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Overview

Guttman Community College is committed to continuous improvement through sustained and systematic assessment. Assessment is a shared institutional responsibility that engages faculty, staff, administrators, and students. Guttman’s assessment work focuses on student learning, academic program, and institutional assessment as follows:

(1) Student Learning and Academic Program Assessment is guided by the Associate Dean for Assessment and Technology with support from the Assessment and Professional Development Committee. Students’ growth and development throughout their academic career at Guttman are assessed in two areas:

- Guttman Learning Outcomes (GLO)
- Periodic Program Review (PPR)

(2) Institutional Assessment is guided by the Center for College Effectiveness (CCE) through a framework known as the Systematic Approach for Guttman Effectiveness (SAGE).

Assessment Principles

- Assessment is an ongoing, recursive process
- Assessment provides engaging opportunities for learning
- Assessment focuses on improvement and learning for students, faculty, staff, and the institution
- Assessment is a shared endeavor

Assessment Framework

The design principles of Inquiry, Reflection, and Integration serve as the framework to guide Guttman’s assessment processes.

- Framing assessment as an inquiry into student or institutional learning highlights its scholarly nature, making it more engaging and rewarding. Inquiry helps stakeholders focus on questions related to learning and improvement.

- Incorporating reflection helps faculty and staff make meaning from their findings and identify recommendations for change. Reflection transforms assessment into an individual and collective learning opportunity.

- In an assessment context, integration involves “closing the loop,” applying the recommendations emerging from reflective assessment to the active process of changing pedagogy and practice, curriculum, and even institutional structure. Designing and implementing new curricula or pedagogical strategies to improve student learning is central to assessment that emphasizes integration. Integration can also address institutional structure and practice.
Using an Inquiry-Reflection-Integration framework allows Guttman to focus on assessment for learning, creating a culture of institutional learning and improvement.

**Stakeholders**

**Students** participate in the assessment process by: (1) completing assignments in the Bridge program, First Year Experience and Program of Study; (2) assessing and reflecting on their learning and achievements related to specific GLOs; (3) submitting ePortfolios for assessment; and (4) providing feedback on assessment practices via surveys, focus groups, and other means.

**Faculty** participate in the assessment process as a service to the college. Faculty participate by: (1) designing, implementing, and refining curricula and assignments that give students opportunities to demonstrate learning related to GLOs; (2) providing opportunities for students to assess and reflect on their learning in courses and programs; (3) assessing student learning related to GLOs using common rubrics developed by faculty and staff; (4) analyzing GLO assessment results and the strengths and weaknesses they reveal at the course, program, and institutional levels; and (5) providing feedback on assessment practices. Faculty participate in assessment activities during Assessment Days and in periods between Assessment Days. In addition, faculty may be invited to serve as members of GLO Assessment Teams.

**Program Coordinators** lead the academic program review process. Working with an interdisciplinary team of faculty and staff, they engage in an examination of their program of study using the process detailed below. PPR Teams work during Assessment Days and in periods between Assessment Days to complete the PPR self-study process.

**Student Engagement Staff** participate in assessment activities as part of their job functions. Staff participate by: (1) designing, implementing, and refining curricula and assignments for LaBSS 1/LaBSS 2 that gives students opportunities to demonstrate learning related to GLOs; (2) designing, implementing, and refining co-curricular activities related to GLOs; (3) assessing student learning related to GLOs using college-approved rubrics; (4) analyzing GLO assessment results and the strengths and weaknesses they reveal at the course, program, and institutional levels; and (5) providing feedback on assessment practices. Staff participate in assessment activities during Assessment Days and in periods between Assessment Days. In addition, staff may be invited to serve as members of GLO Assessment Teams.

**Unit Leaders** collaborate with the CCE on the development and completion of SAGE plans. They use SAGE as a framework to document their unit goals, practices, data collection, accomplishments, challenges, and ideas for improvement and to show how their work aligns with college goals and accreditation standards. Unit leaders and their staff members participate in Institutional Effectiveness workshops that are offered two to four times a year. They are responsible for the annual submission of SAGE plans to the CCE and for sharing their work with supervisors, as appropriate.
As an elected subset of the faculty and professional staff, the members of the **Assessment and Professional Development Committee** convene regularly. The function of the Committee is to collaborate with and provide and present consultative and technical support to the Associate Dean for Assessment & Technology related to GLO assessment and plans for professional development and assessment activities at the Assessment Days. Members of the Committee serve as chairpersons of the GLO Assessment Teams. In this role, they are responsible for ensuring that assessment activities are completed accurately and in a timely manner. GLO team chairs consult with the Associate Dean for Assessment & Technology on analyzing assessment results and preparing interim and final reports.

The **Director of the CCE** is responsible for guiding and facilitating the SAGE process. The CCE Director works with unit leaders both individually and collectively to design SAGE plans, analyze results, and prepare SAGE interim and final reports.

The **Associate Dean for Assessment and Technology** is responsible for ensuring that the GLO and academic program assessment plans are implemented fully and in a timely manner. The Associate Dean (1) collaborates with the Assessment & Professional Development Committee on designing and implementing activities for the Assessment Days, (2) consults with the chairs of the GLO Assessment Teams on designing assessment plans, analyzing assessment results, and preparing interim and final reports, and (3) works with the program coordinators throughout the periodic program review process.

The **President and Senior Administrators** provide ongoing support for the College’s academic and institutional assessment activities. They ensure that Assessment Days are included in the academic calendar and recognize faculty and staff participation in Assessment Days as important service to the College. They provide resources to support student learning, academic program, and institutional assessment activities and ensure that assessment-related professional development remains an institutional priority.
Student Learning Assessment

Background
Guttman Community College’s Learning Outcomes (GLO) encourage students to aim high and provide them with a framework for their entire educational experience, connecting school, college, work and life. These outcomes build on Lumina Foundation’s Degree Qualifications Profile and are informed by AAC&U’s LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes. They are an inclusive framework for a contemporary liberal education, defined not as a selected set of disciplines, but as a set of knowledge and skills for all aspects of life: school, work, citizenship, and social responsibility. They reflect Guttman’s mission and values.

Purpose
- To improve student learning and success
- To collaborate with all stakeholders to refine and sustain our educational model

This is accomplished by
- Assessing student work to determine how students meet our GLOs
- Reviewing faculty, student and staff survey data to determine areas of weakness
- Providing professional development based on that data
- Identifying the resources needed to meet our professional development goals
- Continually assessing our progress to determine where changes need to be made

GLO Implementation
Guttman’s faculty and staff implement GLO assessment and then, based on assessment findings, work directly with students to improve conditions for learning and success. Faculty may perform this work in a curricular manner in the courses they teach or co-curricularly through student organizational advising. Professional staff who facilitate LaBSS or work with students in co-curricular programming also use assessment findings to improve student learning.

The Associate Dean for Assessment and Technology supports faculty assessment of student work by creating, aiding, and maintaining the tools and processes of assessment. Additionally, the Dean reports the attainment of institutional learning outcomes both to internal stakeholders and to specific external audiences. Faculty and staff also rely on the Center for College Effectiveness to supplement GLO data with other relevant student data such as academic achievement, retention and persistence to graduation.

As an elected subset of the faculty and professional staff, the members of the Assessment and Professional Development Committee convene regularly. The committee’s function is to collaborate with and provide and present consultative and technical support to the Associate Dean for Assessment and Technology in plans for the professional development content and the assessment activities of Assessment Days.
The GLO Assessment Process
The Assessment plan provides for two-year cycles of assessment for each of the five GLOs. A subcommittee of the A&PD Committee coordinates assessment of each GLO. Each subcommittee is co-facilitated by two elected members of the A&PD Committee and includes additional members from among the faculty and student engagement staff. All faculty and student engagement staff participate in assessing evidence of learning. The GLO subcommittees provide input into assessment activities, analyze evidence, recommend curricular and pedagogical improvements, and coordinate professional development activities related to assessment, curriculum, and pedagogy.

During Year 1 of a specific GLO Assessment Cycle, the subcommittees gather and analyze evidence of student learning (fall semester). The A&PD Committee reviews draft findings and recommendations (spring semester). During Year 2 of its Cycle, the specific GLO subcommittee presents revised findings and recommendations to the faculty and student engagement staff (fall semester) and coordinates professional development related to curriculum and pedagogy in attainment of that GLO (spring semester).
**GLO Assessment Timeline**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1: Intellectual Skills</td>
<td>Year 2: Intellectual Skills</td>
<td>Year 1: Broad Integrative Knowledge</td>
<td>Year 2: Broad Integrative Knowledge</td>
<td>Year 1: Applied Learning</td>
<td>Year 2: Applied Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1: Specialized Knowledge</td>
<td>Year 2: Specialized Knowledge</td>
<td>Year 1: Civic Learning</td>
<td>Year 2: Civic Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assessment of Student ePortfolios**

GLO assessment focuses on evidence of student learning collected via ePortfolio at three points in a student’s career: the conclusion of Bridge; the conclusion of the First-Year Experience (FYE); and the conclusion of the Program of Study.

At the conclusion of the Bridge program, students complete a Bridge “milestone reflection” and submit their ePortfolio for assessment.

In the First Year Experience, students complete the “How Do I GLO?” section of their ePortfolio in City Seminar II. They also complete an end-of-year reflection and submit their ePortfolio for assessment upon completion of these two pieces.

In the final course in their program of study, students complete a final “How Do I GLO?” section that addresses both the GLOs and the program learning outcomes. In addition, they complete an end-of-program final reflection and submit their ePortfolio for assessment upon completion of these components.

**Assessment Days**

Faculty and student engagement staff participate in gathering evidence of learning, reviewing draft findings and recommendations from the GLO subcommittees, and improving curricula and pedagogy. Work in each of these areas takes place during the college’s 10 Assessment Days. During October and April, the Assessment Days occur over 1.5 days coinciding with Community Days. The first day is a half-day allowing faculty to spend half of the day with students at Community Days. The remaining Assessment Days are two days at the end of Fall I, at the end of Fall II, and at the end of Spring I.
An outline of the work for each set of Assessment Days is provided in the table below. GLO subcommittees will coordinate their Assessment Days activities in consultation with the Associate Dean for Assessment & Technology, the A&PD Committee, and additional staff and faculty as appropriate. Faculty and student engagement staff may engage in additional assessment work before and after the Assessment Days as necessary.

The Assessment and PD committee and the Associate Dean for Assessment and Technology maintain an Assessment Day ePortfolio that illustrates the process of “closing the loop.” The activities for/from that day are posted in the ePortfolio, along with the work that was analyzed and collected during those days. The plans for the following days and their connection to that work are also included in the ePortfolio.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GLO Assessment Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Days</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess student work from the Bridge portfolios <em>(Inquiry and Reflection)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess student work from the FYE portfolios <em>(Inquiry and Reflection)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess student work from the capstone portfolios <em>(Inquiry and Reflection)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin Analyzing Data including ePortfolios needed for PPR <em>(Inquiry and Reflection)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;PD shares findings with faculty for input and steps (draft report) <em>(Inquiry and Reflection)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Days</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and share final report <em>(Inquiry and Reflection)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development/Curriculum Redesign <em>(Reflection and Integration)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development - Assignment Design <em>(Reflection and Integration)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development/Curriculum Redesign <em>(Reflection and Integration)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Academic Program Review

Background
Periodic academic program review is mandated for all academic programs in the City University of New York (CUNY). It is also a requirement for accreditation from the Middle States Commission on Higher Education. CUNY requires that periodic program reviews include both a self-study and an external review and evaluation.

Guttman’s Periodic Program Review (PPR) process aligns with Guttman Institutional Assessment Plan. CUNY academic program review guidelines and MSCHE standards. Program faculty and advisors engage over the course of three years (see Steps and Timeline below) to evaluate the effectiveness of the program and integrate improvements based on findings.

The PPR process is guided by Guttman’s Assessment Principles:

- Assessment is an ongoing, recursive process;
- Assessment provides an engaging space for learning;
- Assessment focuses on improvement and learning for students, faculty, staff, and the institution; and
- Assessment is a shared endeavor.

Student learning is assessed at the course, program and institutional level. The steps of the PPR self-study (outlined below) are designed to assess student achievement at each of these levels and evaluate the overall effectiveness of the program.

Purpose
The purpose of the Periodic Program Review is to assess the effectiveness of learning and teaching in our Programs of Study, identify areas of improvement, and implement changes as appropriate. Using an inquiry, reflection, and integration process, a key step focuses on “closing the loop” – using findings to identify areas of improvement and implement changes to address those areas.

PPR Steps and Process
There are three main steps to the PPR process:

1) the self-study and corresponding report
2) an external review
3) implementation of improvements

1) Self-Study and Report: During the first two years of the PPR process, a team of faculty and staff, led by the Program Coordinator, conducts a self-study and create a written report based on their work. These PPR teams (discussed below) conduct a thorough examination of the program. The examination must include a direct assessment of student learning. Each student submits their ePortfolio for assessment in the final course in their Program of Study. These ePortfolios are used for the direct assessment of student work. In addition, PPR teams review a Program of Study (PoS) dataset that includes enrollment data, course pass rates, graduation rates, etc.
The self-study also includes a set of findings and recommendations based on evidence from the evaluation of student work and the PoS dataset. The Program Coordinator works with the Office of Academic Affairs to put together an action plan and timeline for integrating improvements based on those recommendations. More detail about each step of this process is found below.

2) External Review: According to Middle States accreditation guidelines and CUNY, all programs reviews must include an external reader. If your program already reports to an external accrediting body, this is sufficient. If you do not have an external accrediting body, then you must seek an external reader - someone outside of Guttman Community College. It is recommended that this reader be an existing CUNY employee. The reader is responsible for reading your final report and offering feedback and thoughts relating to transfer/employability/and learning competencies.

The Program Coordinator is responsible for identifying a reviewer in the fall of the second year of the PPR process. Many programs have used reviewers from senior colleges where our students most frequently transfer and where our programs articulate. The Office of Academic Affairs works with the PC to send the reviewer a draft of your PPR report to review as well as to invite them to an on-site visit with your program in the spring semester of Year 2.

3) Implementation of Improvements: In Year 3 of the PPR process, Program Coordinators work with OAA to implement the action plan included in the self-study document. Action plans can include improvements such as curriculum changes, hiring of additional faculty, and professional development for faculty and staff. Depending on the findings, implementation may extend beyond Year 3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPR Year</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>September</td>
<td><strong>Step 1:</strong> Establish a PPR Team</td>
<td>Section I of Self-Study Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October – November</td>
<td><strong>Step 2:</strong> Collect PoS Documents, <strong>Step 3:</strong> Reflect on Current Status of Program</td>
<td>Section II, Appendix A and B of Self-Study Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December</td>
<td><strong>Step 4:</strong> Identify POS Goals, PPR Research Questions, and Data Collection Plan</td>
<td>Section III Goals and Data Collection Plan; Columns A and B of POS Assessment Plan Table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>February - April</td>
<td><strong>Step 5:</strong> Conduct Assessment of Student Work</td>
<td>Complete dataset for analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May – June</td>
<td><strong>Step 6:</strong> Analyze Data, Identify Findings and Recommendations</td>
<td>Section IV Findings and recommendations; Columns C and D of POS Assessment Plan Table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>September – December</td>
<td><strong>Step 7:</strong> Identify External Reviewer, <strong>Step 8:</strong> Complete Draft of Self-Study Report</td>
<td>External reviewer contact information; first draft of Self-Study Sections I - IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>January</td>
<td><strong>Step 9:</strong> Submit PPR to OAA for Review and Feedback</td>
<td>Feedback on Self-Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>February</td>
<td><strong>Step 10:</strong> Revise Self-Study</td>
<td>Revised Self-Study Sections I-IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March – April</td>
<td><strong>Step 11:</strong> Send Self-Study to External Reviewer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May</td>
<td><strong>Step 12:</strong> External Reviewer Site Visit</td>
<td>Section V External Review Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June</td>
<td><strong>Step 13:</strong> Revise and Finalize Self-Study, Including Action Plan</td>
<td>Final Self-Study, including completed POS Assessment Plan Table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td><strong>Step 14:</strong> Implement Action Plan</td>
<td>Improvements to PoS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutional Assessment

Background
The Systematic Approach for Guttman Effectiveness Plan is a framework for continuous improvement. The Center for College Effectiveness guides college areas in their use of the SAGE Plan to identify goals and practices, present evidence to highlight accomplishments and challenges, and determine ways to improve. The SAGE Plan is comprehensive in aligning area goals, the college’s strategic plan goals, and accreditation standards.

Purpose
The SAGE plan streamlines multiple assessment and data collection initiatives by Guttman, CUNY, and accreditation organizations. The SAGE plan engages college areas in a commonly agreed-upon, user-friendly, useful process that focuses on reflection (by looking back at our practices and accomplishments) and direction (by looking ahead at enhancing our practices). The intention is that units will systematize data collection in support of their goals, link evidence to improvements, and have rationales for resource requests.

Benefits
• Provides an easy-to-follow template for mapping plans, practices, and performance
• Links area plans to goals and standards by Guttman, CUNY, and accreditation organizations
• Maximizes efficiency and minimizes duplication of efforts for assessment and data collection activities
• Documents activities and achievements on an ongoing basis
• Describes sufficiency of area resources
• Promotes evidence-based reflection, decisions, and problem-solving
• Creates a SAGE community of practice across college areas

SAGE Process
The SAGE Plan is a three-part process.
1. Identify Goals and Practices: Describe what the unit plans to accomplish and how it aligns with college goals.
2. Support with Evidence: Describe what information the unit will collect to demonstrate its performance.
3. Reflect and Improve: Describe accomplishments, challenges, and ideas for improvements
SAGE Implementation

Unit leaders from areas across the college work with the CCE to develop SAGE plans, as illustrated in Figure 2.

Figure 2: SAGE Implementation

SAGE is used as a framework by units that report to the Office of the President, Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, Office of the Vice President for Administration and Finance, and Office of the Dean of Strategic Planning and Institutional Effectiveness. For example:
Office of the President
• Communications
• Diversity
• Events and Alumni Relations
• Government and External Relations

Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs & Provost
• Academic Affairs
  • Information Commons
  • Office of Partnerships
• Student Engagement
  • AccessABILITY
  • Advising (SSAs/LaBSS, Career Strategist)
  • Leadership and Success
  • Mentoring and Student Success
• Single Stop
• Tutoring
• Wellness

Office of the Vice President for Administration & Finance
• Financial Business Services
  • Admissions and Access
  • Business Office
  • Financial Aid
  • Hub
• Facilities
• Registrar
• Human Resources
• Information Services
  • Center for College Effectiveness
  • Information Systems
  • Information Technology
• Public Safety

Office of the Dean of Strategic Planning and Institutional Effectiveness
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>CCE launches SAGE cycle with units at Institutional Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>workshop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Units identify goals, practices, alignment, and data collection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Units share SAGE plans with supervisors, as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September-</td>
<td>CCE works with units on an as needs basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Unit leaders attend mid-year Institutional Effectiveness meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>CCE facilitates Institutional Effectiveness workshop that focuses on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Units identify accomplishments, challenges, and improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July-August</td>
<td>Units continue to identify accomplishments, challenges, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>Units finalize annual SAGE plan and share with supervisors, as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September-</td>
<td>CCE compiles SAGE reflection reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>Supervisors/Senior Staff review, as appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Process continues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>