

**QUEENSBOROUGH COMMUNITY COLLEGE**  
**The City University of New York**  
**ACADEMIC SENATE**

**COMMITTEE ON ASSESSMENT AND INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS**

**TO:** Academic Senate Steering Committee

**FROM:** Prof. Linda Meltzer, Chair, and Dr. Andrea Salis, Co-Chair, Committee on Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness

**SUBJECT: Annual Report – Committee on Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness (Committee), 2015/2016**

**DATE: July 11, 2016**

---

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

Faculty Representatives (Name, Department)

1. Linda Meltzer, Business, Committee Chairperson
2. Andrea Salis, HPED, Committee Co-Chairperson, Secretary and General Education Task Force Representative
3. Franca Ferrari-Bridgers, Speech Communication & Theatre Arts
4. Joseph Goldenberg, Engineering Technology
5. Mark Schiebe, English
6. Changiz Alizadeh, Mathematics & Computer Science
7. Georgina Colalillo, Nursing
8. Sunil Dehipawala, Physics
9. Simran Kaur, Biological Sciences and Geology (on Fulbright Leave)

Liaisons

1. David Sarno, Chemistry, COC Liaison
2. Tammi Rothman, English, Steering Committee Designee
3. Arthur Corradetti, President's Liaison
4. Ian Beckford, Ex-Officio

**COMMITTEE MEETINGS**

The Committee met on the following dates during AY 2015-2016:

1. October 5, 2015
2. November 2, 2015
3. December 3, 2015
4. February 2, 2016
5. March 2, 2016
6. April 13, 2016
7. May 11, 2016

### **SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE WORK**

The work of the Committee for AY 2015-2016 focused on its charge from the Academic Senate as follows:

1. Reviewed Charge of the Committee
2. Discussed the Committee's assignment to review departments' assessments and where to locate:
  - a. Teaching Department Year-end Reports
  - b. Non-Teaching Department Year-end Reports
3. Worked collaboratively to review assigned teaching department year-end reports. Had greater focus on teaching departments during time frame as compared to non-teaching Departments.
4. Had norming sessions on course assessment reported in teaching departments' year-end reports.
5. As a result of norming sessions, discussed adding a dimension to teaching departments on course assessment follow-up.
6. Revised rubric used to review teaching-department annual reports (see attached).
7. Discussed what makes an assessment report more useful to serve as model for future assessment.
8. Summarized findings of several individual teaching departments based on assessment objectives.
9. Summarized teaching year-end report findings in one table.
10. Shared revised rubric with Provost and Academic Department Chairpersons.
11. Posted to governance website: agenda, minutes, and annual report of the Committee.
12. Discussed importance of the Assessment Institute and the fostering of a climate of assessment throughout the College. Six committee members participated in the training provided by the Institute.
13. Discussed how teaching department year-end reports are a key resource for faculty and the College; demonstrates how we are performing assessment at our College and achieving the accreditation standards of the Middle States Commission on Higher Education and other programs for which we are accredited.
14. Discussion led by Dr. Ian Beckford on work of General Education Task Force on comparisons between different pedagogies implemented in classes (e.g. HIPs vs. non-HIP general education student learning outcomes).
15. Provost Paul Marchese attended one of our Committee meetings.

### **FOSTER A CLIMATE OF ASSESSMENT**

The Committee is thankful to former Committee Chair, Shele Bannon, who was a guest speaker at our first meeting and explained how assessment of teaching and non-teaching departments and respective rubrics were used in prior years. The Committee is thankful to Dean Arthur Corradetti and Dr. Ian Beckford who have further developed the Assessment Institute, having completed its seventh semester of institutes this spring. In SP16, 15 faculty participated, bringing a total of participating faculty over the past three years to 120.

## TEACHING DEPARTMENT YEAR-END REPORTS

The members of the Committee reviewed 16 teaching department year-end reports for 2014-15 posted on the College website under Institutional Effectiveness Reports. Each department was reviewed based on an assessment rubric developed by the Committee. The number of courses assessed by 11 departments in 2014-15 ranged from 1 to 8 with an average of 3.5. The reports varied in their level of responses from missing or vague to complete responses for: (1) general education outcomes; (2) curricular objectives; (3) assessment data findings; and (4) action plan. See table below.

Total Average Score for Course Assessment Reports	Score of 1- 3 General Education Objectives	Score of 1 -3 Curricular Objectives	Score of 1 – 3 Assessment Data Findings	Score of 1 – 3 Action Plan	Number of Courses Assessed
	2.57	2.71	2.30	2.57	3.50

Based on these findings, the Committee has revised the assessment rubric, used to review the reports, to be more clearly aligned with the department year-end report. The revised rubric includes a scoring dimension for follow-up from the prior year's assessment as this is included in the year-end report. The Committee has shared this rubric with departments and the Provost to inform them of how we will review departments' assessment reports in 2016-17. The departments may use this rubric as a useful guide in preparing their reports.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Recommend all current and future committee members attend the Assessment Institute.
2. Continue to review teaching department year-end reports and increase focus on non-teaching annual reports that tie in the previous year's action plan to current year data.
3. Recommend that each department assign an assessment coordinator to ensure course assessments are completed according to a department-approved schedule to ensure a systematic and meaningful approach to assessment.
4. Discuss survey of department chairs on assessment topics that would be of interest.
5. Continue having guest speakers to our meetings to stay informed of college developments (e.g. General Education Task Force and progress made in future comparisons between lower level courses and higher level courses.)
6. Discuss whether departments should receive guidelines for year-end reports.
7. Recommend that courses with high enrollment be assessed every two years.
8. Continue to develop and promote faculty workshops on assessment through CETL and the Office of Strategic Planning, Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness.

**CURRENT COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

All of the committee members remain in place for the Fall 2016 semester except Simran Kaur. One new member, Maurizio Santoro rejoined the committee and participated in our last meeting on May 11, 2016.

Linda Meltzer and Andrea Salis were re-elected as Co-Chairs for AY2015-2016 on May 11, 2016.

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

The committee is extremely grateful to Dean Arthur Corradetti for support, valuable suggestions. The committee also thanks Dr. Beckford for his expertise and valuable time. Dr. Beckford led a discussion that focused on the work of the General Education Task Force and provided greater insight to ongoing efforts of the Task Force. We also want to thank Provost Paul Marchese for attending our meeting and hearing our thoughts. We thank him for his continued support of our efforts

Linda Meltzer and Andrea Salis gratefully acknowledge the outstanding hard work and dedication of every member of the Committee. Andrea Salis, as Co-Chair served as an exceptional secretary, and I am very grateful.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Meltzer

Andrea Salis

2015-2016 Co-Chairs Academic Senate Committee on Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness

**QUEENSBOROUGH ACADEMIC SENATE COMMITTEE ON ASSESSMENT AND INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS  
ACADEMIC DEPARTMENT YEAR-END REPORT ASSESSMENT RUBRIC**

DEPARTMENT: \_\_\_\_\_

YEAR OF ASSESSMENT: \_\_\_\_\_

	<b>3 Exemplary</b>	<b>2 Satisfactory</b>	<b>1 Needs Improvement</b>	<b>0 None Reported</b>
<b>Assessment follow-up from previous year</b>	Evaluation of results and follow-up are clearly linked and demonstrates continuous improvement.	Evaluation of results and follow-up are clearly linked.	Evaluation of results and/or follow-up are poorly described.	
<b>Assessment data findings based on the data reported</b>	Assessment data are clearly described and linked to the Curricular Objectives and General Education Objectives.	Assessment data are clearly described.	Assessment data are poorly described.	
<b>Action Plan based on the findings reported</b>	The Action Plan clearly outlines how the assessment findings will promote continuous improvement.	The Action Plan is clearly described.	The Action Plan is poorly described.	

NUMBER OF COURSES ASSESSED:

GENERAL EDUCATION OBJECTIVES ASSESSED (LIST):

\_\_\_\_\_

CURRICULAR OBJECTIVES ASSESSED (LIST):

\_\_\_\_\_

ACCREDITATION BY EXTERNAL AGENCY (NAME):

\_\_\_\_\_

COMMENTS:

STRENGTHS:

\_\_\_\_\_

WEAKNESSES:

\_\_\_\_\_