

META-ANALYSIS OF OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES [ASSESSMENT CYCLE 2017 – 2019]

INTRODUCTION

On July 23rd & 24th, the CIE Assessment Fellows and interim Dean of Assessment conducted their annual holistic meta-analysis of assessment activity for the 2017-2019 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

- Fifty Academic programs were part of the 2017 – 2019 assessment cycle. Thirty-one programs (62%) submitted reports. Departments offering more than one program submitted multiple reports. The table below shows the results for the Academic assessment reports.
- Twenty-five Administrative & Educational Support (AES) units were part of the 2017 – 2019 assessment cycle. Thirteen units (52%) submitted reports. The table below shows the results for the AES assessment reports.

	Exemplary	Satisfactory	Below Satisfactory	Incomplete	No Report
Academic Reports	2 (4%)	24 (48%)	4 (8%)	1 (2%)	19 (38%)
AES Reports	4 (16%)	7 (28%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	12 (48%)

- The Exemplary Academic Reports reflected best practices. They included multiple means of assessment, large samples, and multiple reviewers. Programmatic changes based on previous assessment cycles were evident.
 - Early Childhood Education
 - Economics
- The Exemplary AES Reports were thoughtful, thorough and detailed. Assessment instruments matched the assessment projects. The assessment projects were useful to the programs and provided meaningful data that can be acted on.

- Athletics
- Bursar
- Child Development Center
- Library
- Student Conduct

CONCLUSION

The seventh annual meta-analysis of assessment reports confirms that faculty and staff understand the expectation to participate in a continuous cycle of assessment activity. Nevertheless, uneven support from the leadership team prevents the college from fully embracing assessment as a tool for improving instruction, supporting students and improving administrative services.

On the academic side, the theme of communication emerged. Faculty observed that student performance improved when faculty clarified their expectations, rubrics were shared early in the semester, and feedback and opportunities for improvement were given to students.

AES assessment demonstrated a willingness to examine processes that had not been previously assessed. Effective assessment tools were used and analysis of the results will provide opportunities for positive change. The results also suggest that some units would benefit from simplifying and/or redesigning procedures.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1) Partner with deans and vice-presidents in all steps of the assessment process.
- 2) Encourage programs and units to act on their recommendations.
- 3) Require programs and units to assess multiple program learning outcomes.
- 4) Promote cross-program/unit 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