

META – ANALYSIS OF OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES [ASSESSMENT CYCLE 2012 – 2014]

INTRODUCTION

On June 12, 2014, the CIE Assessment Fellows and Vice President of Institutional Effectiveness conducted the second annual holistic meta-analysis of outcomes assessment activities reported for the 2012-2014 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 overall strengths and weaknesses of reported assessment activities; congruency and integrity of assessment methodologies; and evidence of meaningful departmental dialogue around assessment results; the team also identified exemplary assessment reports that could be shared with the Bergen community.

RESULTS

- Of the seventeen (17) academic programs that were in the 2012-2014 assessment cycle, 12 programs (71%) submitted their assessment reports. Last year, all of AES (Administrative and Education Support) units were put into the 2013-2015 assessment cycle. The table below shows the results of the meta-analysis.

Exemplary	Satisfactory	Below Satisfactory	Incomplete
2 (16.7%)	1 (8.3%)	4 (33.3%)	5 (41.7%)

- The two exemplary assessment reports showed strong evidence of faculty dialogue around the assessment activity and results; evidence of, at times, difficult internal dialogues around unexpected outcomes; and focused on assessing program outcomes. The reviewers could see that program faculty members were involved with the process and valued the insight gained from their assessment data. The two exemplary outcomes assessment work were carried out by:
 - The American Language Program
 - English Basic Skills
- The results of this year's meta-analysis clearly show that we are still struggling deeply with incorporating outcomes assessment into our daily work. Many assessment reports did not clearly express what outcome was assessed, how it was assessed, and what the unit/program learned out of their two-year long assessment process.
- The review team was surprised to see almost half of the assessment reports submitted were incomplete. As an educational organization, we must address this issue.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Bergen will continue to march toward the goal of embedding outcomes assessment into the College's culture. Although the overall results from the second round of meta-analysis is disappointing, recognition must be given to a new assessment process for General Education, greater engagement from the Learning Assessment Committee and department assessment liaisons. Outcomes assessment will continue to be part of the College's Day of Professional Development.

- 1) Assessment Fellows will continue to work closely with each unit. They will review the Formative Rubric and Summative Rubric for Outcomes Assessment in their individual conversations to clarify misunderstandings and expectations. Individual contact with each unit will be increased.
- 2) An analytical rubric will be added to the cadre of tools to assist faculty and staff, so that they can self-diagnose and assess their own work.
- 3) An outcomes assessment workshop for department heads will be repeated in fall and spring semesters.
- 4) We will continue to emphasize the built-in feedback loop at each stage of the assessment cycle, especially from deans, vice presidents and CIE Fellows.
- 5) CIE assessment workshops will be revised to address the weaknesses observed.
- 6) As an educational institution, we must find ways to significantly reduce the frequency of incomplete work and the number of units which completely ignore their assessment responsibilities.

SUMMATIVE RATING RUBRIC FOR OUTCOMES 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