

META – ANALYSIS OF ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES

[ASSESSMENT CYCLE 2011 – 2013]

INTRODUCTION

In order to create a college-wide common language and understanding of the current status of outcomes assessment at Bergen, the CIE Assessment Fellows and Vice President of Institutional Effectiveness conducted a holistic meta-analysis of assessment activities reported for the 2011-2013 assessment cycle. On August 1, 2013, they reviewed 14 assessment reports from academic departments and 14 assessment reports from AES (Administrative and Educational Support) units submitted in June 2013. This review team focused on the overall strengths and weaknesses of the reported assessment activities; the integrity of the assessment methodologies; evidence of departmental dialog around assessment results; and exemplary assessment reports that could be shared with the College community.

RESULTS

- While 19 out of 28 assessment reports (68%) reviewed were rated either *Satisfactory* or *Exemplary*, the review team observed a significant level of inconsistency in the quality of assessment activities carried out and information included in the assessment reports. Seven (25%) assessment reports were rated as *Below Satisfactory* and 2 (7%) were *Incomplete*. Some of the reports were so vague, it was hard to infer what kind of assessment work was actually done. The review team further concluded that many of the outcomes assessment activities reported appear to be not meaningful to the particular program/unit. The rating rubric used by the review team is at the end of this report.
- The assessment data that were collected did not link well with the particular program learning goal/outcome that was being assessed. The review team also could not find evidence that assessment activities and assessment results were regularly discussed within the department/program. While the second year of our assessment cycle is built around promoting robust internal dialogues around assessment data and results, and developing recommendations and implementation strategies as part of closing the loop, we concluded that these have not been happening consistently.
- The review team selected three assessment reports as *Exemplary* to showcase their work. During the assessment cycle 2011-2013, **exemplary** outcomes assessment work was carried out by:
 - * Visual Art
 - * Communications
 - * The Cerullo Learning Assistance Center

CONCLUSION

The Middle States monitoring report visiting team in October 2012 noted the inconsistent quality of our outcomes assessment work. This first meta-analysis exercise supports their observations. To address the wide discrepancies observed in the 2011-2013 assessment reports, the following actions have been taken:

- 1) The assessment report templates have been revised so that the College's expectations are more clearly stated.
- 2) A built-in feedback loop has been added to the each stage of the assessment cycle so that appropriate deans, vice presidents and CIE fellows can address issues before the end of the assessment period.
- 3) CIE assessment workshops have been revised to address the weaknesses observed.
- 4) A formative rating rubric to guide the development and implementation of the assessment plan is being reintroduced, and a summative rating rubric has been developed to formalize the college's expectations.

We hope these changes will bring about meaningful improvements in outcomes assessment processes at Bergen.

RATING RUBRIC USED FOR 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/staff group○ Focused on assessing program-level outcome○ Showed strong evidence of faculty/staff dialogue regarding assessment results and application of the results |