META – ANALYSIS OF OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES
[ASSESSMENT CYCLE 2013 – 2015]

_____

INTRODUCTION

On July 1, 2015, the CIE Assessment Fellows and Vice President of Institutional Effectiveness conducted the third annual holistic meta-analysis of outcomes assessment activities reported for the 2013-2015 assessment cycle. Guided by the Summative Rating Rubric for the Outcomes Assessment Report (displayed at the end of the report), the review team focused on depth of the assessment; appropriateness and value to the program/unit; involvement of faculty/staff in the assessment process; and evidence of meaningful departmental dialogue around assessment results. The group also identified exemplary assessment reports to be shared with the Bergen community.

RESULTS

- Twenty academic departments/programs were on the 2013 – 2015 assessment cycle. Seventeen programs (85%) submitted reports. Departments offering more than one program submitted multiple assessments. A total of 28 academic assessment reports were analyzed. The table below shows the results for the academic assessment reports.

- Twenty-two Administrative & Education Support Units were on the 2013 – 2015 assessment cycle. Twenty units (91%) submitted reports. The table below shows the results for the AES assessment reports.

- The exemplary academic assessment reports demonstrated purpose, effort, and dialog with colleagues.
  - Education
  - Early Childhood Education
  - Industrial & Design Technologies

- The exemplary AES unit reports demonstrated a deep understanding of the assessment process including the use of valid assessment instruments and multiple measures, meaningful dialog and a desire to affect change.
  - The Cerullo Learning Assistance Center
  - The Sidney Silverman Library
  - Office of Alumni Affairs
  - Financial Aid
  - Athletics

- In this cycle (2013 – 2015), the number of academic assessment reports rated as satisfactory or exemplary more than doubled from the previous meta-analysis cycle (2012 -2014).

	Exemplary	Satisfactory	Below Satisfactory	Incomplete
Academic Reports	3 (11%)	14 (50%)	4 (14%)	7 (25%)
AES Reports	5 (25%)	10 (50%)	2 (10%)	3 (15%)

CONCLUSION

This third meta-analysis of assessment reports has shown maturation in the assessment process and has exposed the growing pains that come with it. The meta-analysis results continue to show an imbalance in the level of understanding and commitment to assessment. There is a slow, but steady increase in the number of satisfactory and exemplary reports, demonstrating that a culture of assessment takes time to evolve, but is occurring. We will need to continue to develop additional means to make outcomes assessment an integral part of our work. In addition, this round of evaluation led the fellows and the vice president to address whether we want to use the summative rubric to reflect the assessment process or assessment product.

The meta-analysis also reflects the dynamic between the assessment fellow and academic liaison or AES leader. Many contact points need to occur between the fellow and academic liaison or AES leader before a relationship of trust and comfort is established. Once this occurs, productive conversations around assessment take place with the intention of creating meaningful work.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1) Outcomes assessment will continue to be part of the College's Day of Professional Development.
2) The Fellows will work more closely with deans and administrators to make certain the feedback loop in semesters one and three are used.
3) The Vice-President of Institutional Effectiveness and the fellows will create a second generation summative rubric to clarify discrepancies between process and product.
4) CIE will explore assigning liaisons to AES units.

SUMMATIVE RATING RUBRIC FOR OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT REPORT

Incomplete	• Did not follow through with the program's assessment plan • No evidence that assessment data were collected • Submitted an incomplete assessment report
Below Satisfactory	• 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
Satisfactory	• 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

Exemplary	• In addition to being *SATISFACTORY-*
	  o Employed a validated assessment tool or rubric developed by faculty group
	  o Focused on assessing program-level outcome
	  o Showed strong evidence of faculty/staff dialogue regarding assessment results and application of the results