. In CHM141, all lab reports now require a

summary analyzing errors in the experimental results and relating them to the theory and underlying assumptions on which the experiment was based as well as the actual execution of the experiment. The new lab report format and the previous grading rubric will be introduced at the beginning of the semester so students will be familiar with them by the time the assessment is done. These changes will be implemented and assessed during the new assessment cycle that begins in Fall 2012. (See Appendix 21c for the assessment report.)

**Biology** - For the 2008-2010 assessment report, the Biology Department determined the intended outcome to be that students would learn the relationship of microbes to other living organisms. Quiz questions from Microbiology and Anatomy and Physiology as well as a case study on the topic of immunology were given to students. The average score on the quiz questions exceeded the 80% desired result. The faculty suggested microbiology and anatomy & physiology faculty work more closely to be sure that they all stressed the importance of the immune system. Three professors developed a research project consisting of an interdisciplinary program between Anatomy & Physiology and Microbiology. Using case studies, the goal was to engage students in topics that overlap both disciplines. With the help of a clinical microbiologist, members of the Biology faculty introduced their students to Clinical Case Studies as a method to further their knowledge of disease processes and the reaction of the human body to disease. Using Webinar technology, students heard the microbiologist discuss the clinical implications of the disease topic and then were able to ask questions about the case study. During Fall 2011, the faculty took the project one step further. A current emerging disease, Escherichia coli O104:H4, was the topic. Lectures on the microbial physiology of E. coli, the anatomy and physiology of the GI tract, and the effect of bacterial toxins on the cardiovascular and urinary system were given, as well as an explanation of the different clinical tests that microbiologists use to determine the cause of a disease. The lectures were captured using the Echo 360 Capture equipment and loaded up onto the WebCT learning platform for all students to review. The lead author of the paper characterizing the outbreak of E.coli O104:H4 in Germany during the spring/summer of 2011 was contacted to be a guest speaker via Skype. Students were able to speak with the scientist and ask questions about the outbreak. Echo 360 Capture was used again so that all students would be able to follow along with the questions and answers even if they had another class to attend. (See Appendix 21d for the assessment report.)

**College Mathematics** - Between 2005 and 2008, the math faculty assessed whether students who completed online sections of Precalculus demonstrated knowledge and skills equivalent to those completing face-to-face sections of the same course. The study took place over two assessment cycles. In the first cycle the mean grade point average of the two modes was compared. Both the t-Test and the Wilcoxon Rank Sum Test resulted in the conclusion that there was no significant difference at the 5% level and that students performed at about the

same level in both types of classes. In the second assessment cycle these tests were repeated using the new data; again, there was no significant difference at the 5% level in the grade point averages between the two modes of instruction. Additionally, the Chi-Square Independence Test on the grade distributions was applied to the grade distributions. The results showed no significant differences between the two teaching modes in grades A through C.

Although student performance was essentially the same in both formats, the faculty made changes in the online course designed to provide additional detailed explanations of material and to keep students up to date with course work. A new set of videos was made available to all online and face-to-face students. These provide supplemental explanations of various topics inherent to the course. Starting in Fall 2008, a pretest covering the prerequisite material was sent to all registered students, allowing them to review any problem areas in the prerequisite before the class began. (See Appendix 21e for both assessment reports.)

**Wellness and Exercise Science (WEX)** - That students would apply what they had learned about conditioning in the theory WEX101 course to subsequent laboratory experiences, such as Swimming for Conditioning, was one intended outcome from the 2005-2006 assessment plan of the WEX department. Faculty used a rubric to evaluate the swimming skills of students for two swimming strokes, the crawl and the breast stroke. The desired result was that 70% of the students achieve a 4 or above, out of 5, on the evaluation. Results showed that student performance surpassed this outcome; 100% of the students achieved a 4 or above, with the overall average being 4.40. The faculty determined to continue the evaluation in the next assessment cycle (2006-2008) using the butterfly and backstroke. This time they wanted to find a way to give the students more objective feedback on their swimming skills. To improve instruction of the swimming strokes, a flip video camera was purchased so that students could be filmed as they swam and then could receive immediate feedback on their technique. This provided a more objective means of evaluation, because the grading rubric could now be explained in both an oral and visual way. Student performance remained high and actually improved; the overall average was 4.67 with the aid of the video camera. These results have led to extending the use of the video camera to all swimming skills. Students are able to improve the efficiency of their strokes and thus their ability to swim for endurance. (See Appendix 21f for both assessment reports.)

**Philosophy and Religion (PHR)** - Beginning in 2006, the Philosophy and Religion faculty decided to assess the ability of students in PHR101, Introduction to Philosophy, to summarize, in writing, the views of philosophers as expressed in philosophical texts. The results exceeded the criterion of success, (that 70% of the students earn a grade of C or better on the essay assignment), but the PHR Department was concerned that the goal was being minimally achieved (72% earned a C or better). Faculty decided to emphasize writing assignments that focused on clear, accurate, and adequate exposition of theories and arguments. This

assessment goal was reassessed in 2010-2012 using the same rubric. Both web based and face-to-face sections were used with a total student population of 238. The classes were expanded to include, in addition to six sections of PHR101, two sections of Introduction to Religion and three sections of Religions of the World. Results again exceeded the criterion for success, but gave rise to discussion on student exposition and understanding of primary texts, and caused many members of the Department to change the nature of, and emphasis on, some of their assignments. A few Department members made these changes to their courses in the Fall 2011 semester. One example of such a change is to move away from writing assignments (essays) that expect both expositions and analysis/evaluation. More assignments focused only on exposition and understanding. A future assessment project to address these kinds of emphasis changes (i.e., like those made during the Fall 2011 semester) are needed in order to determine whether student learning is enhanced with respect to the exposition and understanding of philosophical and religious primary texts. (See Appendix 21g for both assessment reports.)

**Computer Science (CIS)** - For the 2010-2012 assessment cycle the Computer Science Department investigated whether students taking CIS158, Introduction to Computer Science, demonstrated success on a quiz that required knowledge of computer components and computer memory. In Spring 2011, ten sections of the course were involved in the assessment, four online and six face-to-face. The expected measure of success, 60% of the students achieving a grade of 70 or better on the specified questions, was not met. Instead, 36.4% achieved a 70 or better. More emphasis needed to be placed on computer components and on computer memory and storage by the instructors. The Academic Department Chair created an outline on the topic. All faculty members, full-time as well as adjunct, prior to Fall 2011, discussed this outline. The assessment was repeated in the Fall 2011 semester. Student performance showed improvement: now 49.4% of students achieved a grade of C or better, but the faculty committed to continue discussions about teaching components of the computer and computer memory and storage. There will be continued support for all faculty teaching this course. (See Appendix 21h for the assessment report.)

**The following examples are illustrative of the assessment of student learning at the program level:**

**Drafting and Design Program** - For their 2008-2010 assessment study, the faculty chose to study whether students enrolled in the Drafting Program demonstrate the ability to dimension mechanical style multi-view drawings that are compliant to industry standards. This was in support of the program goal that “Our graduates are able to read and create multi-view mechanical and architectural drawings compliant to industry standards.” The average score on the final exam dimensioning problems in Spring 2009 was 6.46, well below the desired result of 7.50 out of a maximum of 10.00. Drafting faculty discussed the results and took the following

action in Fall 2009: they reviewed specific errors made by students with the students and followed up with a brief review class to reinforce the correct process. The average score rose to 7.04, but still fell short of the criterion for success. As a next step, a revised lesson on dimensioning was created using PowerPoint software and a monitor capable of writing on the screen. The lesson was recorded using the Echo 360 Capture system, allowing students to review the lesson from any computer with internet access. The semesters involved were Fall 2010, Spring 2011, and Fall 2011. Results of the test scores using the dimensioning problem showed significant improvement; the average score rose to 8.23 for students in classes where the new lesson was used versus 6.34 for students in classes where it was taught using the old format. The new teaching format is now used in all sections of Drafting I and is being incorporated into other drafting courses. (See Appendix 21i for assessment report.)

**Banking and Finance Program** - The ability of students in the AAS Finance Program to evaluate financial data in order to make strategic business decisions was the focus of the 2005-2006 assessment study. The team research project was graded using a rubric developed by faculty. While the desired result was 75% of students would achieve a grade of C or better on the project, only 65% met this standard. Faculty consulted and reduced the number of students in each project group from five to four. Students were advised to exchange emails to speed up communication and coordination. Additionally, more class time was allotted to complete teamwork activities and develop better team dynamics. After the above recommended changes had been put into place, the goal was reassessed in 2008-2010 using the same grading rubric. Results showed that 86% of the students now had achieved the desired result. Nevertheless, faculty observed that time management was still an issue for some students, causing their achievement to be lower than expected. As a follow-up, time management and attendance have been emphasized with the result that now there are fewer late submissions of the project and fewer absences. (See Appendix 21j for both assessment reports.)

**Developmental Mathematics Program**—The intended outcome of the 2010-2012 assessment report was that the Developmental Mathematics Program would satisfactorily prepare students for entry into college-level mathematics material. Three math objectives were tested: simplifying arithmetic and algebraic expressions, factoring algebraic expressions, and solving systems of linear equations in the solution of verbal problems. Each objective was tested through a question on the final exam for MAT032, Algebra B. The results showed that students performed satisfactorily on word problems and factoring, with over 70% earning a 2 or 3 (out of 3) based on the grading rubric, but unsatisfactorily on simplifying expressions, where only 44.9% earned a 2 or 3.

The Department was in agreement that the difficulty with this concept led back to concepts taught in basic arithmetic. A two part action program was proposed, part one focusing on professional development and part two on continued assessment. A professional

development program was implemented. Continued assessment of the topic in question as well as the other two topics was recommended. The best practices in teaching was completed and a decision made as to the best method to use in teaching the concepts involved. The three concepts will continue to be assessed using a cross sectional random sample, graded by a three person committee. The continued assessment will insure consistent results and establish the effectiveness of the professional development program. The earliest results will be available in Spring 2013 because the students must move through MAT011 (Arithmetic) and MAT031 (Algebra A) before reaching Algebra B. (See Appendix 21k for assessment report)

**American Language Program (ALP)** - The ALP faculty determined to study whether students who complete Level 2 writing will successfully demonstrate proficiency and consistency in integrating their grammar knowledge in paragraph and essay writings. In Fall 2009 there were two experimental sections and four cohort sections. The amount of writing in the experimental sections was significantly higher as compared with the cohort sections. The results showed that in those sections emphasizing the integration of grammar into writing the failure rate on the Level 2 Exit Test was 5% compared with 13%, 16%, 23%, and 29% in other sections. The criterion for success was that compared to the cohort, ten percent more students in the experimental group would demonstrate improved writing skills. This was achieved and the faculty teaching Level 2 recommended placing more emphasis on integrating grammar and writing. The assessment was repeated in Spring 2012 with a larger number of faculty (ten) and sections (ten) participating. The results showed that the students in all ten sections where teachers emphasized the integration of grammar and writing did better than the cohort sections from Fall 2009, thus verifying the earlier results. The faculty will continue to emphasize this integration and involve part time teachers in these discussions. (See Appendix 21l for the assessment report.)

#### **Assessment of Bergen Programs by External Agencies**

Bergen Community College has ten programs that are accredited by external agencies. Diagnostic Medical Sonography, Medical Office Assistant, and Surgical Technology are accredited by the Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs; Respiratory Care by the Commission on Accreditation for Respiratory Care; the Nursing program by the New Jersey State Board of Nursing and the National League for Nursing Accrediting Commission; Dental Hygiene by the Commission on Dental Accreditation; Radiography and Radiation Therapy by the Joint Review Committee on Education in Radiologic Technology (JRCERT) and the Radiologic Technology Board of Examiners of the State of New Jersey; Veterinary Technology by the American Veterinary Medical Association; and the Paralegal Program by the American Bar Association. With the exception of Surgical Technology, which is a one year certificate, all the above are two-year AAS degree programs.

Faculty members teaching in these programs are constantly involved in the rigorous, prescribed assessment required by their accrediting agencies. Consequently, they are always endeavoring to improve student learning. They also participate in Bergen’s assessment activities. Since these are career programs, their assessment cycle is the odd-year, two-year cycle described earlier in this report. The academic excellence of these programs is evidenced by the fact that they are all currently fully accredited. (See Appendix 22 for letters of accreditation. The most recent Self Studies for all the above programs will be available in the document room.) The educational success is evidenced by the performance of the students on the various industry or licensure exams. (See Chart 2 below. Students in the Paralegal Program do not take a licensure test.) The continuous assessment of student learning has been a part of these programs since their inception at Bergen.

**Chart 2 – First attempt pass rates on Licensure tests**

<b>Program</b>	<b>Percent Passing Industry/Licensure Exam – First Attempt</b>
Dental Hygiene	100
Diagnostic Medical Sonography	100
Medical Office Assistant	82
Nursing	89
Radiation Therapy	100
Radiography	96
Respiratory Care	100
Surgical Technology	57 (64 on second attempt – Board preparation has been increased to better prepare the Class of 2012)
Veterinary Technology	100

**Additional examples that support Bergen’s compliance with Standard 14 can be found in Appendix 23.**



## Conclusion

Bergen Community College has been successful in developing and sustaining a mature assessment process that has continued to evolve in scope, robustness, and efficacy. The Center for Institutional Effectiveness has an established structure that includes CIE Fellows and, additionally, assessment liaisons for each academic department. Through the Interim Coordinator for Assessment and Strategic Planning, CIE connects to the Learning Assessment Committee of the Faculty Senate, the President's Cabinet, and the Board of Trustees. The Administration is committed to assessment at all levels and the Board of Trustees supports assessments efforts, particularly through the involvement of its Strategic Planning Committee.

Academic departments and AES areas participate in assessment activities. The results are used to improve student learning, to affect planning and allocation of resources, and to improve services. The examples included in the body of this report and in Appendices 16 and 23 are evidence of Bergen's compliance with Standards 7 and 14. The ten Bergen programs that require accreditation by external agencies have been successful in obtaining and maintaining those accreditations. The assessment process is now truly faculty driven and contains a structure for continuous quality improvement through the Learning Assessment Committee of the Faculty Senate. This committee has revised the Assessment Report Form and the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan. Assessment outcomes for all areas are tied to facets of the College's Strategic Plan -- and, additionally, -- for academic areas, to general education proficiencies and program goals. General education proficiencies are embedded in both transfer and career programs and the College will be implementing a plan to centralize the assessment of these proficiencies during the 2012-2013 academic year. Training for faculty and staff is well established in-house with CIE and Faculty Development working together to sponsor various workshops, which are supplemented with attendance at external conferences.

As documented in this report Bergen Community College has, since the start of its assessment initiative in 2005, taken serious and tangible actions that demonstrate a commitment to continuing and improving its assessment process and to using assessment results to effect positive change.

## Acknowledgements

Thank you to all of the following people who contributed to this report and to any others whose names may have been accidentally omitted.

Dr. Jose Adames, Interim President (July 2011 – August 2012)  
Dr. Mi Ahn, Assistant Professor - Social Sciences  
Lena Bakir, Manager, Cerullo Learning Assistance Center  
Dr. Susan Barnard, Dean, School of Health Professions  
Gregg Biermann, Academic Department Chair, Visual Arts  
Patti Bonomolo, Assistant Director, Human Resources  
Dr. Ann Brown, Assistant Professor - Social Sciences  
Barbara Buff, Center for Health, Wellness, and Personal Counseling  
Joanna Campbell, Professor - Dental Hygiene  
Joseph Cavaluzzi, Assistant Director, Public Relations  
Rose Marie Chatterton, Dean, Student Advising and Development  
Keith Chu, Academic Department Chair, History and Geography  
Robert Coane, Director, Campus Planning and Improvements  
Amparo Coddling, Dean, School of Arts, Humanities and Wellness  
William Corcoran, Director, Public Safety  
Dr. George Cronk, Academic Department Chair, Philosophy and Religion  
Dr. Ursula Parrish Daniels, Interim Executive Assistant to the President  
Judith Davis, Professor - English Basic Skills  
Tobyn DeMarco, Associate Professor - Philosophy and Religion  
Tom DePrenda, Manager, New Media Services, Public Relations  
Lisa DiGaetano, Administrative Services Analyst  
Mecheline Farhat, Assistant Professor - Criminal Justice  
Khairia Fazal, Interim Associate Dean, Cerullo Learning Assistance Center  
Gail Fernandez, Associate Professor - American Language Program  
Dr. Steven Fischer, Professor - Horticulture  
Dr. Randolph Forsstrom, Academic Department Chair, College Mathematics  
Laurie Francis, Director, Bergen Community College Foundation  
Seamus Gibbons, Instructor - Writing and Literature  
Barbara Golden, Director, Purchasing and Services  
Adam Goodell, Academic Department Chair, Writing and Literature  
Joshua Guttman, Associate Professor - Physical Sciences  
Robert Highley, Academic Department Chair, Biological Sciences  
Compton Jenkins, Professor - Wellness and Exercise Science  
Dr. William Jiang, Academic Department Chair, American Language Program  
Lawrence Joel, Academic Department Chair, Legal Studies  
Maria Kasparova, Associate Professor - English Basic Skills  
Dr. Alan Kaufman, Chair, Faculty Senate, Professor - Writing and Literature  
Matthew King, Academic Department Chair, Industrial Design and Technology  
Marybeth Klein, Academic Department Chair, Computer Science  
Priscilla Klymenko, Interim Dean, Enrollment Management  
Evan Kobolakis, Chief Information Officer, Information Technologies  
Richard Kuiters, Associate Professor - Criminal Justice

Dr. Pierre Laguerre, Assistant Professor - Business  
Lenore Lerer, Associate Professor - College Mathematics  
Heidi Lieb, Academic Department Chair, ALP-Speech  
Martha Lowe, Associate Professor - Biology  
William Madden, Academic Department Chair, Information Technology  
Dr. Bonnie MacDougall, Interim Academic Vice President (July 2011-August 2012)  
Diane Mandrafina, Senior Financial Officer  
Joann Marzocco, Interim Coordinator, Assessment and Strategic Planning  
Janet Masiello, Manager, Testing Center  
Marilyn MacDonall, Assistant Director, Grants Administration  
Claire McConaughy, Associate Professor - Visual Arts  
Marie McCrary, Instructor - Physical Sciences  
Florence McGovern, Professor - Business  
Susan McKee, Center for Health, Wellness, and Personal Counseling  
Tonia McKoy, Associate Director, Institutional Research  
Nestor Melendez, Interim Assistant Dean, Student Life and Judicial Affairs  
Dr. Carol Miele, Dean, School of English  
Jennifer Migliorino-Reyes, Interim Assistant Dean, Center for Student Success  
Jim Miller, Chief Human Resources Officer, Quality and Process Improvement  
Joan Murko, Academic Department Chair, Interim Director of Nursing  
Laura Ochoa, Academic Department Chair, Social Sciences  
Caroline Ofodile, Director, Financial Operations and Student Assistance  
Jane Phelps, Assistant Professor - Communications  
Katherine Pignatelli, Professor - Wellness and Exercise Science  
Tiziana Quattrone, Academic Department Chair, World Languages  
Donald Reilly, Academic Department Chair, English Basis Skills  
Dr. P.J. Ricatto, Dean, School of Science and Mathematics  
Annemarie Roscello, Associate Professor - Sidney Silverman Library  
Fran Ruff, Academic Department Chair, Education  
Robert Saldarini, Academic Department Chair, Business  
Elin Schikler, Academic Department Chair, Communications  
Norman Shapiro, Director, Physical Plant  
Sarah Shurts, Assistant Professor - History and Geography  
Deborah Sousa, Interim Chief of Administrative Services  
Sandra Sroka, Interim Dean, Continuing Education and Public Sector Training  
Arthur Tolve, Professor - Hotel and Restaurant Management  
Dr. Andrew Tomko, Interim Dean, School of Business, Social Sciences, and Public Service  
Dr. Joan Tscherne, Academic Department Chair, Physical Sciences  
Anita Verno, Associate Professor - Information Technology  
Melanie Walker, Assistant Professor - Developmental Mathematics  
Rong Wang, Assistant Director, Sidney Silverman Library  
Mark Wiener, Assistant Professor- Developmental Mathematics  
William Yakowicz, Director, Grants Administration

## APPENDICES

1. Vision and Mission Statement
2. Letter to College Community from Carter Corriston, Chairman of Board of Trustees
3. Letter to College Community from Dr. Jose Adames, Interim President
4. Organizational Chart
5. Learning Assessment Committee Survey
6. Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan and Assessment Report Form
7. Programs That Have Completed Curriculum Mapping
8. Academic Assessment Report Chart
9. Faculty Focus Newsletter Articles
10. The Center for Institutional Effectiveness Newsletter
11. Board of Trustees Presentation
12. Strategic Plan
13. Revised Key Performance Indicators
14. Standard 7 Assessment Reports
  - a. Human Recourses
  - b. Health Services
  - c. Bergen Community College Foundation
  - d. Continuing Education
  - e. Enrollment Services
  - f. Criminal Justice
  - g. Cerullo Learning Assessment Center
  - h. 1-2-3 Connect
15. Center for Instructional Research and Development – Korean Student Study
16. Additional Examples for Standard 7
17. Assessment Workshops-Fall 2005 Through Spring 2012
18. The Center for Institutional Effectiveness Workshops Fall 2012
19. Faculty Development Schedule
20. AAS Templates
21. Standard 14 Assessment Reports
  - a. History
  - b. Literature/Composition
  - c. Physical Science
  - d. Biology
  - e. College Mathematics
  - f. Wellness & Exercise Science
  - g. Philosophy and Religion
  - h. Computer Science
  - i. Drafting and Design
  - j. Banking and Finance Program
  - k. Developmental Math Program
  - l. American Language Program
22. Letters of Accreditation
23. Additional Examples for Standard 14