

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

**COMMITTEE ON ASSESSMENT AND INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS**

**TO: Academic Senate Steering Committee**

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

**SUBJECT: Annual Report – Committee on Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness (Committee), 2016/2017**

**DATE: July 25, 2017**

---

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

Faculty Representatives (Name, Department)

1. Linda Meltzer, Business, Committee Co-Chairperson
2. Andrea Salis, HPED, Committee Co-Chairperson
3. Franca Ferrari-Bridgers, Speech Communication & Theatre Arts
4. Urszula Golebiewska, Biological Sciences & Geology
5. Mark Schiebe, English
6. Changiz Alizadeh, Mathematics & Computer Science
7. Georgina Colalillo, Nursing
8. Sunil Dehipawala, Physics
9. Maurizio Santoro, Foreign Languages and Literatures

Liaisons

1. Pema Yanzon, student representative
2. Faith Oyebola, student representative
3. Arthur Corradetti, President's Liaison
4. Ian Beckford, Ex-Officio

**COMMITTEE MEETINGS**

The Committee met on the following dates during AY 2016-2017:

1. October 5, 2016
2. November 16, 2016
3. December 13, 2016
4. February 1, 2017
5. March 1, 2017
6. April 5, 2017

7. May 10, 2017

### **SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE WORK**

The Committee for AY2016-2017 fulfilled its charge from the Academic Senate as follows:

1. Proposed and submitted changes to the Committee on Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness Bylaws, including the rationale for changes to Steering Committee (see Appendix A). Awaiting approval of proposed changes.
2. Dr. Emily Tai, co-Chair of the Steering Committee, attended the Committee meeting on November 16, 2016 to discuss the proposed changes to the Bylaws of the Committee. Dr. Tai made recommendations including for the Committee to develop a handbook that would guide the work of the Committee.
3. Discussed the Committee's plan to review assessments and where to locate non-teaching department year-end reports on the college's website.
4. Drafted rubric for reviewing non-teaching department's year-end reports.
5. Conducted norming sessions on assessment of expected outcomes, action plans and actual outcomes reported in non-teaching departments' year-end reports.
6. As a result of norming sessions, discussed adding a dimension to the rubric on assessment follow-up, notably reviewing prior year's "action plan."
7. Adopted a holistic rubric used to enhance review of non-teaching-department annual reports (see Appendix B).
8. Worked collaboratively to review assigned non-teaching department year-end reports. (Note: The teaching department year-end reports were last reviewed by the Committee in 2015-16.)
9. Summarized findings in table format of individual non-teaching department assessments based on assessment objectives.
10. Shared holistic rubric and individual department ratings and comments with each Division Head.
11. Developed Guide for Committee on Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness. Expect to post on Committee website in fall 2017, pending approval of proposed changes to committee charge and Committee approval.
12. Dr. Karen Steele, Vice President, Office of Strategic Planning, Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness led discussion on changes to General Education Outcomes and review of curriculum map template. These changes are designed to better guide students through their academic programs.
13. Posted to governance webpage: agenda, minutes, and annual report of the Committee.

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

Led by the expertise and guidance of Dean Arthur Corradetti and Dr. Ian Beckford, the Assessment Institute has completed its eighth semester of Institutes this spring. In SP17, 26 faculty participated, bringing a total of participating faculty to 161 since the Institute's inception.

### **REVIEW OF NON-TEACHING DEPARTMENT YEAR-END REPORTS**

Established at the end of the self-study process back in 2009, the Committee is charged with "review[ing] documents relating to assessments of institutional effectiveness from all academic and non-academic units of the College." Over a number of years, the Committee has been

reviewing the year-end reports of teaching and non-teaching departments and including its findings in the Committee’s annual report to the Senate.

As the College has begun its Middle States Self-Study process this year-and every effort should be made on an institution-wide basis to demonstrate assessment for continuous improvement, the Committee has decided to share directly with the Vice Presidents, the Committee’s findings relative to specific non-teaching department year-end reports. Similar efforts by the Committee will be implemented, notably sharing the Committee’s teaching department assessment rubric with the teaching departments. This will inform them of how we review teaching department’s assessment in their year-end reports. The review of institutional effectiveness during the self-study process is very important, and the year-end reports represent one of the primary ways in which the institution can demonstrate compliance in this area and foster a climate of assessment.

The members of the Committee reviewed 42 non-teaching department year-end reports which were posted on the College’s website under Institutional Effectiveness Reports. (Five department reports were missing.) Of the 42 reports that were reviewed, four were from 2014-15 (the latest reports posted) and 38 reports were from 2015-16. Each department was reviewed based on an assessment rubric developed by the Committee (see Appendix B). Twenty-five reports were deemed “exemplary”, 14 reports were “adequate” and 3 reports were deemed to “need improvement”. That is, approximately 93% of the reports that were reviewed were either deemed “exemplary” or “adequate” and approximately 7% of the reports “needed improvement.” Overall, these results demonstrate that as a whole, the College is successfully participating in department assessment which defines expected outcomes, addresses issues raised from the previous year and provides data analysis and an action plan for continuous improvement. See table below.

	TOTAL	EXEMPLARY	ADEQUATE	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT	MISSING	LATEST PROVIDED 2014-15
<b>NON-TEACHING DEPT. ANNUAL REPORTS</b>	47	25	14	3	5	4

The Committee has shared the rubric and specific comments for individual departments with division heads to inform them of our review. The departments are encouraged to use this rubric as a useful guide in preparing their reports.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. All current and future Committee members attend the college’s Assessment Institute.
2. Continue to review non-teaching and teaching department year-end reports.
3. Complete Committee’s guidelines for Committee members, anticipated in fall 2017.
4. Consider examining program review reports and templates for academic programs.
5. Participate in the Middle States study by meeting with Middle States Working Group 5:

Educational Effectiveness.

6. Continue to invite speakers to the Committee's meetings to stay informed of College developments (e.g. General Education Task Force where progress was made in future comparisons between lower level courses and higher level courses.)
7. Each department assign an assessment coordinator to ensure that course and program assessments are completed in accordance with a department-approved schedule and to ensure a systematic and meaningful assessment occurs.
8. Courses with high enrollment are assessed every two years.
9. Continue to develop and promote faculty workshops on assessment through CETL and the Office of Academic Affairs.

#### **CURRENT COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

The Committee welcomed three new members: Bjorn Berkhout, Whan Ki Lee, and Barbara Rome. The new members replace Changiz Alizadeh, Georgina Colalillo, and Sunil Dehipawala who have finished their term. The Committee thanked the outgoing members for their contributions and service. The remaining Committee members are: Franca Ferrari-Bridgers; Maurizio Santoro; Mark Schiebe; Urszula Golebiewska; Linda Meltzer and Andrea Salis. On May 10, 2017, Linda Meltzer and Mark Schiebe were elected as Co-Chairs for AY2016-2017.

#### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

The committee is extremely grateful to Dean Corradetti for his support and valuable guidance. The Committee also thanks Dr. Beckford for his contributions. We also wish to thank Dr. Karen Steele, Vice President for Strategic Planning, Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness for presenting on general education assessment and academic programs. Dr. Steele enlightened the Committee with the valuable work done by the General Education Task Force. Co-Chairs Meltzer and Salis gratefully acknowledge the outstanding hard work and dedication of every member of the Committee. Finally, the Committee expresses its gratitude to Dr. Salis as Co-Chair, for her invaluable work for the past two years. We are very pleased that Dr. Salis will remain a Committee member for AY2017-18.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Meltzer  
Andrea Salis

2016-2017 Co-Chairs Academic Senate Committee on Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness

**Appendix A: Proposed Changes to the Committee on Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness Bylaws**

*(Submitted via email to the Bylaws Committee January 13, 2017)*

The Committee on Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness would like to change its Bylaws Charges (as per Article VII, Section 11)

FROM:

- a. Receive and Review summary reports describing initiatives to assess student learning from academic departments, academies, and academic programs of the college;
- b. Receive and Review documents relating to assessments of institutional effectiveness from all non-academic units of the college;
- c. Make annual reports of progress in assessment of data collection, including:
  1. The receipt of assessment reports from each department/unit of the college;
  2. Courses/college units assessed from each department;
  3. Summary of Assessment data gathered from assessments;
  4. Any departmental conclusions drawn and/or actions taken as a result.
- d. Review assessment procedures the College undertakes and make recommendations concerning these assessment initiatives to the Academic Senate, in support of principles of shared governance, academic freedom and transparency.

TO:

- a. Review and evaluate summary reports describing initiatives to assess student learning from academic departments, academies, and academic programs of the college;
- b. Review and evaluate documents relating to assessments of institutional effectiveness from all non-academic units of the college;
- c. Make annual reports of progress in assessment of data collection, including:
  1. The review of assessment reports from each department/unit of the college;
  2. Courses/college units assessed from each department;
  3. Summary of Assessment data gathered from assessments;
  4. Any departmental conclusions drawn and/or actions taken as a result.
- d. Review and evaluate assessment procedures the College undertakes and make recommendations concerning these assessment initiatives to the Academic Senate, in support of principles of shared governance, academic freedom and transparency.

Rationale:

The Committee no longer needs to request to receive assessment reports since they are posted on the College website. Allowing for the review and evaluation of the department assessment reports enables the Committee to provide constructive feedback to departments to demonstrate that their assessment reports are complete and are following up on the action plan based on their findings.

**Appendix B: Holistic Rubric for Non-Teaching Department Reports**

Name of Department \_\_\_\_\_

Year of Assessment \_\_\_\_\_

3	<p><b>Exemplary:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The report lists clearly defined expected outcomes, which completely address the issues raised in the previous year’s action plan.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The data (quantitative/qualitative) analysis provides a thorough description of the results obtained and indicates how previous concerns have been fully addressed.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> An effective action plan for continuous improvement is also provided.</li> </ul>
2	<p><b>Adequate:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The report lists a series of expected outcomes, but partially addresses the issue(s) raised in the previous year’s action plan.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The data (quantitative/qualitative) analysis provides a description of the results, but outlines a partial resolution of the problems addressed.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> An action plan for continuous improvement is not fully described.</li> </ul>
1	<p><b>Needs improvement:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The report vaguely lists expected outcomes, which do not address the issue(s) raised in the previous year’s action plan.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The data (quantitative/qualitative) poorly describes the results obtained, and outlines an unclear resolution of the problems investigated.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> An Action plan for continuous improvement is not provided.</li> </ul>

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

