

Meta-Analysis

Outcomes Assessment at Bergen

Center for Institutional Effectiveness

Oct. 1, 2014 | C-313

Oct. 9, 2014 | C-315

Why Meta-Analysis?

- 80+ moving parts
- Facilitate an uniform understanding of the current status of assessment at Bergen
- Closing the Loop at the college level

Why Meta-Analysis?

MSCHE and Bergen

- Long history of in-and-out of COMPLIANCE

October 2012 Visit:

- Complete the curriculum mapping
- Consistent quality
- Demonstrate use of assessment results

Process Used

- Formative and Summative Process Rubrics
- Holistic evaluation
- Assessment Bottom Line:
 - What are we trying to do?
 - How are we doing?
 - How do you know?
 - So, What?

Results of Meta-Analysis

	2011-2012 Cycle Summer 2013 (n=19 reviewed)	2012-2014 Cycle Summer 2014 (n=12 reviewed)
Exemplary & Satisfactory	68%	25%
Below Satisfactory	25%	33%
Incomplete	7%	42%
<i>Missing Reports</i>	9	5

Results of Meta-Analysis

- Inconsistency in the quality
- Vague; Unclear
- Incomplete reports
- Minimal evidence of internal dialogue

Lack of Accountability & Pride

How Can We Improve?

- **Follow the Bergen's Assessment Cycle**
 - Semester 1 – create program/unit assessment plan
 - Semester 2 – develop assessment tool(s) & timeline
 - Semester 3 – collect and analyze data
 - Semester 4 – share knowledge & close the loop
- **Follow MSCHE's Recommendations on Assessment**
 - Focus on assessing the most important goals
 - Easy to interpret
 - Easy to implement
 - Easy to adapt

Assessment Fellows

- Gail Fernandez (Lead)
 - Sony Tiwari
 - Maureen Ellis-Davis
 - Joanna Campbell
- } Academic Units
-
- Ilene Kleinman
 - Jill Rivera
 - Amarjit Kaur
- } AES Units

Thank You!





Formative Rubric for Outcomes Assessment Plan

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

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

SUMMATIVE RATING RUBRIC FOR OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT REPORT

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