



DRAFT - Jan 6, 2007

**Academic
and
Institutional
Outcomes Assessment**

Arriving at one goal is the starting point to another.

John Dewey

Academic and Institutional Outcomes Assessment

Contents

York College Outcomes Assessment Timeline	3
Section 1 Background	4
Why Outcomes Assessment – Revisited	
The Foundations for Current Assessment at York	
Where We Are Now	
Section 2 Academic Outcomes Assessment	10
What Should Students Learn?	
Identifying Shared Academic Outcomes	
What Do Students Learn?	
A. Analytical Skills	
B. Academic Literacies	
Section 3 Institutional Outcomes Assessment	17
How Should the Institution Help Students Learn?	
Identifying Shared Institutional Outcomes	
How Does the Institution Help Students Learn?	
A Structural Framework for Academic and Institutional Outcomes Assessment	
Section 4 A Plan for Academic and Institutional Outcomes Assessment	22
Where We Go From Here – Summary Recommendations	
Appendix A Acknowledgements	24
Appendix B York College Mission Statement	26
Appendix C Outcomes Assessment Strategy Schematic	27
Appendix D York College Outcomes Assessment: Current and Pending	29
Appendix E York College Outcomes Assessment Plan 2006-07	37

N.B. All reports and working papers mentioned in the Academic and Institutional Assessment report are available in the Office of Academic Affairs.

York College Outcomes Assessment Timeline

Phase I **Statement of Policy and Goals for the York College Outcomes Assessment Program**
(Working Paper #1, 1995; Middle States Self-Study, 1998, Periodic Review Report, 2004; Strategic Plan, 2006)

Phase II **Identifying and Defining Shared Academic Outcomes**
(Working Paper #2, 1996, Periodic Review Report, 2004; Strategic Plan, 2006)

Identifying and Defining Shared Institutional Outcomes
(Periodic Review Report, 2004; Strategic Plan, 2006)

Fall 2006: Finalized Outcomes Assessment Report that identifies prioritized outcomes assessment goals based on the strategic plan is presented to the College Senate

Phase III **Developing Methods for Measuring Outcomes**
(Working Paper #2, 1996, Periodic Review Report, 2004, Outcomes Assessment Committee – in progress)

January 2007: Finalized means outlined through which Outcomes Assessment will be achieved and the criteria for success; this outline will include pre-existing assessment (including instruments of assessment and funding sources)

Phase IV **Implementing Ongoing Assessment Procedures**
(Outcomes Assessment Committee – in progress)

January through May: Outcomes Assessment continues across the campus in a coordinated fashion that reflects the recommendations presented in the Senate report

Phase V **Outcomes Assessment as the Means for Refining and Improving Academic Programs and Administrative Procedures**

June 2007: Initial results are used to re-evaluate stated goals and the Outcomes Assessment process

August 2007: Documentation of results to support strategic plan interventions based upon the Outcomes Assessment process; report of interventions and re-evaluated Outcomes Assessment goals

Section 1 Background

Why Outcomes Assessment – Revisited

Outcomes Assessment is a national movement begun in the late 1970s, fueled by the perceived educational crisis of the 1980s, and impelled by the demand for accountability in educational systems at all levels. The movement has generated a mixed bag of procedures and tests to evaluate the success of academic programs and administrative practices. While not all of these efforts have been constructive, there remains a demand for accountability in higher education that looks at institutional effectiveness as this is realized by student learning outcomes. Outcomes assessment follows planning and implementation in the continual development cycles that provide direction to an evolving institution.

Evaluators of all stripes – national, state, and municipal government departments, accreditation agencies, professional organizations, students and their families – demand increasing accountability as education has become a high-priced commodity. Although outside evaluators are the ones who typically generate questions of accountability and demand operationally defined assessment plans, the questions posed are ones that York College has a primary obligation to answer for itself so the College community can better understand its accomplishments and dissatisfactions as these relate to our Mission Statement and Strategic Plan. Such questions include:

*What should students learn?
How are we teaching these things?
How well are students learning them?
How does the institution support what we want our students to learn?
How well does the institution accomplish this?
How do we know?*

Being able to respond thoughtfully to questions posed by outside evaluators gives us the opportunity to look within, to consider our goals and how well we meet these goals. This aim is a central motive behind the accountability necessitated by all outcomes assessment; that is, valid assessment is the means through which we can identify and build upon our most successful efforts as well as identify those aspects of our program that require revision and improvement. The outcomes assessment process is cyclical and comprehensive within the institution, moving from the classroom to the academic programs to the administrative procedures to the President's office and back again.

Foundations for Current Assessment at York

In response to the demands of the outcomes assessment movement, York College has been working towards a self-maintaining assessment plan since 1992. The current proposal incorporates and refines previous assessment plans. It takes into consideration the

current dynamics of assessment that broadens these initial efforts by including the dimension of institutional effectiveness. The College's Mission Statement, the goals and objectives established by the Strategic Planning Committee, and the specific needs of accrediting agencies, all have an impact on the Outcomes Assessment plan.

A history of these efforts at York College as the foundation of the current plan is summarized in the following timeline:

- 1992 Reformulation of the York College Mission Statement to better reflect the academic goals of the College and the needs of its students. This revision reaffirmed the College's commitment to access and excellence and expanded the Mission Statement to include a delineation of the College's goals in terms of student outcomes.
- 1992 Presidential Task Force on Writing Proficiency appointed to evaluate analytical skills.
- 1993 Establishment of the Task Force on the Implementation of the York College Mission. The Task Force was charged with evaluating the implications of the revised Mission Statement and with developing a plan to implement it.
- 1994 The work of the Task Force on the Implementation of the York College Mission was enhanced by the establishment of two other committees, the York College Academic Program Planning Committee (YCAPP) and the York College Strategic Planning Committee. YCAPP endorsed the recommendations of this Task Force placing an emphasis College-wide on analytic and communication skills; the need to acquaint students with ways of thinking about the organization of knowledge; the need to provide students with the knowledge and skills of cross-cultural literacy; and the need to strengthen information technology within the curriculum.
- 1995 Establishment of the Outcomes Assessment Committee. The charge of the committee was twofold: One task was to review the field of outcomes assessment and develop an ideology and outline for the York College Outcomes Assessment plan in the academic programs. The second task was to identify and define specific sets of operationally defined outcomes and create a plan for evaluation.
- 1995 *Working Paper #1: Outcomes Assessment* at York was presented to the faculty at an all-day workshop. Engaging a broad constituency at the College and embracing the literature and research of outcomes assessment, a program of Underlying Philosophy and Assumptions toward assessment was formally articulated.
- 1996 Middle States Self-Study Task Force appointed.
- 1996 *Working Paper #2: Shared Academic Outcomes* presented a program of assessment that included a 5-Phase Development Plan building on the Underlying Philosophy and Assumption presented in Working Paper #1 and addressing the proposed goals and outcomes of the College Mission Statement and Strategic Plan.

- 1997 The York College Mission Statement and Strategic Plan were revised in response to the finding of the Outcomes Assessment Committee and the Middle States Self-Study Task Force in order to place a greater emphasis on a faculty-driven assessment of specific and measurable goal attainment and Student Learning Outcomes.
- 1998 Middle States Self Study Report and reaccreditation.
- 1999 *Planning for the 21st Century: York Strategic Plan, Promoting Student-Centeredness* summarized the outcomes assessment endeavors through 1999 and presented a five-year plan for the implementation and assessment of College-wide and Departmental goals.
- 2002 A newly appointed Middle States Self-Study Task Force was charged with the next phase of evaluation in preparation for the mid-term accreditation visit.
- 2003 The *Periodic Review Report* evaluated the academic programs and administrative functions of the College. The Report addressed “Suggested Activities” and “Suggested Assessment Activities” for every program and function at the College.
- 2005 Reconstitution of the York College Strategic Planning Committee to address the finding of the Period Review Report.
- 2006 Re-Charging of the York College Outcomes Assessment Committee maintaining the rigors of Student Outcomes Assessment and giving a heightened emphasis to Institutional Effectiveness.
- 2006 Establishment of the Middle States Steering Committee for the 2008 Self-Study evaluation.
- 2006 Reformulation of the York College Strategic Plan stating goals, objectives, and an institutional implementation plan that interfaces with the Outcomes Assessment plan.
- 2006 Presentation of a preliminary Shared Academic Outcomes and Institution Effective plan to the College community for discussion, evaluation, and implementation.

In 1992 and again in 1997, the York College Mission Statement was reformulated with the approval of the College Senate to reflect the new and changing demands of the global community in which the College’s academic and institutional goals together with the needs of students are better served (See Appendix B). The Mission Statement is the keystone in identifying and defining our academic and institutional goals. The Statement expresses the College’s commitment to the mission of The City University as interpreted through needs of our student-centered institution by presenting goals framed as academic and institutional outcomes. The primary mission of the College is to prepare students to:

- Succeed in a chosen discipline.
- Acquire basic knowledge in the humanities, behavioral and natural sciences and mathematics.
- Think, speak, and write, clearly, critically, and effectively.
- Develop technological literacy and skill.
- Seek objectivity and shun bias.
- Esteem research and scholarship for life-long learning.

- Understand and appreciate culture and cultural diversity.
- Value ethical attitudes and behavior.
- Promote knowledge of health and pursue wellness.
- Engage in public service.
- Enrich their communities, the nation, and the world.

Through the work of the various groups cited in the preceding timeline, the College has considered the implications of the Mission Statement, developed practices to implement it, and gathered outcomes assessment data to evaluate the success of these efforts. It is through the guidance of these working groups that a newly-appointed Outcomes Assessment Committee has taken on the responsibility for this endeavor. The recently initiated Performance Goals and Targets of the College also inform the current plan.

Where We Are Now

In Phase I of the 1996 Outcomes Assessment Plan, the Outcome Assessment Committee studied numerous outcomes assessment programs developed at other colleges with the aim of defining the scope of an outcome assessment program for York. This year-long process resulted in *Working Paper #1: Outcomes Assessment at York*, where the Underlying Philosophy and Assumptions of assessment at York are delineated as the guiding principles of the ongoing assessment process. This statement stresses the principle that all assessment must be driven by collaboration between faculty members and administrators, with faculty members and administrators determining the goals for their individual programs and the best way to measure these goals. This principle has been championed with both positive and negative results. The positive result is that all of the academic programs and administrative procedures at the College are regularly evaluated and assessed under the leadership of the faculty within the academic programs or managers who oversee the administrative offices. The negative result is that while individual faculties and managers have responded to the demands of outcomes assessment; a coordinated system of communicating these efforts to the College community has been lacking. One task of the present Outcomes Assessment Committee is to gather assessment data throughout the College and present this data to the College community in an organized way, utilizing the College website. Such an approach integrates leadership, knowledge, and skills to effectively implement assessment activities and procedures to further develop self-accountability and self-direction.

In Phase II of the original Outcomes Assessment Plan, three broad sets of outcomes were identified and defined:

- Shared Academic Outcomes
- Discipline-Specific Outcomes
- Shared Institutional Outcomes

Working Paper #2: Shared Academic Outcomes expresses the first set of outcomes: shared academic objectives central to our mission and our curriculum that are important to all disciplines. The *York Strategic Plan: Promoting Student-Centeredness* completed

in 1999 addresses the second goal by specifying how shared academic outcomes are articulated as discipline-specific outcomes, how these outcomes are measured, and how these outcomes are connected to College-wide assessment and budgeting concerns. The *Middle States Periodic Review Report* responded to all three goals by systematically evaluating College-wide academic outcomes, individual academic programs, and administrative initiatives. The *Middle States Periodic Review Report* presented “suggested assessment activities” across the College to serve as the basis for ongoing outcomes assessment. The *Middle States Periodic Review Report* concludes by establishing the criteria for reconstituting the Strategic Planning and Outcomes Assessment Committees.

In April 2006, the College Senate accepted the *Manual for Strategic Planning: A Case for Institutional Effectiveness*. This report summarizes the goals and objectives for the College in the next five-year cycle and presents a conceptual model for planning, implementation, and evaluation that provides feedback for the Outcomes Assessment Committee and its charge. The strategic goals that follow include specific objectives for achieving each goal:

1. Improve academic programs
2. Improve student recruitment and retention
3. Improve access to technology
4. Create College-wide integrated systems for technology
5. Promote the College’s core characteristics and values to enhance its image and position among all constituencies
6. Increase, manage, and allocate financial resources to support the goals and objectives for strategic planning
7. Improve the physical plant

In March 2006, the Outcome Assessment Committee was charged to complete Phase III of the assessment plan (See page 3), move toward a more systematic implementation of Phase IV, and create a plan for Phase V to firmly establish the evaluation-assessment loop. To this end, Committee members gathered the existing data and assessment procedures from around the College. The Committee had to seek answers to the following questions:

What facets of shared academic and institutional outcomes are being assessed?
Who is responsible for each facet of assessment?
How is assessment being done?
Is assessment ongoing and, if not, when did assessment of a particular dimension last occur?

The results of this work together with a summary of continued and planned assessment are reported in Appendix D: York College Outcomes Assessment: Current and Impending.

After the data gathering component, the Academic Chairs and Program Coordinators were asked to give the details of current assessment being done within their respective disciplines and to suggest types of assessment that each would like to see done. Colleagues were asked to focus their responses by using the approved goals and objectives put forward by the Strategic Planning Committee as a guide. This outreach was the first step in bringing an enhanced outcomes assessment plan to the College community. The result of these efforts are reported in Appendix E: York College Outcomes Assessment: 2006-07. This plan is the first year plan for the implementation of Outcomes Assessment in coordination with Strategic Planning as year one efforts in a three year cycle that will eventually phase in all of the stated goals of the strategic plan.

Section 2

Academic Outcomes Assessment

What Should Students Learn?

The answer to the question *What should students learn* is addressed directly in the College's Mission Statement and in the curriculum of the College. There is a latent component as well since course syllabi, classroom practices, administrative protocols, and administrative office procedures are not directly apparent to the casual observer, yet are integral to the shared academic and institutional outcomes of the College.

Working Paper #2: Shared Academic Outcomes systematically identified and defined the Criteria for Shared Academic Outcomes using the perspectives that inform the College's academic program as the foundation for establishing these criteria. It also considered the critical skills necessary to meet academic outcomes. This approach allowed the 1996 Outcomes Committee to define a set of learning goals that it believed were widely shared by the York academic community. Please refer to *Working Paper #2* for thorough definitions and explanations of these academic perspectives and critical skills.

Criteria for Shared Academic Outcomes

1. *Mastery of the defined outcome is implicit in the meaning of the baccalaureate degree.*
2. *The outcome can be defined in such a way that it does not apply solely to a single course, program, or major.*
3. *The outcome can be phrased in such a way that it will apply to as many courses and programs as possible, in as many disciplines as possible, across the curriculum.*
4. *The outcome can apply both to lower- and upper-division offerings.*
5. *The outcome is sufficiently clear and limited to permit focus and meaningful efforts to measure how well it is being achieved.*

These criteria do not stand alone; they are simultaneously evaluated and implemented with the analytical skills and academic literacies that are shaped by these criteria. Analytical skills are those overarching categories of interpretive and expressive competencies such as interpretation, analysis, critical judgment, exposition, argument, and task analysis. Academic literacies are those communicative competencies in which and through which those analytical skills are exercised and expressed such as reading, writing, oral communication, quantitative literacy, technological literacy, and information literacy. Analytical skills and academic literacies are intricately woven throughout the undergraduate curriculum both within and outside the student's major program of study.

Identifying and Achieving Shared Academic Outcomes

The aim of academic outcomes assessment at York is to improve teaching and learning by working towards a common set of desired outcomes, evaluating the ability to meet these desired outcomes, and adjusting curriculum or teaching to better achieve these outcomes. Coordinated effort has been fundamental to the learning-outcomes strategy as seen in the newly instituted response to College-wide targets and goals completed by the academic departments and programs each year. These reports permit departments to begin to set outcomes objectives, assess the progress of goals and targets, and take appropriate action as needed. This process is guided by the objectives and targets put into place for the College by The City University of New York (CUNY) and the institutional goals of the College. (These reports are in addition to the program reviews done cyclically in by programs and departments.)

The establishment of explicit College-wide goals has provided individual faculty members within the various academic programs of the College a way to design instruction so that all courses reflect the academic perspectives embedded in the York curriculum while simultaneously working toward the critical skills needed to complete the baccalaureate degree and succeed beyond the academy. These College-wide goals allow us to design instruction so that it provides common points of reference, a common vocabulary, and an articulated sequence of assignments and expectations from level to level. Since proposed a decade ago, these goals are now themselves embedded in the York curriculum. What follows is a summary of these goals together with examples of how these goals have been met.

1. **Common points of reference** refers to the shared understanding of the academic perspectives that sustain and enrich the analysis and interpretation of texts, social and political events, music, arts, and other activities and experiences.

- Every academic program now prepares a response to the University's targets and objectives established for the College. This means that the same targets and goals are seen from the unique academic perspective of each discipline.
- All new course proposals presented to the College Curriculum Committee must now include specific learning objectives stated in those terms common to the national pedagogical movements that have been successful in fostering the skills described.
- The expectation that students will pass National and University tests has brought about a uniform academic perspective to address requisite skills. Instead of idiosyncratic ideologies, specific, meaningful ideologies are now used such as those associated with "critical reading" and "quantitative reasoning." These are no longer novel perspectives; they are philosophical research-supported pedagogies.

2. A **common vocabulary** for critical skills is conveyed to students and becomes increasingly familiar to students as they move from course to course, encouraging the transfer of learning from one context to another.

- Programs such Writing Across the Curriculum and the College-wide Writing Program, have brought about a common vocabulary for writing skills so that terms such as writing enhanced and writing intensive across course offerings are understood by faculty and students.
- Pedagogical objectives such as the “spiral curriculum” and the “scaffolding” of the learning process are part of curricular ideology at the College. Careful attention has been given to the prerequisite structure so that upper division courses build on ones in the lower division and . . . A specific example of the former is the way the revised English 125 course sets the foundation for the junior-level writing course.

3. An **articulated sequence of assignments and expectations from level to level** has allowed us to clarify shared expectations of students so assignments are now devised that call on their skills and understanding in increasingly demanding contexts, creating a clearer prerequisite structure and more consistent grading practices.

- A College-wide analysis of prerequisites was carried out resulting in the reworking of all prerequisite sequences to better prepare students with the specific skills and curricular content needed for each course in a sequence.
- Many academic programs reworked their entire prerequisite and course sequencing structures to ensure that actual course numbers directly correspond to their level of difficulty or to the technical skills needed in a particular course. Thus, a 100-level course is an introductory or survey course, a 200-level course corresponds to sophomore-level skills, a 300-level course (such as the Writing 300 courses) reflects junior-level competencies, and a 400-level course generally marks the capstone experiences within a discipline.
- The junior-level College-wide Writing Program builds upon the skills gained in the lower division of the curriculum to prepare students to work in the upper division of their chosen majors. Three separate courses – Writing 301, 302, and 303 – were created for students to take a specific section of the Writing course depending on their major program of study, the needed writing skills for the major, and the style needed in a major (such as using APA versus MLA style).

What Do Students Learn?

It should be noted that the recommendations of the Presidential Task Force on Writing Proficiency have become the blueprint for inculcating both the analytic skills and academic literacies related to all areas that broadly involve reading and writing. The

revised English 125 course, a prerequisite for numerous other courses at the College, as well as the College-wide Writing Program and the Writing Across the Curriculum Program each resulted from this effort.

There is no dearth of research exploring the critical skills that are needed as students move from one educational level to the next or from an educational setting to the community. It is not hyperbole to claim that much panic has been spurred by governmental reports, academic papers, and popular books about not only which critical skills are vital, but how the mastery of these critical skills is validated. The legislation known as “No Child Left Behind” quickly became no child left untested. Long before this legislation was enacted, the matter of critical skills was tackled by York College and in *Working Paper #2: Shared Academic Outcomes* these critical skills were identified and operationally defined. Critical skills were ultimately identified along the two dimensions of analytical skills and academic literacies.

A. Analytical Skills

Analytical skills are evaluated through the interpretive skills of analysis and critical judgment, but also include the more actively defined competencies of exposition, argument, and task analysis. Although these analytical skills can be viewed as the general skills that are the primary responsibility for the faculty to develop, they are also the hardest to operationally define without settling for a reductive methodology. Consequently, assessment of the analytical skills has a broad scope at York that includes the methodologies of individual disciplines together with institutional protocols, University-wide testing, and the evaluation procedures of national and state professional organizations.

Starting before their admission to the College, all students are continuously evaluated for analytical skills. Students take a range of placement tests, are necessarily evaluated in their coursework as they complete the General Education Requirements at the College and their programs of study; and as they move toward graduation there are additional checks that demonstrate the required competencies required by the College, the University, the New York State Office of Higher Education, and, depending on the program of study, other professional organizations.

These evaluations are both quantitative and qualitative in keeping with the assumption that not all analytical skills can be assessed numerically. This is not only true in the Humanities where the capability to interpret literature or music or the fine arts is a distinctive matter; it is also true in areas as seemingly prosaic as the Bursar’s Office or the Welcome Center where the value-added measure of “student satisfaction” is open to various levels of understanding. This is one reason why outcomes assessment has been given local control to the experts in each academic or administrative area within the College.

The College-wide Writing Program was devised and established during the 1993-94 academic year resulting in curriculum proposals that were passed by the College Senate

in Spring 1994. The proposals created a choice of three Writing 300 courses to be taken dependent on a student's major program of study. Although the course objectives are the same for Writing 301, 302 and 303, the style taught to students in these courses matches the genre of their discipline. These courses are designed to expand the analytical skills gained in the lower division of the General Education Requirements and become the underpinning for advanced work in the disciplines. It was during the 1994-95 academic year that the Program began to offer courses.

It was also in the 1994-95 academic year that the deliberations of the CUNY-wide Assessment Review Committee came to a similar conclusion as the York Task Force on Mission Implementation and YCAPP stating that there was an identifiable need throughout CUNY to work on analytical skills. The Assessment Review Committee recommended an examination to focus on the intellectual skills of description, analysis, problem solving, interpretation and critical judgment. In time, the CUNY Office of Academic Affairs piloted a test that eventually became the CUNY Proficiency Examination (CPE). The CPE is a required test that students take for the first time between their 45th and 60th credit hour (or, for transfer students with 45 or more credits, during their first semester at CUNY). The CPE tests the ability to understand and respond to the kinds of reading material, data, or observations that are typically encountered in upper-division courses. Exams are read and scored by professional readers from and are evaluated across two "tasks." Task I is graded according to how well students: develop a focused response to the writing assignment; show an understanding of the readings; use specific references to the readings to support thoughts; and write in clear, correct prose. Task II is graded according to the following criteria: Accuracy, Completeness and Clarity.

B. Academic Literacies

Concern regarding academic literacies first surfaced at York in a substantive way in the 1980s. Prior to the formation of the Presidential Task Force on Writing, a survey conducted by the Ad Hoc Committee on Student Writing found serious concern about students' writing skills to be virtually unanimous among faculty members. Many added that difficulties in writing were compounded by shortcomings in reading and reasoning. Since that first assessment, there has been a systematic effort at the College to address the academic literacies of reading, writing, oral communication, and quantitative literacy. The result of lengthy cycles of outcomes assessment that include detailed planning as well as influencing policy and requirement changes is seen in two programs at the College that are now well-established in the graduation requirements for students. The first of these is the Writing 300 course requirement cited above and the second is the Writing Intensive course requirement.

The York College Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) Program is a College-wide effort to develop students' competencies in reading, critical thinking, and writing – part of a larger CUNY-wide initiative. WAC curriculum requirements for graduation were enacted by the College Senate in 2001. WAC at York is a response to an international educational movement that began to take hold in American colleges, universities, and high schools in the 1970s. In the United States, WAC emerged as a response to concerns

about students' reading and writing levels as they entered (and graduated from) college. Faculty members (and employers) complained that their students (and employees) could not read or write at the levels they expected from college students (or graduates).

The problem, it seemed, was twofold. First, people saw that students struggled to understand material they were assigned to read. Rather than actively engaging course readings, students read passively and failed to really learn from what they had read. Second, even students who performed reasonably well in high school and freshman English classes struggled to write in ways valued by teachers in history, anthropology, business management, and other disciplines. Part of the problem was practice. Freshman composition does a good job teaching students how to read critically, develop and organize ideas, synthesize sources, develop paragraphs, and follow a citation style. But these skills atrophy if they are not used beyond freshman composition. Further, multiple choice tests do not offer students an opportunity to exercise their writing skills.

It turned out while spelling, punctuation, sentence and paragraph structures are common across disciplines, other elements of good writing are not so widely shared. Citation style, paper format, rules of evidence, and conventions of organization can vary widely across disciplines.

While these perceived problems are distinct, and so require different solutions, they really are related to each other. The issue of reading comprehension, it turns out, can be addressed through writing. Writing is necessarily active. When people write about what they read, they discover what they do and don't understand. They work through problems in the readings. In other words, writing encourages people to think. This insight is an important cornerstone of a technique WAC scholars call "writing to learn," and the motivation behind low-stakes writing and the Writing Enhanced nature of courses in York College's General Education Program.

The second part of the problem, the issue of writing ability beyond freshman composition, is addressed by another element in WAC. WAC programs at colleges and universities typically specify a minimum number of "writing intensive" courses students must take. Writing intensive course requirements are a way to familiarize students with a variety of discipline-specific writing conventions. This requirement, while helping students learn to write well in their majors, also affords also them the opportunity to exercise more common or general writing skills. This element of WAC is often called "learning to write in disciplines" because students practice writing within particular disciplinary contexts. York College's Writing Intensive graduation requirement, and the high-stakes writing in courses with the Writing Intensive designation, are motivated by precisely these aims.

WAC at York is guided by the concept of a *spiral curriculum*, one in which learning in the foundational writing course is clearly articulated and then explicitly reinforced and practiced in subject-area courses, and in which this learning at lower levels is extended and reinforced within the academic disciplines throughout a student's academic career. This *spiral curriculum* helps develop the related skills of reading, writing, and thinking. Students begin with English 125 (Introduction to College Writing) and take a series of General Education courses that are all writing enhanced. Between their freshman and junior years, they take two lower division courses with a Writing Intensive designation in

any discipline they choose. In the junior year, students take a research-based writing course appropriate to their major fields of study (the Writing 300 courses). And in the senior year, students complete their final Writing Intensive course by taking an upper division Writing Intensive course in their major.

Institutionally, this *spiral curriculum* is supported by the academic departments, an interdisciplinary WAC Steering Committee, six CUNY Writing Fellows, a WAC Curriculum Committee, the Provost, and close collaboration among the English Department, the College-wide Writing Program that oversees Writing 301, 302, and 303, and the Writing Center. Since the WAC program received this broad support and includes all programs at the College, the required outcomes assessment that was part of the legislation adopted by the College Senate in 2001 provides a coordinated opportunity to evaluate the entire academic program from an extra-disciplinary perspective. This assessment is ongoing, however, current fiscal cutbacks will undermine plans for more coordinated activities.

Section 3

Institutional Effectiveness

How Should the Institution Help Students Learn?

The effectiveness of a publicly-funded institution like York College begins with its accountability to The City University of New York which, in turn, must answer to the New York State Department of Higher Education and the New York State Legislature. The sensitivity of this process is unique in higher education since ultimately it is to the people of New York City, who elect representatives to the State legislature, that York must answer. Our students and their extended families are also voters. Unlike some private institutions, the matter of how well York is run is seen in the public record. There is a transparency of conducting business that ranges from academic concerns such as curriculum proposals and grading procedures to administrative issues such as salaries and purchasing habits. Assessment by the CUNY Chancellor through performance evaluations affects the hiring of additional faculty for the academic programs equally with compensation for senior administrators in their achievement of specified targets and objectives that are re-evaluated each academic year.

Yet the aim of outcomes assessment at York in the end is the same as at every institution of higher learning, namely, to improve the quality and delivery of education to the students who have chosen to attend that institution. The academic outcomes of the College are a campus-wide responsibility, and cannot be achieved without a supportive administrative environment that is also planning, implementing and evaluating its role in the academic process. The aim of outcomes assessment at York requires the institution to show its effectiveness in supporting the goals of the Mission Statement in a way that facilitates the ability of academic programs to do the same. Appropriately there is an indissoluble linkage between Institutional Effectiveness and Academic Outcomes that relies upon operational cooperation and dependable communication. There is accountability to outside evaluators and there is accountability to each other.

The Institution has responded to student needs by supporting myriad initiatives. In some cases this has meant restructuring entire divisions of the College, such as the Office of Student Enrollment Management and Student Development so that related services are managed in a way that brings related areas under the same supervision. A second, more visible, response has been to consolidate student service areas and put them into one physical space giving students easier access to College services. Specific Centers now exist such as the Welcome Center, the Academic Advisement Center, the Writing Center, and the Computer Center. Some examples looking at the effectiveness of these centers follow below.

Identifying Shared Institutional Outcomes

As stated above, certain performance goals and targets are set for the College by CUNY. The goals are divided into three categories: Raise Academic Quality, Improve

Student Success, and Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness. There are, additionally, specific Objectives, Indicators and Targets for each goal for the academic year. The goals presented are CUNY-wide goals that reflect the holistic plan of the University at large; and individual units are now given specific goals that are tailored for each unit. So, for example, the CUNY-wide goal that states to “increase revenues from external sources” becomes a goal where York is asked to meet a specified target.

Institutional goals are often vague or broadly defined, so creating clear, operational definitions allows such goals to be translated into data that will provide feedback about the current success in achieving these goals and the need for re-evaluating stated goals. The way this has been done at York is through the identification of problems or system failures in the smooth operation of administrative functions. This has been a continuous endeavor at the College with the result that every few years there has been a re-evaluation of the essential documents that serve as the blueprint for the operation of the College. The process begins with the Mission and Vision Statements which then guide the Strategic Plan which is then evaluated in turn by the Middle States Self-Study and Periodic Review Reports. Thus, the needed feedback is available that brings planning back to the Mission Statement of the College as operationally defined.

In 2005, when the Strategic Planning Committee was reconstituted, the President highlighted four areas of focus for the strategic goals of the college: strengthening the academic programs, improving retention and recruitment, creating College-wide integrated systems for technology, advisement, information, evaluation, etc. and strengthening external relations. In the most recent strategic planning document, the *Manual for Strategic Planning Process: A Case for Institutional Effectiveness*, the Drivers for Change behind these areas of focus in the planning, assessment, and evaluation conceptual model at York are stated as:

- Improving the image of York
- Changing technology
- Changing demographics
- Changing of the workforce
- Improving quality and accountability
- Competing in the marketplace
- Balancing access and educational quality

The first phase of the Committee’s work was to generate ideas for action, through examination of the processes at other colleges and through discussion within subcommittees created to explore the four areas of focus, and to prioritize those ideas, selecting those that were the most feasible and that might have the greatest impact on the College. At every step, the Committee asked, “How does this benefit the college? How does it enhance the student experience? Who will benefit, and how?” Constituencies of the College and community were apprised of the subcommittee reports and asked for feedback. In the second phase of this work, using the feedback received, modifications were made to the plan and an outline of steps for implementing the ideas, including timelines and where responsibility for action lies, was presented.

This conceptual model breaks down planning into four components which, in turn, provided a framework for creating the overall Strategic Goals for the College as well as the specific objectives needed to achieve each goal. Outcomes assessment is addressed in the third and fourth components of the strategic plan that call for Assessment and Evaluation for Institutional Effectiveness: Division/Department Level and The Use of Assessment and Evaluation Results to Improve Institutional effectiveness: All Levels. When Component IV is completed, one is back at the start of the cycle where planning and re-evaluation occur once again.

It now becomes the task of the Outcomes Assessment Committee, working with the entire College community to evaluate how the objectives for each of the strategic goals are being achieved. This implies a process of determining how (or whether) assessment is being done to determine whether or not the College is meeting these objectives, gathering the existing data related to these objectives, and evaluating the data and assessment procedures to determine institutional effectiveness.

How Does the Institution Help Students Learn?

Institutional effectiveness requires institutional leadership, yet even in light of the challenges in this regard at York, with several Presidents since the last Middle States accreditation, there has been a sincere attempt to coordinate outcomes assessment efforts. Each President has given outcomes assessment a significant position in the planning and implementation of College goals and targets. As noted above, specific Centers now exist making outcomes assessment of Institutional effectiveness more logical in that related functions exist together rather than in a scattered way throughout the campus. This allows, for example, the administration of a satisfaction survey about a particular set of services to be done in more coordinated way that provides more reliable data.

The Welcome Center's goal is to provide a "one stop" service that is beneficial and informative for students, staff, faculty, and visitors. The Welcome Center is where dissemination of information regarding basic skills and CPE Testing, Grants and Scholarships, Admission Applications for Transfer and Incoming Freshmen, public safety as well as print materials like the *York College Bulletin*, Schedule of Classes, and graduate school guides can be gotten. This centralized approach to the sharing of information means that a potential or new student can get needed information in one location. The Welcome Center illustrates the cyclical and comprehensive nature of the outcomes assessment process within the institution described at the outset. The President's office played a direct role in establishing the Welcome Center and oversees and bears the responsibility for the work of the center taking a special interest in the professional development of the staff. The effectiveness of the Welcome Center is evaluated through assessments such as student satisfaction surveys, and values in certain direct measures such as admissions rates.

The Academic Advisement Center at York College provides supplemental advising services to students unable to see their faculty advisor, and a resource for evening students who cannot meet with advisors in their major. It also advises non-matriculated

students. Advice is given to students regarding setting realistic academic goals, stressing the necessity of continuing advisement once a major program of study is chosen, and helping students develop responsibility for decision-making regarding their overall academic program. The Academic Advisement Center works with students enabling them to formulate an academic plan focused on successful progress towards the completion of the baccalaureate degree.

Student Support Services is a comprehensive program aimed at helping students successfully complete their undergraduate degree. The mission is to help participating students stay in college and advance toward a degree in a reasonable timeframe, through an array of services and activities. As a result of these services and activities, students have been able to make such measurable improvements as passing assessment tests such as the CPE, achieving better grades, persisting in college, and advancing toward graduation faster. The effectiveness of the Academic Advisement Center and Student Support Services is seen in retention and graduation rates, the rates at which students pass basic skills and other tests, and the levels at which students perform on those national tests given in certain major programs of study.

A Structural Framework for Academic and Institutional Outcomes Assessment

As pressure for accountability in higher education increases, every institution of higher learning has had to respond with the appropriate plans, reports, and procedures to satisfy the requirements of accrediting agencies. A necessary step in implementing the work entailed in this report is to create a structural framework to support the efforts towards academic and institutional outcomes assessment. An Office of Institutional Research, and Assessment will permit a more effective utilization of resources and streamlining of planning, research, and assessment procedures and implementation. The benefits of this restructuring include:

1. The Office will simplify the process of collecting and reporting assessment data by reducing the level of bureaucracy associated with such efforts; and,
2. The Office will imbue greater meaning to activities related to academic and institutional effectiveness within the College community related to strengthening and improving its programs and services by establishing a campus culture committed to the ongoing evaluation of those programs and services through the planning, analysis, and use of assessment data evaluation efforts.
3. The Office will be a permanent home for ongoing assessment of institutional effectiveness.

The centralization of institutional planning, research, and assessment functions of a college under one leadership in a single institution-wide office is supported nationally by the scholars and consultants who specialize in matters of accountability. Many of these individuals advise the accrediting agencies of appropriate structure for these functions. By centralizing and coordinating the oversight of these functions duplication of activities

will be reduced and productivity will increase as planning, policy development, and budgetary decision-making are centrally monitored. Currently, this work is divided among offices at the College who operate independently. This often results in fragmented planning, research, and assessment efforts. Creating this entity will demand additional personnel and financial resources, but most of the needed funding is designated in the fourth component of the re-funded Title III grant. Initially the grant will provide the money and over the five-year life of the grant, the College can gradually take on the institutional responsibility for continuing this effort.

The implementation of the strategic plan goals and objectives, the CUNY future performance goals and targets, an outcomes assessment plan, and self-study recommendations will demand a centralized office of planning, research, and assessment to work effectively to meet the College-wide requirements for progress and productivity.

An Office of Institutional Research, and Assessment will provide the needed support to develop and implement the strategic planning, institutional research, and outcomes assessment functions of the College leaving the existing committees to concentrate on their theoretical charges. This will allow the College to formulate a pedagogical ideal through the analysis of data so it can work toward creating and maintaining the evidence that the College is achieving its academic and institutional goals in coordinated, cooperative way.

Section 4

A Plan for Academic and Institutional Outcomes Assessment

Where We Go From Here – Summary Recommendations

York College has a commitment to outcomes assessment as evidenced by its nearly 20-year record of planning, implementation, and reflective evaluation. There is no lack of outcomes assessment at either an ideological or functional level. What must be developed is a plan that prioritizes assessment objectives, activities, and evaluations.

The following summary recommendations are designed to ensure that the work of outcomes assessment across the campus is clearly acknowledged and afforded a central place in the day-to-day operations of the College.

1. The Outcomes Assessment Committee must remain a College-wide committee reporting to the President, or the President's designee. Its membership will be appointed by the President in cooperation with academic and administrative department heads to reflect all constituent units, programs, and departments of the College. The Chief Academic Officer will be an ex-officio member of the Committee. The chair or co-chairs will be appointed by the President and assigned three hours of Reassigned Time per academic semester as well as compensation for work performed during annual leave times as appropriate. The charge of the Committee is to develop a College-wide outcomes assessment plan, monitor the implementation of that plan, and evaluate changes to that plan as necessary. Any plan that is enacted must consider the College's Strategic Plan and the standards of accrediting agencies.
2. All outcomes assessment done at the College must be channeled through the Outcomes Assessment Committee so there is greater collaboration and coordination of assessment activities. Just as no curriculum is enacted without the approval of the Curriculum Committee and the College Senate, no outcomes assessment should be undertaken without the oversight of the Outcomes Assessment Committee and the College Senate.
3. The efforts toward outcomes assessment that are now scattered throughout the College must be centralized so that the ability to reach all constituencies and all individuals within constituencies is assured. Rather than individual units being solely responsible to conduct student experience surveys or alumni surveys, for example, oversight of this work must lie with the Outcomes Assessment Committee and be administered through an Office of Institutional Research and Assessment that will permit a more effective utilization of resources and streamlining of planning, research, and assessment procedures and implementation.

4. Authentic outcomes assessment is a shared responsibility among faculty members, staff, and members of the administration. The Committee is charged with the planning, implementation, and evaluation of an assessment plan, the Office of Academic Affairs is charged with the supervision of all support activities.
5. A parallel concern for the Committee is the protection of the attendant components of outcomes assessment, namely, data, information, and institutional knowledge with respect to accuracy, reliability, timeliness, and security. Thus, the Committee is charged with the task to oversee these matters vital to the integrity of the outcomes assessment process.
6. The work of the Outcomes Assessment Committee must be transparent and accessible to the College community and beyond. Hence, there must be a link to the York College website through the page for the Office of Academic Affairs where Committee membership, summary documents, existing data, and ongoing procedures can be readily assessed. A web presentation of outcomes assessment will permit certain genres to be presented that are omitted in written reports. Theater performances, gallery exhibitions, debates, concerts, summer camp opportunities, and athletic events and such can be virtually presented through wallpaper and links to video or music clips. It is further recommended that an institutional technology representative be a member of the Committee to serve as the liaison for this function.
7. Additionally, an Outcomes Assessment Newsletter must be developed to keep the College community informed of ongoing procedures entailed in the decision-making processes at the College. It is suggested that the newsletter is published at the midpoint of each academic semester

Appendix A

Acknowledgements

Outcomes Assessment Committee

Professors Denise Agin and Donna Chirico, co-Chairs
Acting Vice President for Academic Affairs Linda Barley, *ex officio*

Professor Aegina Barnes
Professor Robert Clovey
Professor William Divale
Professor Margarita Drago
Professor Dana Fusco
Professor Cynthia Haller
Professor Andrea Krauss
Professor Joe Malkevitch
Professor Ouida Murray
Professor Adam Profit
Professor Theresa Rooney
Professor Di Su
Professor Margaret Vendryes

Ms. Fenix Arias
Ms. Olga Dais
Mr. Patrick Gao
Professor Che-Tsao Huang
Dean Janis Jones
Dr. Paula Middleton-Lalande
Mr. Abdelhamid Kherief
Dr. Aghajan Mohammadi
Mr. Nate Moore
Assistant Vice President Cheryl Smith
Associate Dean Yvette Urquhart

It is impossible to list all of the contributors who enable the Outcomes Assessment Committee to meet its goals. Many who have been at York College in last 15 years and certainly those who are currently at the College have contributed to this work. That said, it is nonetheless important as a historical note to mention those individuals who led the various committees mentioned or who had the chief responsibility in authoring the reports cited prior to 2005. Without their energy and talents, there are no shoulders to stand upon.

- Task Force on Writing Proficiency, Professor Joan Baum, Chair
- Task Force on the Implementation of the York College Mission Statement, Professors Jo Lewis, Shirley Ostholm-Hinnau, Robert Parmet, Howard Ruttenberg, and Anita Wenden, Committee Chairs
- York College Academic Program Planning Committee, Provost Stevenson and Professors Pearl Bailey, Daisy DeFilippis, Howard McGee, Sidney Rosenberg, Howard Ruttenberg
- York College Strategic Planning Committee authors of the *York Strategic Plan: Promoting Student-Centeredness*, Provost Leo Corbie and Professor Linda Barley, Co-Chairs, 1999; Professor Helen Strassberg and Dr. Aghajan Mohammadi, Co-Chairs, 2005

- Outcomes Assessment Committee authors of Working Paper #1 and Working Paper #2 (1995-96), Provost Hubert Keen, Dr. Parvine Ghaffari and Professors Richard Bartman, Laurel Cooley, Stu Dick, Che-Tsao Huang, Carolyn Kirkpatrick, Louis Levinger, Beth Rosenthal and Anita Wenden; Professors Alan Cooper, Daisy De Filippis, and Howard Ruttenberg, Representatives on the University Assessment Review Committee
- Middle States Self Study Team (1998), Professors Elayne Feldstein and Howard McGee, Co-Chairs
- Middle States Periodic Review Team (2003), Professors Margaret Ballantyne and Elayne Feldstein, Co-Chairs
- Middle States Self-Study Team (2008), Professors Gila Aker, Margaret Ballantyne, and Tim Paglione, Co-Chairs

Appendix B

York College Mission Statement

As a senior college of The City University of New York, York College is committed to the University mission of "teaching, research, and public service" responsive to "the special needs of an urban constituency." The College is a student-centered institution whose mission is to prepare students to:

- Succeed in a chosen discipline.
- Acquire basic knowledge in the humanities, behavioral and natural sciences, and mathematics.
- Think, speak and write clearly, critically and effectively.
- Develop technological literacy and skill.
- Seek objectivity and shun bias.
- Esteem research and scholarship for life-long learning.
- Understand and appreciate culture and cultural diversity.
- Value ethical attitudes and behavior.
- Promote knowledge of health and pursue wellness.
- Enrich their communities, the nation, and the world.
- Engage in public service.

The College offers baccalaureate degrees in liberal arts and in a variety of professional programs such as accounting, business, computer studies, education, health, and social work. It maximizes each student's intellectual, professional, and personal growth by integrating studies in liberal arts and sciences, professions, knowledge of diverse cultures, and technology. It meets changing social and intellectual needs by developing undergraduate and graduate programs from its established academic strengths. The College aims to graduate students poised to meet new demands and provide leadership for human progress.

The College supports the professional growth of its faculty and staff and serves as a resource for continued advancement of the broader community. It calls upon all members of the York community to commit themselves to scholarship and learning, respect for individuals and individual differences, just and fair treatment of others, open and direct communication, ethical behavior, and involvement in the life of the College.

Appendix C

York College Outcomes Assessment Strategy: Data Collection, Data Analysis, Decision-Making, Oversight

Appendix D

York College Outcomes Assessment: Current and Impending

York College Outcomes Assessment: Current and Impending

Assessment Area	Campus Affiliation	Services Provided	Current Assessment	Notes	Continued and Planned Assessment
CUE (Coordinated Undergraduate Education Initiative)	Office of Academic Affairs	Summer Program – basic skills for freshmen and transfer students	Evaluation undertaken by Director of Academic Skills Immersion Programs, Office of Institutional Research, Assistant VP for Academic Affairs	No mention of specific method of data collection	Compare Summer Program student performance (i.e., grades, retention rates) to students not in the program
		Basic Skills Tests	General post USIP-intervention data; no pre/post data		Correlate Test performance across variables (i.e., GPA, retention rates, CPE pass rate)
CUE	Office of Academic Affairs	RETENTION INITIATIVE			
		1) Freshmen Monitoring Program	No official evaluation		Implement end-of-semester survey (CUNY protocol?)
		2) Academic Advisement Center	Student Satisfaction Survey Spring 2005; Entering Student Survey and Advisement Survey	Student Experience Survey is Student Satisfaction Survey at York; Check validity of surveys administered	Continue monitoring and comparing survey results
	Academic Advisement Center	3) Newly proposed advisement goals		Lacking computer technology; CUNY DegreeWorks proposed	Develop survey to evaluate efficacy of new procedures for students and faculty members
	Office of Institutional Research	4) Academic Achievement Center	Database tracking of students, individual/focus group interviews, student/faculty evaluation surveys		Continue current procedures and expand to include CUNY-wide protocols
CUE	Counseling Department or Academic Advisement Center	5) Mid-semester student evaluation		Teleessaging system is used to inform students about less than satisfactory evaluations; Use e-mail instead?	Continue evaluation; add follow-up component to assess value of intervention as per faculty perspective

Assessment Area	Campus Affiliation	Services Provided	Current Assessment	Notes	Continued and Planned Assessment
CUE (Coordinated Undergraduate Education Initiative)	English Department Chair	6) Writing Center	Student surveys for those enrolled in tutorial services; review of student requests for services; student observation		Create faculty questionnaire to assess consequence of using the Center's services
	Academic Advisement Center	Tutoring Services, Tutoring workshops	Office of Institutional Research tracks statistics and reports to 80 th Street, i.e., # tutored, class standing, ethnicity, etc.	Review comments of Committee report as to quality of program	Continue current assessment; Compare students across criteria before and after services (GPA, retention rates, etc.)
CUE	Gen Ed Committee	GEN ED INITIATIVE	1) Self-Study including review of college/dept mission statements 2) 3-question faculty survey	Who received the 3-question survey?	Continue assessment of Gen Ed syllabi to judge how course goals relate to mission statement goals
		1) English 125 (staffed mainly by adjuncts)	Data on pass rate etc. is available but no formal data collection mentioned	No formal monitoring of adjuncts to increase low pass rate; Coordinator for English 125 program assigned 2005-06	Monitor pass rate as it relates to other variables such as HS GPA, course load, services utilized, etc.
		2) Writing 301, 302, 303	No data collection reported	Adjunct faculty would be compensated for faculty development sessions	Create faculty survey for those courses where Writing 300 is a pre or co requisite to judge efficacy
	Writing Program Coordinator	Writing 300 courses	CUNY-mandated teaching observations; student teacher evaluations each semester;	Review Writing Program Director comments/suggestions	Create faculty survey for those courses where Writing 300 is a pre or co requisite to judge efficacy; review syllabi (as in WAC)
			Classroom student survey- not formally analyzed but "looked-over" for trends, and not distributed in 2005-6		Continue to administer survey with careful analysis of trends

Assessment Area	Campus Affiliation	Services Provided	Current Assessment	Notes	Continued and Planned Assessment
CUE (Coordinated Undergraduate Education Initiative)	Collaborated effort of Gen Ed Program and WAC (Pairing of Gen Ed course + English 125)	Learning Communities Initiative (Now ended)	Mid/end-of-semester group workshops to be scheduled to share insight and observations; Office of Institutional Research collects data on student performance in learning communities		Compare student performance across criteria (i.e., GPA, retention rates, etc.) for Learning Communities students versus those not in the program
CUE	WAC Program Coordinator, Writing in the Disciplines Coordinator, Writing in Gen Ed Coordinator, Writing Fellows Coordinator	WAC	Faculty and student surveys of Gen Ed courses; Faculty and student surveys of WI courses; End-of-semester focus group survey for WI students and instructors; New initiative: Office of Institutional Research to track student progress		Continue all on-going assessment in WAC; Use WAC procedures as a model to implement other College-wide assessment initiatives
CUE Overall Plan	1) Academic Advisement Center 2) Academic Achievement Center 3) Writing Center 4) Counseling Center 5) Testing Center		Assessment plan to substantiate effectiveness of CUE's various components; maintain records of student inquiries and types of services provided; pilot study initiated (Fall 2004) to determine effectiveness of advisement		Continue current evaluation; Centralize assessment procedures and reporting of results; Expand to include all Centers for operational efficacy

Assessment Area	Campus Affiliation	Services Provided	Current Assessment	Notes	Continued and Planned Assessment
WAC Gen ED	WAC Coordinator, WAC Gen Ed Coordinator		Faculty Survey Spring 2001, Student survey Fall 2003, Faculty survey Spring 2004, Student survey Spring 200, Faculty survey Spring 2005	No assessment AY 2001-2002; Provided sample data and sample surveys	Continue all on-going assessment in WAC; Use WAC procedures as a model to implement other College-wide assessment initiatives; Faculty focus group Spring 2006; Student focus group Fall 2006
WAC Writing in the Disciplines	WAC Coordinator, WAC Writing in the Disciplines Coordinator		Faculty survey Spring 2002, Student survey Spring 2002, WI Faculty survey Spring 2003, WI Student survey Spring 2003, WI Faculty Focus Group Spring 2004	No assessment AY 2004-2005 Provided sample data and sample surveys	Continue all on-going WAC assessment; WI Faculty Survey Spring 2006
CPE	CPE liaison and CPE Workshop Coordinator; CPE advisement/appeals in Academic Advisement Center Center; CPE Workshops in Writing Center	CPE	Student survey is distributed at CPE Workshops and reviewed by CPE Workshop Coordinator and CPE liaison; CPE database to be implemented;	Registration stop to notify students to take exam; Proposed assessment: Office of Institutional Research to develop a longitudinal study regarding curricular sequences and workshops vs. student success on exams	Develop on-line CPE tutorial, Develop and pilot on-line CPE help desk, Develop CPE registration and Appeals Form on-line, Develop comprehensive relational database to track student participation in CPE workshops; correlate variables to CPE pass rate
CPE	CPE Testing Office		Testing Office reports : Failure risk level for student cohorts, tracking of show rates and pass rates by department, tracking of CUNY/non-CUNY vs. York freshmen students	Proposed data that was not implemented: Pass rates of CPE vs. non-CPE intervention, etc.	Analyze results to pinpoint specific variables that lead to examination success

Assessment Area	Campus Affiliation	Services Provided	Current Assessment	Notes	Continued and Planned Assessment
CUE Overall Plan (Coordinated Undergraduate Education Initiative)	1) Academic Advisement Center 2) Academic Achievement Center 3) Writing Center 4) Counseling Center 5) Testing Center		Assessment plan to substantiate effectiveness of CUE's various components; maintain records of student inquiries and types of services provided; pilot study initiated in Fall 2004 to determine the effectiveness of advisement		Continue current assessment; expand to include all Centers for operational efficacy; Utilize CUNY protocols (especially those with reliability validity checks)
Faculty Demographics	CUNY System Database University Faculty Senate, Report published in Senate Digest		Data for full/part-time employees including occupation, race/ethnicity, gender, tenure status. Assessment as per CUNY Faculty Experience Survey, Spring 2005		Continue assessment of faculty demographics; Implement the CUNY faculty satisfaction survey to all faculty members
Library	Chief Librarian	General library services and information literacy classes available to York students and faculty members, York classes and the High School for the Sciences.	Data available for numerous library demographics (i.e., staffing, circulation of periodicals, reference services, interlibrary loans, information literacy classes, etc.) CUNY-wide survey (Spring 2005) related to quality of library services	Of note: Reported was an increase in circulation and reserve, and a decrease in periodical and microfilm use. Internet use was assumed to contribute to this decrease. This is a good example of how assessment can be used to alter programs and budgeting.	Continue assessment of library usage demographics; Utilize CUNY-wide assessment especially for online usage of services; Create and implement student and faculty surveys to determine which services are most utilized and which services need improvement

Assessment Area	Campus Affiliation	Services Provided	Current Assessment	Notes	Continued and Planned Assessment
Technology	Director of Academic Computing and Educational Technology	Communications Technology Major with 50 students (2006); campus-wide tech services; AC 101	No tech data submitted; Technological competency test is performed on an ad-hoc basis to waive AC 101;	No tech faculty reappointment; commented mainly about how finances were dispersed to support campus technology (tech fee); Tech fee report needed	Design and implement technological competency test ; Create data base to assess factors related to students waived from AC 101
Institutional Effectiveness	Office of the President		To comply with the 2003 PRR, several assessment practices are in progress	Many PRR 2003 items complete but data not sent	Continue current evaluation protocols; Centralize assessment procedures and reporting of results through the Outcomes Assessment Committee
			Gramm-Leach-Bliley (GLB) Information Security Program Review Report: the first assessment was performed	GLB Compliance Survey (sample received)	Continue current evaluation protocols; Centralize assessment procedures and reporting of results through the Outcomes Assessment Committee
			Annual Discrimination Investigations Report: data available on sexual harassment training for faculty and staff, # of discrimination complaints filed, etc.		Continue current evaluation protocols; Centralize assessment procedures and reporting of results through the Outcomes Assessment Committee
			Annual Report: CUNY Initiative to Foster Diversity and Pluralism on Campus	Data can be # programs per year, etc.	Continue current evaluation protocols; Centralize assessment procedures and reporting of results through the Outcomes Assessment Committee

Assessment Area	Campus Affiliation	Services Provided	Current Assessment	Notes	Continued and Planned Assessment
Institutional Effectiveness: Customer Service Issues	Office of Academic Affairs; Office of Enrollment Management and Student Development	Includes all College services (i.e., financial aid, Bursar, Registrar, etc.); Division of Student Development provides Orientation Program for freshmen and transfer students: services include financial aid, advisement, health services, counseling, and tutoring.	Student Experience Survey; Report mentions CUNY Immigration Center (located in Welcome Center) for students/community as of 4/06. Some data on use of program.	Assume some data are available. Review report: many suggestions were not implemented	Continue to access CUNY data for Student Experience; Develop and implement end-of-session surveys to evaluate student experience of specific services provided at York
Institutional Effectiveness: Strategic Plan 2005-2006					Primary goals must be isolated as agreed upon by the Outcomes Assessment Committee; Current assessment procedures need to be centralized so the relationship to primary goals is clearly evident; Any evaluation linked to primary goals that is not currently being assessed must be developed and implemented ASAP

Appendix E

York College Outcomes Assessment Plan 2006-07

Assessment objectives, as stated above, take into consideration the College's Mission and Vision Statements, the specific needs of accrediting agencies, and the "drivers for change" which have been further elaborated as the Strategic Planning Process 2005-08: Strategic Goals for Institutional Effectiveness. Given the extent of current assessment at the College and the scope of needed future assessment, it is clear that a central task for the Outcomes Assessment Committee is organization and oversight, but focusing on primary assessment objectives, those that reflect the higher-level goals and objectives must be delineating so that organization and oversight are guided by the ideological framework for outcomes assessment at the College, must be highlighted so that they are directly and plainly addressed.

Assessment Plan: Overall Concerns

ALL NEW INITIATIVES, COLLEGE-WIDE OR UNIT-BASED, MUST BE PILOTED AND TRACKED TO DETERMINE EFFECTIVENESS.

ALL NEWLY PILOTED PROGRAMS AND PROCEDURES MUST INCLUDE AN ASSESSMENT COMPONENT.

ALL ASSESSMENT EFFORTS MUST BE COORDINATED BY THE OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE IN COLLABORATION WITH THE OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND ASSESSMENT.

Strategic Goal I: Improve academic programs

Year One Assessment Plan Objectives:

1. The Academic Programs need to choose two or three of the assessment tasks primary to the department/program mission statement for implementation and evaluation. In choosing these tasks, the various documents that have set forth assessment targets should be utilized including the Periodic Review Report, the Department Self-Study, etc. department/program members will be assisted in this process by members of the Outcomes Assessment Committee.
2. Implement and evaluate the Performance Goals and Targets listed as to "complete" under the "Raise Academic Quality" heading (as assigned by the Office of Academic Affairs within the appropriate academic departments).
3. Evaluate the Winter Intersession pilot program.

Strategic Goal II: Improve student recruitment and retention

Year One Assessment Plan Objectives:

1. Administer the National Survey of Student Engagement as described by the BEAMS task force and analyze the results to help determine if there are specific factors that are evident among students who continue at the College versus those who leave.
2. Assess the effectiveness of Student Development and SEEK courses as related to number of 1st year credits completed, retention beyond 45 credits, time to graduate, and graduation rates.
3. Track students who have participated in any of the current retention-based special programs such as College Now and Learning Community courses to determine if there are differing retention rates.
4. Prepare a meta-analysis of demographic variables to determine if there are specific “red flag” criteria that are related to retention; then target students in these categories for assistance to determine if specific intervention is effective in retaining these students.

Strategic Goal III: Improve access to technology

Year One Assessment Plan Objectives:

1. Academic Outcomes – Evaluate the effectiveness of Blackboard.
2. Academic Outcomes – Evaluate the effectiveness of Podcasting.
3. Academic Outcomes – Evaluate the effectiveness of asynchronous versus hybrid versus classroom-based courses.
4. Institutional Outcomes – Evaluate student satisfaction with the redesigned College web site.
5. Institutional Outcome – Evaluate student satisfaction with access to technology on campus
6. Institutional Outcomes: As Degree Works is established, its effectiveness must be tracked together with satisfaction regarding the system among, students, faculty members and administrators.

Strategic Goal IV: Create College-wide integrated systems for technology, advisement, information, and evaluation

Year One Assessment Plan Objectives:

1. Academic Outcomes – Evaluate the effectiveness of YorkTalk, YorkForum and other campus ListServes as a means of academic communication.
2. Academic Outcomes – As College-wide advisement procedures are reconceived, this plan must be evaluated for both efficiency and satisfaction for both students and advisors.
3. Institutional Outcomes – As IT procedures and protocols are developed, evaluate their efficacy.
4. Institutional Outcomes – Create a flow chart of campus communication and process through which campus-wide announcements are distributed; then evaluate the results with respect to satisfaction as compared to current practices. This should include centralizing the College events calendar, and evaluating effectiveness of scheduling of College-wide events and determine prime hours of participation for events.

Strategic Goal V: Promote the College's core characteristics and values to enhance its image and position among all constituencies

Year One Assessment Plan Objectives:

1. Administer the Faculty, Administrator, Staff Perceptions Climate Survey to gain an overview of how the core characteristics of the College are currently perceived by those who serve the College in these capacities
2. Go through the Mission Statement point by point and indicate the specific initiatives geared toward each; then evaluate the effectiveness of achieving each goal.
3. Evaluate the public image of the College within constituencies with an emphasis on evaluating the image of the College among Black males.

Strategic Goal VI: Increase, manage, and allocate the financial resources to support the goals and objectives of strategic planning

Year One Assessment Plan Objectives:

1. Academic Outcomes – Go through the course schedule to determine which course patterns attract the greatest number of FTE's.
2. Academic Outcomes – Analyze individual course sections of courses required by each major to determine which sections attract the greatest number of FTEs (as determined by course limits), and to consolidate sections with particularly low enrollments (under 5).
3. Evaluate the effectiveness of fundraising efforts including Raisers Edge, tracking of alumni, and 40th anniversary events in of cost/benefit analysis.

Strategic Goal VII: Improve the physical plant

Year One Assessment Plan Objectives:

1. Pilot, implement, and evaluate a “Keep Our Campus Clean” campaign to increase awareness and responsibility for keeping the campus free from trash.
2. Evaluate the effectiveness of access to the College particularly as this affects faculty, staff, and students with special needs. This includes repair schedules and maintenance of elevators, escalators, ramps, gates, etc.