META –ANALYSIS OF OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES
[ASSESSMENT CYCLE 2015 –2017]

_____

INTRODUCTION

On August 1st and 2nd, the CIE Assessment Fellows, interim Dean of Assessment and Vice-President of Institutional Effectiveness conducted their annual holistic meta-analysis of assessment activity for the 2015-2017 assessment cycle.   Guided by the Summative Rating Rubric, 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 share with the Bergen community.

RESULTS

- Seventy-four academic programs were part of the 2015 – 2017 assessment cycle. Forty-two programs (57%) submitted reports. Departments offering more than one program submitted multiple assessments. The table below shows the results for the Academic assessment reports.

- Twenty-five Administrative & Educational Support Units were part of the 2015 – 2017 assessment cycle. Eighteen units (72%) submitted reports. The table below shows the results for the AES assessment reports.

- The Exemplary Academic Reports were thorough, innovative, and meaningful. Their findings demonstrate a shared desire among faculty to improve student learning and an openness to explore how to make academic programs stronger.

    - Surgical Technology Program
    - Economics
    - Database Programming & Administration
    - Networking Administration
    - Information Technology
    - Office Technology (AAS)
    - Medical Informatics
    - Database Programming & Administration
    - Office Technology (Cert)

- The AES Exemplary Reports were comprehensive, meaningful and collaborative. They each yielded valuable data that can be acted upon. In addition, the assessment results led to additional questions and opportunities for improvement.

    o Cerullo Learning Assistance Center (Tutoring Center)
    o Library
    o Student Conduct

	Exemplary	Satisfactory	Below Satisfactory	Incomplete	No Report
Academic Reports	9 (12%)	20 (27%)	13 (18%)	0	32 (43%)
AES Reports	3 (12%)	11 (44%)	4 (16%)	0	7 (28%)

CONCLUSION

As we complete our fifth meta-analysis of assessment reports, we are beginning to see a maturation in how and why we conduct assessment. This cycle included a number of interdisciplinary assessments that not only indicate student learning, but also reflect the collaborative nature of higher education. For example, by looking at research assignments given in WRT 101, the Library assessment project highlighted the disconnect between students' confidence and their lack of experience with research paper production and the research process. The Library assessment findings, which will be presented at workshops in the fall semester, can be used by faculty to inform curricular decisions. Similarly, the Surgical Technology project assessed the interdisciplinary nature of heath care by looking at teamwork in addition to specific surgical technology skills. The assessment project was inclusive of faculty and students from other health profession programs and can serve as a partnership model. Other disciplines, including Business, are using assessment to reevaluate and restructure their programs.

The "Below Satisfactory" ratings continue to be given to reports that show minimal effort or those where assessment methods do not link clearly to the stated outcomes being assessed. While the number of "No Reports" remains high, these missing reports are concentrated in specific departments and units. The interim Dean of Assessment and Assessment Fellows will continue to help these units with their assessment work.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1) Nurture a culture of continuous improvement.

2) Continue to garner support for assessment from division leaders.

3) Strengthen the assessment process by encouraging:
   a. AES unit leaders to clarify their mission and outcome statements.
   b. Academic programs to revisit their program learning outcomes.

4) Update the academic and AES assessment report form and summative rubric.

5) Create a fellow/liaison journal to promote communication.

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