META-ANALYSIS OF OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES
[ASSESSMENT CYCLE 2016 – 2018]

_____

INTRODUCTION

On July 24th & 25th, 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 2016-2018 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

- Forty-four Academic programs were part of the 2016 – 2018 assessment cycle. Twenty-seven programs (63%) submitted reports. Departments offering more than one program submitted multiple reports. The table below shows the results for the Academic assessment reports.

- Nineteen Administrative & Educational Support (AES) Units were part of the 2016 – 2018 assessment cycle. Fourteen units (74%) submitted reports. The table below shows the results for the AES assessment reports.

	Exemplary	Satisfactory	Below Satisfactory	Incomplete	No Report
Academic Reports	3 (7%)	17 (40%)	5 (12%)	1 (2%)	18 (42%)
AES Reports	2* (32%)	8 (42%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5 (26%)

*Five IT units assessed as one unit.

- The Exemplary Academic Reports included evidence of broad collaboration with departmental faculty, use of validated assessment instruments, and a focus on how the assessment project can improve student learning.

    - Developmental Math
    - English Basic Skills
    - Communication

- The Exemplary AES Reports were thoughtful. The assessment projects were useful to the programs and provided meaningful data that can be acted on.

  - o Information Technology
  - o Center for Health, Wellness and Personal Counseling

CONCLUSION

The sixth annual meta-analysis of assessment reports indicates that faculty understand that assessment is integral to program effectiveness. The notion of continuous improvement is taking hold as some programs assessed the changes they implemented in previous cycles. In addition, the connection between faculty liaisons and assessment fellows was evident. The liaisons and fellows worked closely through all phases of the assessment cycle. Based on the suggestions of the fellows, faculty modified rubrics and improved reporting of data. In addition, it was evident that there was collaboration among department faculty in all phases of the assessment cycle.

Similar to academic assessment, AES units conducted assessment projects that were important to the units. Effective assessment tools were used and thorough analysis of the results will provide opportunities for beneficial change.   Larger AES units, including Information Technology, assessed multiple facets of their projects. Moreover, many of the AES assessments addressed the student experience.

Over the last number of assessment cycles, assessment expectations have been communicated to faculty and staff through various channels. Even with frequent contact between assessment fellows and liaisons, some smaller programs and interdisciplinary programs continue not to be assessed. The "Below Satisfactory" rating was given to units that put minimal effort into their assessment activities.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1) Continue to offer workshops tailored to the needs of the liaisons.

2) Begin using the new assessment form which allows programs /units to highlight accomplishments and changes from past assessment cycles.

3) Encourage programs and units to assess multiple program learning outcomes.

4) Promote cross-program/unit assessment projects.

5) Partner with deans and vice-presidents in all steps of the assessment process.

SUMMATIVE RATING RUBRIC FOR OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT REPORT

No Report	• **Report not submitted**

Incomplete	• Did not complete the assessment cycle
	    o Did not follow through with the program's assessment plan
	    o No evidence that assessment data were collected

Below Satisfactory	• 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
Satisfactory	• 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

Exemplary	• In addition to being *SATISFACTORY-*
	    o Employed a validated assessment tool or a rubric developed by faculty/staff
	    o Focused on assessing program-level outcome (for academic programs only)
	    o Focused on assessing a significant department/program outcome (for AES units)
	    o Showed strong evidence of faculty/staff dialogue regarding assessment results and application of the results