70:

Dean Means and Weisberg

FROM:

Carlos Hernandez

g ATE:

10/16/89

FOR YOUR INFORMATION

jersey city state college

TO:

Vice President Hernandez

Associate Vice President Carter

FROM:

Linda Lyons

SUBJECT:

COEP Consultant Reports

DATE:

October 12, 1989

At the October 11th meeting of state college COEP Liaisons, the enclosed material was distributed. The four consultant reviews of the institutional objectives that we submitted last June may be of particular interest to you. Dr. John Mikulaninec intends to distribute the consultant reviews to faculty who will attend the Senate COEP Committee meeting on Tuesday, October 17th.

Also, as was discussed at yesterday's meeting, we will be asked to administer the GIS in February, 1990 to a representative sample of 200-300 sophomores. More detailed information will be forwarded next month.

cc: Dr. John Mikulaninec

Enclosure

JERSEY CITY STATE COLLEGE

OCT 1 2 1989

ACADEMIC VICE PRESIDENT

## JERSEY CITY STATE COLLEGE

#### **GENERAL**

Jersey City State College (JCSC) has concisely stated a single goal for Community/Society impact relevant to its mission. The concept of "access" directed to a non-traditional student clientele is both important and necessary. The description of the student population is particularly good — it establishes a framework for the outcome goal and objectives to follow. Efforts are made to adhere to the organizational framework and instructions provided by COEP. However, the College has consciously chosen a path for Community/Society impact assessment that concentrates on "local" interpretation of goal and outcomes objectives, the design of assessment measures, and the evaluation of data. COEP is valued only insofar as it does not constrain the autonomy of JCSC in performing its mission in accord with unique attributes of its student population. This strategy, while admirable and appropriate given the population served by JCSC, results in problems vis-avis the organization and reporting of information.

#### **STRENGTHS**

The strength of the JCSC Community/Society impact statement rests on the description of the non-traditional student population served and the support programs designed to meet needs. The objectives related to this mission, as well as the overiding goal statement, are appropriately developed and can be viewed as a strength. On the surface, it appears that JCSC has involved multiple groups in the task of identifying outcome goals and objectives. The College has also begun to address how to best achieve stated goals and objectives related to the Community/Society mission. Considerable promise is evident in the organization for research and assessment established by JCSC. This organization should pave the way for solid assessment research on Community/Society impact goals both important to the College and the COEP Program.

#### AREAS OF CONCERN

Several areas of concern can be identified in the mission-related outcome goal and objectives articulated by JCSC. These can be categorized as follows: unclear definition of College service region, absence of information related to mission-related goals, confusion between objective and outcome indicators, absence of specified outcome indicators, and incomplete information.

- \* The <u>service region</u> identified for JCSC is broad and undefined. It is described as "urban" and reflective of a non-traditional student population. Geographic boundaries are not specified thereby posing problems in outcomes assessment. What are the target population(s) to be served? What are the geographic limits to these populations? How far do college resources and outcomes assessment methodologies stretch in terms of service region definition?
- \* The mission-related impact statement does not specify <u>outcome goals</u>. It does specify outcome objectives and, in an isolated case, outcome indicators. A gap exists between the mission statement on page one entitled "Community/Society Goal Definition" and the outcomes objectives immediately following.

- \* With one exception, <u>outcome indicators</u> that relate to and follow from the mission statement are not specified. The sole outcome indicator -- employer satisfaction -- is identified as an "objective." Community satisfaction is also identified as an indicator of college performance, but not distinguished from employer satisfaction.
- The information presented in the JCSC mission-related impact statement is incomplete. Comparison of the information requirements specified in the COEP manual and information provided by the College shows: a) missing information relative to mission-related goals, outcome indicators, and outcome assessment methodologies and b) incomplete or partial information relative to the process used to develop outcome goals and objectives. The College has a tendency to mention specific strategies and assessment plans in the document, but not to explain these strategies/plans in sufficient detail to ensure reader understanding. Instead, the reader is referred to a host of institutional support documents which contain the needed information, but which are available only upon request.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

JCSC as the "premier cooperative education institution in the State" is unique in that the methodologies it can apply to outcomes assessment will be different from those used by other colleges. This is an advantage as well as a disadvantage. Sensitivity and flexibility will be required on the part of COEP staff to the unique problems and issues that confront JCSC in outcomes assessment. At the same time, uniqueness should not be used as a wedge to avoid adherance to basic strategies to be employed in an outcomes assessment project coordinated by a state agency. The issue is outcomes assessment, not institutional autonomy. It is recommended that JCSC undertake the following steps:

- \* Define the College service region in such a way that geographical boundaries are specified which include and exclude specific population groups.
- \* Identify specific outcome goals which connect the mission statement (page 1) to outcome objectives and indicators.
- \* Identify specific outcome indicators and assessment methodologies that will be used to gauge mission-related impact. Include a full bank of information concerning these elements in the report in order to ensure reader understanding. Do not refer the reader to college documents -- include the documents with the report.
- \* Reorganize the report to adhere to the COEP format outlined in Reporting Formats for June. 1989. for Community/Society Impact Assessment. This will address the problem of missing information all of which is within the purview of the College, but simply not included in the document.

#### Jersey City State College

Jersey City State College is an urban college that has an ethnically diverse population. It views its community/society service mission as providing cooperative education services and continuing education program. The college offers extensive non-credit courses and non-credit enrichment activities.

In order to assess the impact of its community service mission. Jersey City State College already has an active economic impact study conducted every five years. In addition to this, however, it may decide that it would be very useful to collect data and information from students as they enter the non-credit courses just to get base line information about their background characteristics and their goals and aspirations. Periodically, the college may benefit from following up with students who take non-credit courses to find out how these courses and their exposure to the college has helped to enhance their lives. This is something that would be useful beyond the current study conducted by the Career Planning and Placement Office. The Career Planning and Placement Office may be most useful in helping to identify the success and progress of students who have completed the degree credit curriculum. Periodically, the college may want to continue to survey the employers not only to find out whether they are satisfied with the graduates, but also to find out the new and emerging needs that

employers have, both in the degree credit curriculum as well as the continuing education program. If the college decides to take this route, I would recommend a book published by the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education (CASE), written by Dr. Barbara McKennon.

I would encourage Jersey City State College to consider conducting satisfaction surveys of people in the non-credit curriculum and also to consider allowing them to evaluate the quality of their instruction through instruments developed for faculty evaluation. It may be useful for the college with such a large continuing education program to periodically assess the needs of the community by asking people in the community which courses they would like to take at the college or what kinds of cultural programming they would like to see the college sponsor. This is more of a needs assessment based on the opinions of the citizens in the service area.

Jersey City State College should also consider listing the geographical boundaries whether it is county or cities that encompass its service area. It might also be useful to determine how many of the present faculty members at Jersey City State College live in the service area and thereby make daily contributions to enhancing the relationship between the college and the community.



#### REPORT TO JERSEY CITY STATE COLLEGE

I have read your report and can especially appreciate how difficult it must have been for you to address the question of outcomes and assessment when you were in the midst of preparing for your Middle States visit. In spite of that, you have made some progress toward the creation of a program that is more outcome-oriented and one that lends itself more to assessment of student performance. I do have some comments to make and questions to raise, but I do understand the time constraint you faced as you prepared your report; so use my suggestions as you find them helpful.

#### General Education

The first observation I have about this section of your report is that it focuses pretty heavily on content rather than on abilities students will be able to demonstrate. In your introductory statement you say that the General Education program "introduces students to a significant range of mankind's most valuable knowledge and achievements and requires students to demonstrate their understanding of this material." While you do state that the students must demonstrate understanding, the emphasis is on the content they will be studying. I do not want to suggest that the content they study is not important, but I think you need to give some more attention to what they will be able to do with the content they study. You may even find that, as you discuss the outcomes you want the students to achieve, you will begin to re-think the content they need to study in order to achieve those outcomes. The present constellation of courses may not provide the best approach to learning if the outcomes require experiences that you don't presently offer. In other words, it might be better to begin with a wide-open discussion of outcomes and then go back to courses and content rather than figuring out which outcomes can be achieved within the present structure of subject matter.

When you do list objectives for your General Education program, you use the word "understanding" in almost every objective. This reflects the issue I mention above, but it also raises another question.

What will the students be expected to do in order to demonstrate that understanding? How will you determine whether they really "understand" or not? These questions suggest that I think you have to break down your sense of what you mean by "understanding" into more specific detail. In my own education I was asked to remember a lot of things, but I think you mean more than that; so you need to spell out what it is that you are really looking for in the student. This will help you as you determine which experiences will help them achieve that outcome, and it will help the student see what it is that he/she is supposed to be learning. And when it comes time for assessment remember that you will have to be able to observe something the student does which tells you whether he/she has achieved the outcome or not. At that point you are going to have to develop specific criteria which say what the student can actually do in order to demonstrate the ability you have in mind.

Once you have spelled out the outcomes you want students to achieve it is important then to indicate where the students will be learning for those outcomes. Which courses will be teaching for which outcomes? The faculty will need to come to some kind of agreement about who will be responsible for what or you may be requiring certain outcomes without providing the opportunities students need in order to achieve them. This can be a little more complicated if students have wide variety of choices in selecting General Education courses, but it is important to insure that students will have the learning experiences they need in order to develop the abilities you outline for them.

## Assessment in the Major

As I read through your section on outcomes in the majors, I had some questions about the descriptions from each department, so I will try to address some comments to each one. Again, use these as they are helpful.

#### Art

What is involved in "mastery?" And can you be more specific about what the "cognitive, informational, and technical abilities" are? These may be clear in your mind, but I think you need to spell them out in more detail for assessment purposes and so the students have a better sense of what is involved.

## Computer Science

What abilities do you think students need in order to be "effective and professional computer scientists?" What will they have to be able to do in order to demonstrate "understanding of professional conduct and the ethical requirements of software licensing?" Perhaps you have already dealt with these questions, but it is not clear in the report, so I thought I'd raise the questions anyway.

#### Criminal Justice

What will students have to do in order to demonstrate "understanding" of things like the nature of crime, major theories of crime causation, and the major components of the criminal justice system? I assume they will have to do more than just remember them, so what will be expected? Will they have to apply them? compare them? defend them? evaluate them? In other words, I think you need to be more specific about this at some point so that you know what you are assessing for and how to assess it. A related point is that I would try to be more specific about what you think it takes to be "successful" in transferring classroom learning to a cooperative education work experience.

#### Media Arts

How are you going to determine whether students are "independent" or not? What would they have to do to demonstrate this? What will be the measure of whether a student is "competent" and "creative" in production? I realize that this may be a little more elusive in the arts, but I assume you will have standards to use in determining the quality of student work. Perhaps you have this indicated somewhere else, but I bring it up because it is not in the report. Finally, "a sense of social purpose and standards of aesthetic judgment" is pretty vague. Will any sense of social purpose do? Are there any parameters to the aesthetic judgment you refer to? These are ticklish questions I know, but you will be faced with them if you are really planning on assessing students for these outcomes and making judgments about their competence in these areas.

## Nursing

Can you be more specific about what qualities/abilities would indicate that an RN has been "socialized" to professional education in

nursing? I certainly have a sense of what you are talking about here, but I think it would be helpful to you and your students to spell this out in more detail. I would also like to see you explore the "progress towards self-actualization" idea a little more fully as well, especially since so many nurses have encountered conflicts in this area for a variety of reasons. And how will you determine whether a student "understands" the research process in nursing? What will tell you that the students have that understanding?

## Student Development

I think you raise a very good question in this section of your report about the difficulty of determining the outcomes that will serve as a kind of standard for maturity and growth among the students. This is a very tricky business, and I think you are wise to approach it cautiously. Perhaps one thing you might do is indicate some outcomes that you would like to foster on campus but which you would not necessarily assess for. For example, you might want to make your campus a more cooperative and less competitive environment so you could list that as an outcome you hope to achieve and that you will give attention to but which you would not assess students for.

The outcomes you have identified are good in the sense that you will be able to measure them, and I encourage you to approach statements of outcomes in that way in the future. State them in a way which suggests a method of assessment which really can determine whether the outcome has been achieved or not.

The other point I would make about student development is that the classroom can be a place to help students explore the significance and meaning of their other experiences through the use of the disciplines they are studying. In this sense, one of the major goals of student development might be to help students make connections between the disciplines they are studying and the other experiences in their lives. This is a goal that could be assessed and would say a lot about the way in which students are actually using their education.

I hope my comments have been helpful to you, and I wish you the best in your future work.

Sincerely, Turnethy M. Rioden

## COLLEGE OUTCOMES EVALUATION PROGRAM

## Assessment of Institutional Plans

Institution: Jersey City State College

## Section A. General Education

- 1. Description of general education curriculum. A description of the general education curriculum is present.
- 2a. Outcome goals. There is a sentence which links general education with the phrase in the mission statement, "combining liberal arts education with career training." A set of six goals is present.
- 2b. Student learning outcomes. There is a statement of eight objectives that corresponds roughly with the six goals.
- 3. Level of involvement in developing goals. A Senate COEP Steering Committee with a subcommittee on general education was established to report to the Senate.
- 4. Planned campus assessment activities. Campus activities for 1989-90 are not mentioned.
- 5. Concerns and needed assistance. There is no mention of concerns. A preoccupation with the Middle States review is identified as a reason for some lack of achievement with respect to the COEP plan.

# COLLEGE OUTCOMES EVALUATION PROGRAM Jersey City State College

Page: 2

## Section B. The Major/Study in Depth

- 1. Description of each major. How many majors are there? Why were these five selected to report first? The criminal justice major is not described at all, nursing has a single sentence, and the other three are described in only the briefest terms.
- 2a. Outcome goals for each major. Goals statements are brief indeed -- very general in nature.
- 2b. Specific learning outcome objectives for each major. Objectives are stated in measurable terms, but are few in number for each major.
- Level of involvement in developing goals. No information is provided concerning the institutional process used to develop goals and objectives for majors.
- 4. Planned campus activities. No campus plans for the coming year are provided.
- 5. Concerns and needed assistance. No problems/concerns are identified.

## COLLEGE OUTCOMES EVALUATION PROGRAM

Jersey City State College

Page: 3

## Section C. Personal Development, Satisfaction, and Involvement of Students

1. Outcome goals (definitions and objectives)

- A. Personal development. The Senate Committee has recommended that the College <u>not assess outcomes</u> in the area of personal development.
- B. Student satisfaction.
- C. Student involvement.

  One goal and one objective are stated for each of the two areas of satisfaction and involvement.
- 2. Relationship of outcome goals to institutional mission. Student satisfaction is linked with the College mission statement on cooperative education. Student involvement is viewed as a goal only for those students who live on campus or attend full-time during the day.
- 3. Level of involvement in developing goals. A subcommittee of the Senate Steering Committee dealt with the student development goals.
- 4. Planning campus assessment activities. The section on activities for 1989-90 was omitted.
- 5. Concerns and needed assistance. This section was omitted.

# COLLEGE OUTCOMES EVALUATION PROGRAM Jersey City State College

Page: 4

### Summary Comments

#### A. Format

- 1. Is all information present? Items 4 and 5 were omitted from all sections. Item 3 was omitted for the majors.
- 2. Are mission and objectives consistent? Minimal effort was devoted to linking mission and learning outcomes.
- 3. Is the process participatory? Description of campus participation in the process was sketchy. It is impossible to tell how widespread the effort may have been. However, the statement concerning preoccupation with the Middle States review provides evidence that involvement was minimal. In addition, the typographical error in line 1 of page 1 -- indicating that planning began in Fall 1989 -- is telling. Apparently, insufficient lead time was given to insure the success of this project.
- 4. Are goals/objectives STATED assessably? The statement of goals and objectives provides evidence of minimal expenditure of energy in connection with this plan.

## B. Future assessability of goals/objectives.

No mention is made of future assessment plans. <u>Much work is yet to be</u> done simply to develop a <u>full set</u> of goals and objectives for the majors and for student development.



## State of New Jersey

## DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION

20 WEST STATE STREET CN 542

TRENTON, NEW JERSEY 06625

## COLLEGE OUTCOMES EVALUATION PROGRAM

#### **MEMORANDUM**

#### 11 October 1989

TO:

COEP Liaison

Institution:

JERSEY CITY

FROM:

Edward A. Morante, Director

College Outcomes Evaluation Program

SUBJECT:

Comments by External Consultants on Goals and Objectives from June 1989 Institutional Reports

During the Summer of 1989 we received over 2,600 pages of text and data from public colleges and universities describing their outcomes assessment activities in the broad areas of student learning/development and community/society impact. Portions of these campus reports were sent to out-of-state consultants for their review and comment. Two consultants read each institution's report on goals and objectives for general education, the major, and student development, while two additional consultants read each college's report on goals and objectives for mission-related community/society impact. Our consultants were:

## Community/Society Impact

Richard Alfred, Associate Professor, Program in Higher and Adult Continuing Education, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI

Kay McClenney, President, MC<sup>2</sup> Educational Consultants, Evergreen, CO

Michael Nettles, Vice President for Assessment, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN

## Student Learning and Development

Trudy Banta, Research Professor and Director, Center for Assessment Research and Development, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN

E. Thomas Moran, Vice President for Academic Affairs, SUNY College at Plattsburgh, Plattsburgh, NY

Raymond Phillippi, Research Associate, Center for Assessment Research and Development, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN

Gary Pike, Associate Director, Center for Assessment Research and Development, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN

Timothy Riordan, Professor and Chair, Department of Philosophy, Alverno College, Milwaukee, WI

W. Robert Sullins, Vice President for Educational and Student Services, St. Petersburg Junior College, St. Petersburg, FL

Attached you will find comments prepared specifically for your institution from the four, out-of-state consultants who reviewed your goals and objectives in the areas mentioned above. We believe that all of our consultants have done an outstanding job of providing you with insightful (and usable!) suggestions. We hope that their comments and suggestions will help you and the members of your campus committees as you proceed through the next steps of the assessment process (please refer to the 9/28/89 letter from Stan Bergen, Chair of the COEP Council, to your President for a full calendar of COEP activities during 1988-91).

Each consultant also provided COEP with an overall summary of findings based upon the 10 to 20 campus reports that she or he reviewed. In the area of Community/Society Impact, some of the global findings were:

1. Many of the goals and objectives were phrased in process rather than outcome terms (e.g., "to provide..." rather than "to increase by 20 percent..."). These statements should be refined so as to address outcomes expected rather than services to be provided.

2. Some Community/Society Impact goals were actually Student Learning goals. While overlaps exist between the different conceptual areas of COEP (e.g., student learning does affect the society at large), in terms of workload at the campus level, duplication of this sort should be avoided.

- 3. Many of the mission-related goals provided by colleges dealt with some of the "common" areas covered by COEP (e.g., access and human resource development). Again, to avoid duplication of effort at the campus level, perhaps it might be better to think of these as other mission-related outcomes.
- 4. A strength of many of the campus programs was related to the extent to which these goals and objectives were being incorporated into the ongoing planning activies of the institution. This should be encouraged.
- 5. Another strength was related to the fact that at most institutions these goals and objectives were developed by a group representing a variety of campus constituencies.

In the area of Student Learning and Development, some of the global findings were:

- 1. Generally, descriptions for the major programs were more specific and goal-oriented than those for general education.
- 2. Many institutions presented goals statements that referred to inputs or processes rather than outcomes. For example, in the areas of student satisfaction, involvement, and personal development, most institutions focused on services to be provided which would foster student development rather than on the nature of that development itself.
- 3. The area of students' personal development was apparently the most difficult for institutions to handle. Goals and objectives were not as clearly defined in this area as they were for the areas of general education and the major.
- 4. Almost all institutions indicated that there was broad involvement of the various components of the campus community in goal setting. It was suggested, however, that greater efforts be made to include students in the process of setting goals (especially in the areas of satisfaction, involvement, and personal development) because they can provide valuable insights, and because this might help to legitimize assessment efforts in the minds of other students.

- Institutions reported a variety of assessment activities planned for the coming year which include review and refinement of goals and objectives; development of plans for data collection and use; discussion of how goals and objectives are tied to the curriculum, and how findings might be tied to curriculum development; and further effort to inform faculty,
- administrators, and students about assessment.

  Most institutions expressed a need for further technical assistance and workshops to cover such topics as the writing of outcomes goals and objectives, and the development or identification of assessment methods and/or instruments.

  Institutions also expressed an interest in a more fully developed information sharing network.

Attachments

### COLLEGE OUTCOMES EVALUATION PROGRAM (COEP)

Assessment Strategies: General Education and the Major/Study in Depth

Middlesex County College The College Center Edison, New Jersey

> October 27, 1989 (8:30 - 4:00)

#### SCHEDULE

|               | <u> </u>   |
|---------------|--|
| 8:30 - 9:00   | Registration and Coffee  |
| 9:00 - 9:15   | Helcome and Opening Remarks<br>Maria Cobarrubias, Chair, Student Learning<br>and Development Committee   |
| 9:15 - 10:30  | Overview of Assessment Methods & Strategies Trudy Banta, Director, Center for Assessment Research and Development, University of Tennessee, Knoxville  |
| 10:45 - 12:00 | Topics of Concurrent Horkshop Sessions (I)   |
|               | A. GIS & the Assessment of General Education: Nade Curry, Coordinator, Division of Undergraduate Education, N.J. Department of Higher Education and Robert Kloss, Professor of English, Nilliam Paterson College of N.J. |
|               | B. Course Embedded Assessment Donald W. Farmer, Vice President and Dean for Academic Affairs, King's College, Pennsylvania   |
|               | C. Comprehensive Assessment in the Major Trudy Banta   |
|               | D. <u>Portfolio Analysis</u> Richard L. Larson. Professor of English CUNY Herbert H. Lehman College, New York  |
|               | E. Capstone Experience<br>Leona Truchan, Professor of Biology<br>Alverno College, Hisconsin  |
|               | F. External Examination Bobby Fong, Professor of English Hope College, Michigan  |
|               | G. <u>Mriting Outcome Goals &amp; Objectives</u> Lion F. Gardiner, Professor of Biology Rutgers University, New Jersey   |
| 12:15 - 1:15  | LUNCH  |

Concurrent Morkshop Sessions (II) (repeat workshops  $\lambda = G$ ).

Round Table Meetings With Presenters (Informal Small Group Discussions)

1:30 - 2:45

3:00 - 4:00