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• What is “Closing the Loop”?  
• LaGuardia’s Approach  
• LaGuardia’s Case Study  
• Our Lessons Learned & Next Steps
Using assessment evidence to make change designed to improve student learning.

A challenging task: In Banta’s 2009 study of assessment programs at 150 colleges, only 6% demonstrated a meaningful closing the loop process.
Our Assessment Cycle

Inquiry

Classroom Implementation
Faculty test new competency-focused assignments w. students.

Gathering Evidence
Students deposit work that demonstrates learning in ePortfolio.

Integration

Faculty Development
Faculty design assignments addressing competencies in specific courses.

Designing Change
Programs use CTL mini-grants to design change processes.

Analysis & Recommendation
Faculty analyze data, identify needs and recommend changes in curriculum & pedagogy.

Reflection

Assessment of Student Work
Faculty review student work against rubrics.
A Learning College: Systematic Inquiry into Student Learning

Faculty in Programs
Read & Assess Student Work in Periodic Program Reviews
• Make changes in curriculum & pedagogy, based on findings

Faculty Collegewide
Read & Assess Student Work in Benchmark Readings
• Assess progress on core competencies across programs.

Individual Faculty
Read & Assess Student Work in Courses
• Provide developmental guidance & assessment in classes

Students examine their own learning in reflective ePortfolios
ePortfolios Support Authentic Assessment

- Students document & reflect on their learning
- Builds engagement & student success
- Helps us gather & organize artifacts for college-wide assessment process
- Grounding assessment in authentic artifacts helps faculty identify changes in pedagogy & curricula to improve student learning
Our Assessment Cycle

Faculty Development
Faculty design assignments addressing competencies in specific courses.

Classroom Implementation
Faculty test new competency-focused assignments w. students.

Gathering Evidence
Students deposit work that demonstrates learning in ePortfolio.

Assessment of Student Work
Faculty review student work against rubrics.

Designing Change
Programs use CTL mini-grants to design change processes.

Analysis & Recommendation
Faculty analyze data, identify needs, and recommend changes in curriculum & pedagogy.

Core Competency Assessment Cycle
Gathering Evidence

### Competency Grid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELN 120</th>
<th>All Competencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### STATUS KEY:
- N/A
- Waiting for Student
- Waiting for Faculty
- Complete
- Passed
- Not Passed

#### Students
- BRUNA
- BINIT
- SARA
- SELMA
- SENDY
- SABRINA
- SILKY
- JEANNE
- HUA

---
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### Assessment of Student Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Technological Literacy</td>
<td>Jan 01, 2011</td>
<td>Dec 31, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 Winter</td>
<td>Critical Literacy</td>
<td>Jan 04, 2013</td>
<td>Jan 04, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 Winter</td>
<td>Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td>Jan 04, 2013</td>
<td>Jan 04, 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Core Competencies

• 4 General Education Competencies:
  – *Critical Literacy* (includes: Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing,)
  – *Oral Communication*
  – *Quantitative Reasoning*
  – *Information and Research Literacy*

• Programmatic Competencies
  – Defined by programs and majors
  – As appropriate, defined by outside accrediting bodies
Benchmark Readings

Conducted annually since 2011

• Focus on Gen Ed Competencies: Critical Literacy, Research and Information Literacy, Quantitative Reasoning, and Oral Comm.

• Over 50 faculty have participated, full-time and adjunct, from all departments.

• Results reported to college at-large and to programs doing PPRs
Progress in Core Competencies

Making Progress Avg. Gain Across Competencies = 0.87

Scores Against Rubrics

25 or Under Credits vs. 45 or Over

Critical Literacy: 5.64 vs. 6.52
Rsch & Info Lit: 4.19 vs. 5.68
Oral Com'n: 7.44 vs. 7.58
Quant. Literacy: 6.83 vs. 7.80
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What is a Periodic Program Review?

• Programs do a PPR every 5-7 years – Focus on 3 years of intensive work
• Faculty use evidence to assess Gen Ed & Program competencies
• Faculty identify areas needing attention, develop recommendations and action plan
Our Assessment Cycle

Faculty Development
Faculty design assignments addressing competencies in specific courses.

Classroom Implementation
Faculty test new competency-focused assignments w. students.

Gathering Evidence
Students deposit work that demonstrates learning in ePortfolio.

Designing Change
Programs use CTL mini-grants to design change processes.

Core Competency Assessment Cycle

Analysis & Recommendation
Faculty analyze data, identify needs and recommend changes in curriculum & pedagogy.

Assessment of Student Work
Faculty review student work against rubrics.
# PPR calendar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT/UNIT - Degree</th>
<th>PPR LAST COMPLETED</th>
<th>Accreditation STATUS</th>
<th>Accrediting body</th>
<th>Last accreditation</th>
<th>Next accreditation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROGRAM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Technology Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting-A.S.</td>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>non-accredited</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration-A.S</td>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>non-accredited</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel, Tourism and Hospitality Mgmt-A.A.S.</td>
<td>non-accredited</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Processing Specialist-CERT</td>
<td>non-accredited</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Associate: Bilingual Child-A.A.</td>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>non-accredited</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: Childhood - AA</td>
<td>1998-1999</td>
<td>non-accredited</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Language</td>
<td>1997-1998</td>
<td>non-accredited</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>non-accredited</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Translation-A.A.</td>
<td>new 2009</td>
<td>non-accredited</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENGLISH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Program (ENG099, 101, 102, &amp; 103)</td>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>non-accredited</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing and Literature-A.A.</td>
<td>new 2007</td>
<td>non-accredited</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism Option</td>
<td>new 2011</td>
<td>non-accredited</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>new 2011</td>
<td>non-accredited</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HUMANITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Photography: Fine Arts Option</td>
<td>non-accredited</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Photography-CERT</td>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>non-accredited</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Studies-A.A</td>
<td>new 2009</td>
<td>non-accredited</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adjusting the Process

• Providing sustained, collective support
• Engagement w/ Program Directors
• Multiple follow-ups with program faculty
• CTL Mini-grants: Programs have option to apply CTL for support needed to implement change
• Link to Strategic Planning
Our Assessment Cycle

Faculty Development
Faculty design assignments addressing competencies in specific courses.

Designing Change
Programs use CTL mini-grants to design change processes.

Classroom Implementation
Faculty test new competency-focused assignments w. students.

Analysis & Recommendation
Faculty analyze data, identify needs and recommend changes in curriculum & pedagogy.

Gathering Evidence
Students deposit work that demonstrates learning in ePortfolio.

Assessment of Student Work
Faculty review student work against rubrics.
Program Directors

• Powerful group of campus leaders
• Charged w/ relating assessment process to their colleagues
• Crucial and effective because PPR focuses on the major.
• Developed grids, implementation plans, general competency assignments, and data collection
A case study: Business Administration

1) **PPR Finding:** Scores on oral communication low in accounting, business administration & other business majors.

2) **Follow-Up Action:** Using a mini-grant, faculty tested an intervention, using Communication faculty, who did classroom workshops & trained other business faculty.
3) **Action**: Evaluate the **Intervention** – Faculty assessed pre- & post-student speeches:

- Avg. score increased from 3.05 to 3.675
- 60% of students showed improvement

**Departmental Conclusion**: Intervention was effective; must be expanded to reinforce/deepen impact.
Building a “Culture of Assessment”

- **Spring 2012:** Middle States commends LaGuardia for creating “a culture of assessment,”

- **Spring 2013:** College-wide Faculty Meeting highlights the work and the recommendations of 6 programs that engaged in PPR in 2012-13.

- **2013-14:** College-wide engagement in developing new Core Competencies.
Key factors include:

• Using ePortfolio to build on authentic student work
• Faculty ownership of assessment; faculty-led assessment team; involving program directors
• Institutional Leadership
• Support Change: Mini-grants via CTL
• Inquiry, Reflection & Integration as design principles
ePortfolio initiatives can move Outcomes Assessment beyond accountability by *spotlighting* student work, *engaging* faculty and staff, and *supporting* student, faculty, and institutional learning.

In an era where higher education is increasingly asked to demonstrate and enhance what students are learning, the development of meaningful approaches to outcomes assessment is a growing priority. On C2L campuses, ePortfolio-based outcomes assessment advances student, faculty, and institutional learning.

**Campus Stories**

*Explore* the ways campus teams *link* ePortfolio and Outcomes Assessment, often a pivotal step for the scaling up of ePortfolio initiatives.

**C2L Analysis**

*Examine* how ePortfolio and authentic student work deepens General Education and programmatic Outcomes Assessment, creating a culture of learning.

**Additional Resources**

*Browse* the list of articles, presentations, and other multimedia resources related to ePortfolio-based Outcomes Assessment.
QUESTIONS?

Core Competency Assessment Cycle

- **Classroom Implementation**: Faculty test new competency-focused assignments w. students.
- **Gathering Evidence**: Students deposit work that demonstrates learning in ePortfolio.
- **Assessment of Student Work**: Faculty review student work against rubrics.
- **Analysis & Recommendation**: Faculty analyze data, identify needs and recommend changes in curriculum & pedagogy.
- **Designing Change**: Programs use CTL mini-grants to design change processes.
- **Integration**: Faculty develop assignments addressing competencies in specific courses.

Eynon & Polnariev -- CUNY CUE meeting Feb. 2014
References


• Catalyst for Learning: ePortfolio Resources and Research, http://c2l.mcnrc.org
Thank you!

- Dr. Bret Eynon, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs
  beynon@lagcc.cuny.edu

- Dr. Bernard A. Polnariev, Admin. Executive Officer
  Bpolnariev@lagcc.cuny.edu

718-482-5400
How do you ‘close the loop’?

-Talk to your neighbor:

• How far along are you at closing the loop at your campus?
• What are the challenges to closing the loop on your campus?
• What have you learned from your experience that will help you in future efforts to close the loop?
Gen Ed Outcomes Assessment
Two Complementary Structures

• **Benchmark Readings**
  College-wide readings of student work related to Gen Ed competencies

• **Periodic Program Reviews**
  Each major (program) reviewing student work related to both Gen Ed AND programmatic competencies
Our next steps...

• Rethinking competencies
  – Testing ways to measure *Integrative Learning*.

• Alignment with Student Affairs and co-curricula assessment

• Refining PPR process.

• Evaluation of assessment-based changes in curricula and pedagogy