

META –ANALYSIS OF OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES [ASSESSMENT CYCLE 2014 –2016]

INTRODUCTION

On July 19 & 20, 2016, the CIE Assessment Fellows, Interim Dean of Assessment and Vice President of Institutional Effectiveness conducted the fourth annual holistic meta-analysis of outcomes assessment activities reported for the 2014-2016 assessment cycle. Guided by a revised Summative Rating Rubric for the Outcomes Assessment Report (displayed at the end of the report), the review team focused on the appropriateness and usefulness of the assessment project to the program/unit; contribution of faculty/staff to the assessment process; and evidence of meaningful departmental dialog and action around assessment results. The group also identified exemplary assessment reports to be shared with the Bergen community.

RESULTS

- Forty two academic programs were on the 2014 – 2016 assessment cycle. Thirteen departments/programs (31%) submitted reports.
- Nineteen Administrative & Education Support Units were on the 2014 – 2016 assessment cycle. All of the units (100%) submitted reports.
- The exemplary academic assessment reports conducted meaningful assessment projects and exhibited strong evidence of faculty dialog and involvement:
 - English Basic Skills
 - Developmental Math
- The exemplary AES assessment reports demonstrated purpose, were shared with supervisors, staff and faculty, and included clearly identified next steps:
 - Center for Innovation in Teaching and Learning (CITL)
 - Academic Scheduling
 - Media Technology

	Exemplary	Satisfactory	Below Satisfactory	Incomplete	No Report
Academic Reports	2 (5%)	8 (19%)	3 (7%)	0	29 (69%)
AES Reports	3 (16%)	8 (42%)	7 (37%)	1 (5%)	0

CONCLUSION

The results of the fourth meta-analysis continue to identify unevenness in the commitment to assessment and its role in assuring quality. The completed academic reports suggest a strong understanding of the requirements of good assessment: looking at a significant project using an appropriate tool along with dialog among faculty members. The reports rated as *Below Satisfactory* reflect a lack of shared effort and sincerity. The large number of programs that did not submit an assessment report included programs with little or no enrollment. Some departments with multiple options chose to assess only one of the options rather than all programs in the assessment cycle.

The Administrative and Educational Support (AES) units have demonstrated a growing understanding and welcoming of assessment as a tool for continuous improvement. All of the AES units submitted assessment projects. The reports rated as either *Satisfactory* or *Exemplary* assessed outcomes that were beneficial to the unit and the outcomes were communicated with stakeholders. *Below Satisfactory* reports suggest that some units are still uncertain of assessment expectations.

The revised Summative Rating Rubric includes a *No Report* category which has allowed us to further differentiate between assessment reports that were incomplete from those that were never submitted, giving CIE a more accurate picture of assessment activity across the college.

During the past cycle, the assessment fellows have added resources to the Institutional Effectiveness website, and have shared their processes on a regional and national level. Within Bergen, nevertheless, a lack of accountability hinders the growing culture of evidence and data informed decision making for continuous improvement.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1) Continue to nurture a culture of accountability that recognizes assessment as integral to the work of each program/unit.

- 2) The Interim Dean of Assessment will share the results of the meta-analysis with the academic deans and encourage the deans to begin discussions with faculty about the viability of the large number of programs and options offered.
- 3) The fellows will continue to advocate that the deans and vice-presidents use the built-in feedback loops.
- 4) The academic assessment fellows will encourage:
 - a. Liaisons to include a faculty member from a transfer institution or a working professional to serve as a member of their assessment team.
 - b. Faculty to use multiple readers for each artifact to increase internal reliability and richer dialog.
- 5) The Interim Dean of Assessment and the AES fellows will help the AES units continue to refine their assessment projects.

SUMMATIVE RATING RUBRIC FOR OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT REPORT

<i>No Report</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report not submitted
<i>Incomplete</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did not complete the assessment cycle <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Did not follow through with the program's assessment plan ○ No evidence that assessment data were collected
<i>Below Satisfactory</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed the assessment cycle • 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 outcome/department 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 a rubric developed by faculty/staff ○ Focused on assessing program-level outcome (for academic programs only) ○ Focused on assessing a significant department/program outcome (for AES units) ○ Showed strong evidence of faculty/staff dialogue regarding assessment results and application of the results