STANDARD V: EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS ASSESSMENT

Standard V: Educational Effectiveness Assessment

Assessment of student learning and achievement demonstrates that the institution's students have accomplished educational goals consistent with their program of study, degree level, the institution's mission, and appropriate expectations for institutions of higher education.

Introduction

This chapter addresses how LaGuardia effectively meets the Middle States Standards for Accreditation and **Requirements of Affiliation 8, 9 and 10.**

The nature of Educational Effectiveness Assessment at the College clearly is focused on the continuous improvement of the institution's Mission and its Strategic Plan Priorities. Assessment at LaGuardia provides regular feedback to faculty and programs about how students achieve their learning objectives, and therefore allows faculty and staff opportunities to strengthen learning over time. Our practice of continuous improvement with our General Education Core Competencies (GECC) and Communication Abilities (GECA), Pathways, and our Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and Periodic Program Reviews (PPRs), drives the College's Mission and Strategic Plan Priorities by providing data and evidence for the strength of our academic programs.

This chapter discusses the achievement of LaGuardia's student learning outcomes through our nationally recognized assessment culture and annual collegewide Benchmark Readings, through our focus on outcome-oriented assignment design from first-year seminar to capstone, and through the success of our grant-funded and faculty-driven professional development led by the Center for Teaching and Learning and the College-wide Assessment Leadership Team.

This chapter will also offer suggestions to further improve our educational effectiveness in line with the Intended Outcomes of the Self-Study. The College can best support continuous improvement when it advances communication by sharing assessment goals and data, and when it advances Institutional Effectiveness by publicly funding and valuing assessment activities. Finally, the practices and culture of educational effectiveness assessment can build and sustain an inclusive community through a transparent self-appraisal process that sparks evidence-based strategic plans for student success.

5.1 Clearly stated student learning outcomes at all levels at the institution and degree/program levels, which are interrelated with one another, with relevant educational experiences, and with the institution's mission

LaGuardia's Mission is to "educate and graduate one of the most diverse student populations in the country to become critical thinkers and socially responsible citizens who help to shape a rapidly evolving society." [Mission & Core Values 34] The Mission is further supported by our Core Values - Learning, Diversity, Opportunity, Responsibility, and Innovation. [Mission & Core Values 34] LaGuardia's assessment of course, program, and collegewide outcomes provide a comprehensive, faculty-driven mechanism to provide evidence of how we achieve the basic tenets of our Mission and Core Values. The LaGuardia Strategic Plan Priorities (SPP) 2019-

[2024 were](#) developed and approved by college governance in 2019. [19] The second priority, Strengthen Learning for Students, Faculty, Staff, and the College, strongly affirms LaGuardia's identity as a learning college, and anchors the College's orientation to the Criteria of Standard V. The Core Competencies ([Inquiry & Problem Solving](#), [Global Learning,](#) and [Integrative Learning)](#) and [Communication Abilities (Oral, Written, and Digital)](#) were specifically revised after our last Middle States Self-Study to meet our Mission through the development of higher order skills identified by external stakeholders and community constituents to encourage student success in employment, in transfer, and in life-long learning.

LaGuardia has clearly articulated General Education Core Competencies and Program Learning Objectives throughout its majors, programs, and certificates. In every academic program there are courses designated for assessing Gen Ed competencies and abilities that correspond to faculty-created curriculum and degree maps. The [Institutional effectiveness website](#) provides information about the process of the assessment framework. [940]

Collegewide General Education Outcomes

In part, General Education at LaGuardia falls under the purview of the CUNY-wide Pathways program, which began in 2013. This initiative drastically restructured the curriculum of all degree programs in the University, including at LaGuardia. [Pathways [General Education Requirements](#) 426, [CUNY Pathways](#) 465] CUNY Pathways ensures students are able to transfer their 60-credit Associates degrees to senior CUNY colleges. In Programmatic maps at LaGuardia both Pathways and non-Pathways courses are included. Courses are assessed according to programmatic needs. Pathways courses are not assessed separately as standalone entities. CUNY has done its own robust assessment on the Pathways initiatives and Pathways courses over the last six years. [[CUNY Pathways 6-year Evaluation Report](#) 749, [CUNY Pathways 6-year Updates 942]](#)

The structure of the 30-credit Pathways core:Required Common Core (12 credits/4 courses)

☐ English Composition (2 courses)
☐ Mathematical and Quantitative Reasoning (1 course)
☐ Life and Physical Sciences (1 course)

Flexible Common Core (18 credits / 6 courses)

☐ World Cultures and Global Issues (1 course)
☐ U.S. Experience in Its Diversity (1 course)
☐ Creative Expression (1 course)
☐ Individual and Society (1 course)
☐ Scientific World (1 course)
☐ One additional course will be taken from one of the above areas

At the College, student learning outcomes consist of the General Education Core Competencies and Communication Abilities (GECC). There are three core competencies: Inquiry and Problem Solving, Global Learning, and Integrative Learning. These competencies are expressed through three communication abilities: Written, Digital, and Oral. The three Core Competencies and two of the Communication Abilities (Written and Oral) were adapted from the Value Rubrics of the American Association of Colleges & Universities, and/or on former outcome rubrics created by the College. The College created the Digital Communication Ability through active research and campus conversations, and remains, to our knowledge, the only known digitally-based communications skill for General Education in the nation. Full definitions of the competencies and abilities can be found on the [Assessment Website.](#) Student artifacts of General Education from the courses are assessed during the annual collegewide Benchmark Readings, which

have recently been opportunities to provide additional data for specific courses from programs undergoing program review.

Administrative and Education Support units (AES units) have missions, goals, and learning outcomes that are assessed annually starting in 2018-19. [Assessment AES-Mission-Goals 680] and more comprehensively periodically (every 4-6 years) These assessments are aligned with the College's Mission and strategic plan and are used for improvements that increase student success.

Program Assessment: Program Learning Outcomes and Periodic Program Review

Since 2019-2020, there has been systematic assessment in all programs in every department to describe and communicate the specific skills, competencies, and knowledge the students will achieve as outcomes (PLOs). Programs usually have between three and five PLOs, and faculty annually assess one PLO; based on the results, they then implement actions either to sustain or improve outcomes. Assessment methods for PLOs differ in each program and may be connected to individual courses, assignments, or other program-specific measures. A list of accredited program can be found at National Center for Education Statistics. [312] and at the Institutional Effectiveness website. Prior to 2019-2020, the assessment of PLOs occurred through Periodic Program Reviews and on that timetable. Now, rather than waiting for the Periodic Program Review cycle, PLO's are assessed with more regularity to provide more information to progams about how effectively students are meeting the program goals.

Course Learning Outcomes

At the course level, faculty detail and assess student learning outcomes for each course. These are included in course proposals that Department and College Senate Curriculum Committees review and approve. In our interview with the English Department Chairperson, for example, she mentioned that courses in the English Department lists course level student outcomes on every syllabus. The department communicates these outcomes to all faculty teaching the course, and they are assessed using course level assessments.

Periodic Program Reviews (PPRs) provide occasions for reviewing and possibly revising course and program level outcomes. General Education data from annual Benchmark Readings are communicated to programs annually at Program Director meetings, although such communications could be improved by opening other channels and opportunities for sharing such data. This data may also inform PPRs and be incorporated into accompanying reports. By strengthening student learning, assessment of ILOs and PLOs connect to the College Mission of educating and graduating students by providing them with the competencies and skills they need to create new opportunities. It also connects to the College's Strategic Plan Priority of strengthening learning for students, faculty, and staff.

Syllabi Repository

Individual departments maintain and file their syllabi and list them on their website. All course proposals also contain a sample syllabus [934]. Over the past few years LaGuardia has engagedin a syallabi revision process which has ensured that student learning outcomes and assessment targets appear on syllabi. Many revisions to syllabi occur during PPRs. [48]

Curriculum Mapping

Curriculum Mapping predominantly happens at the program level. [338] Program curriculum maps consolidate course learning outcomes under various program level outcomes. [48] Many program level outcomes link to the General Education Core Competencies and Abilities.

5.2 Organized and systematic assessments evaluating student achievement of goals.

The College conducts systematic and periodic assessment of student learning outcomes to implement appropriate curricular changes. The LaGuardia Community College Assessment Website provides descriptions for all levels of academic assessment and provides publicly available benchmarking results. It communicates multiple policies, procedures, and processes that describe student learning outcomes at the institutional, program, course, and department levels, and explains their relevance to the College's Mission and Strategic Priorities.

The Standard V Working Group examined the College's Mission Statement and Strategic Plan Priorities LaGuardia's Institutional Effectiveness Plan, the CUNY Performance Management Process (particularly the annually published "PMP Data Book"), and conducted an interview with LaGuardia's Dean for Institutional Effectiveness. [34, 19, 486, 13, 15] They concluded that the College's Mission, Core Values, and Strategic Plan Priorities are embedded throughout each level of assessment, and they operate as two major signposts for our assessment practices.

Those signposts are themselves assessed periodically. LaGuardia's Mission Statement offers a stable set of foundational values and objectives, and it's evaluated every five years by President's Cabinet (formerly Executive Council). Each year, President's Cabinet reflects on the College's Strategic Plan Priorities in tandem with measurements of their objectives, as well as with CUNY's larger Performance Management Process Data Book, which includes an extensive list of "Pillars" and "Goals." [interview with Dean for IE [956]]. The Strategic Plan Priorities reflect and align with CUNY's annually updated goals and research, as well as with the goals and needs generated by the College community during its five-year strategic visioning process that took place in 2019.

The Mission Statement was developed through extensive research and in consultation with the College community by a Committee on LaGuardia's Mission commissioned by the President in 2011, and was most recently reviewed and approved by the Executive Council in 2016. [760, 948] It was further reviewed by the Mission Committee in the Middle States Periodic Review Report in 2017. [844]

5.2a Define meaningful curricular goals

Faculty define meaningful curricular goals in concert with their Program Directors and department chairpersons. This collaborative effort ensures that curricular goals are both attainable by students and meet the rigors required by each discipline. These discussions by necessity involve departmental curriculum committees and the Curriculum Committee of the College Senate and can sometimes include the Assessment Leadership Team and Program Directors. Degree maps, Curriculum maps and Program Learning Objectives provide a comprehensive view of curricular goals. Program Learning Objectives define the learning that

will happen within the program. Curriculum Maps demonstrate where within each program a learning objective is assessed and Degree Maps provide a clear student facing focus for how to progress through a degree.

5.2.b Collect and provide data about how students are prepared for careers, meaningful lives, and, where appropriate, further education

College Learning Outcomes: General Education Core Competencies and Communication Abilities

As mentioned above, the Core Competencies are Inquiry and Problem Solving, Integrative Learning and Global Learning, and the Communication Abilities are Written, Oral and Digital. [594, 593, 590, 609] These Core Competencies and Communication Abilities are integrated across the curriculum in all courses at the College. [College Senate Curriculum Handbook 608]

The General Education Core Competencies have a definitive Liberal Arts orientation, one that was carefully revised in the early 2010's to align with the AACU Values Project. In our last MSCHE Self-Study LaGuardia had identified General Education competencies as very skills based. The College used to asses Writing, Quantitative Reasoning, Information Literacy and Oral Communication. These competencies did not seem relevant to the faculty since they were very focused on skill development rather than assessing actual broad-based learning that faculty knew students were doing. After a college wide Jam, the General Education Core Competencies were revised to the ones noted above- Inquiry and Problem Solving, Integrative Learning, and Global Learning to better reflect the skills and values that students would encounter in the work force and upon transfer. Additionally, we decided to measure these competencies through specific abilities that would also be vital to students in transfer and career; therefore, each competency is measured through a communication ability -either writing, speaking, or digital. Again, these communication abilities represent the ways that students are expected to demonstrate and share knowledge through their college and career lives.

LaGuardia conducts the assessment of Core Competencies and Communication Abilities and provides ample evidence of how these assessments are used to strengthen student learning. Assessment of the competencies and abilities occurs through annual Benchmark Readings that generally occur during the Fall II semester. Teams of faculty and staff read and score student work; these teams consist of volunteers of faculty who receive minor compensation for the vital work of collegewide assessment, as well as staff and other members of the community. Based on their interests and the distribution of volunteers, faculty and staff form reading teams for each competency and ability. Members of the Assessment Leadership Team conduct norming and training sessions on the collegewide rubrics and conduct post-assessment reflection sessions. [Benchmark Reading Facilitator's Guide and Tip Sheet 604, Benchmark Reading 2020 Participant Agenda 600, Benchmark Reading 2020 Individual Reflection 602, Benchmark Reading Reflection Participant Agenda 605, Benchmark Reading Reflection Leader's Agenda 606] The College uses results from these Benchmark Readings to identify areas where student learning could be improved and disseminates these findings through Instructional Staff presentations and through Program Directors meetings [Benchmark Readings 2019 884, Benchmark Readings 2020 883].

Periodic Program Review. While Benchmark Readings allow LaGuardia to assess the broadest swarth of student learning, further focused assessment occurs at the programmatic

level. The College conducts Periodic Program Reviews (PPRs) to implement changes in student learning goals, and to address issues related to program issues beyond curriculum, such as student transfer and employment opportunities. Academic Affairs provides programs with guidelines for the PPR that are regularly updated. [PPR Guidelines 2019-2020 48, Periodic Program Review Schedule 2019-2020 661] PPRs are opportunities for program faculty to reflect on their mission, PLOs, curriculum, advisement, and assignments, and to address priorities for the program's growth and success, indeed, they are "opportunities for academic programs to study, reflect, assess, and ultimately renew their pedagogy, advisement, and curriculum. Every seven years, programs institute a five-year cycle of analysis, implementation, and reflection." [PPR Guidelines 2019-2020 48]They are also opportunities to examine data about enrollment, retention, graduation, and transfer, and to implement evidence-based actions to address issues that arise. During PPRs, Academic Affairs can also provide programs data about the student work deposited for the Core Competencies and Communication Abilities, and to discuss ways to strengthen and sustain student work in the programs. As our Assessment programs have evolved so have the guidelines for our Periodic Program Reviews. The most notable change to the actual guidelines is that there is a greater emphasis on defined Program Learning Outcomes with very specific questions to guide programs to investigate their learning outcomes. These can be found on pages 14-15 of the PPR Guidelines. Additionally, these newer guidelines make space for Program Directors to define specific assessments that would be meaningful for program related issues. The purpose of the Periodic Program review as noted in the Guidelines is to "foster a culture of learning for both students and faculty, wherein faculty use the information from assessments to revise curriculum, pedagogy, and assignments in an effort to create an even stronger learning experience for all students." [PPR Guidelines 2019-2020 48]

Until 2021, PPRs occurred over a five-year period. That process involved three stages spread across the five years: one Prep Year, one Active Year, and three Implementation Years. During the PPR process, programs receive data provided by the College's Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (IR), which the program PPR team then analyzes. IR provides data for PPR's on demographics, grades, and student success as measured by graduation and transfer. During the first and second years of the reviews, Program Directors attend a series of meetings led by representatives from the Assessment Leadership Team, and further individual consultations occur as needed. At the end of the first year, a capstone meeting occurs about the PPR plans between the PPR team, the chair, representatives from ALT, the Dean of Academic Affairs, and the Provost. In 2021, the Provost authorized PPRs to occur on a four-year schedule, followed by two break years and two options years. In part, the purpose of this innovation was to allow programs more time to conduct their annual PLO assessments.

Specialized Accreditation Review. Several programs at the College have specialized accreditation; most are in the Health Sciences Department. The Associate of Applied Science in Nursing is accredited by Accreditation Commission for Education in Nursing (ACEN) last in 2016. Its next reaccreditation is in 2024. The Occupational Therapy Assistant Program is accredited by the Accreditation Council for Occupational Therapy Education (ACOTE) of the American Occupational Therapy Association (AOTA). It was last reaccredited in 2016 and will have a reaccreditation in 2022. The Physical Therapist Assistant program is accredited by the Commission on Accreditation in Physical Therapy Education (CAPTE) and was last accredited in 2020. The Veterinary Technology Program is accredited by the American Veterinary Medical Association will have its next reaccreditation in 2024. In 2016, the Paramedic Program was accredited by the Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs (see College Navigator - CUNY LaGuardia Community College Student - Faculty Ratio Data). [312]

The Paralegal Studies Program was reapproved by the American Bar Association in 2020. Their next reapproval will be in 2027. All of these programs boast high pass rates on required licensing exams and strong placement rates for their graduates.

Student Outcomes. Preliminary data from the College's most-recent Benchmark reading cycle (Fall 2021) was positive, and continues to show improvement from one year to the next. Our last completed Benchmark Reading demonstrates that most students improve from their entry (at less than 12 credits) to their exit (more than 45 credits). There is a strange dip from mid-point to exit in Global Learning; however, this might be attributed to when students take the courses that are designated for depositing for Global Learning in their degree pursuit. [Benchmark Readings 2019 884, Benchmark Readings 2020 883]

Mean Score (Average of sum of two scores)

Deposit Year -->	Spring & Fall 2018				Spring & Fall 2019			
BR Year -->	Jan. 2019				Jan. 2020			
Credit Range -->	<=12	13-44	>=45	Average	<=12	13-44	>=45	Average
Inquiry and Problem Solving	4.01	4.46	5.10	4.56	4.60	5.07	5.47	4.92
Global Learning	3.47	3.98	4.17	4.00	3.71	4.63	4.36	4.36
Integrative Learning	3.62	3.78	4.32	3.89	3.14	3.89	4.59	3.90
Written Communication	4.91	5.39	5.62	5.35	4.92	5.48	5.77	5.35
Oral Communication	4.96	5.11	5.21	5.12	4.85	5.71	5.91	5.47
Digital Communication	3.84	4.11	4.62	4.22	3.66	4.16	4.66	4.12

The College hopes that students move towards competency in our GECC and CA's. From the chart above, there is generally movement in the average of early career artifacts to graduating artifacts.

Assessment Leadership Team (ALT). The College's Assessment Leadership Team (ALT) meets once a month, and is responsible for facilitating broad efforts to shape learning, teaching, and assessment associated with the Colleges' competencies and abilities. ALT representatives come from each department. [ALT Membership Information 772]. ALT members serve as links to programs working on Periodic Program Review, as facilitators for annual Benchmark Assessment Readings, and as liaisons to their departments to communicate assessment related events and news. Periodic Program Review results can be disseminated through ALT members to program faculty. Members of ALT support the work around the assessment PLOs and can help field questions about assessment at CTL seminars.

Assessment Leadership Team Executive Committee (ALT-EC). Since 2014, the College's Assessment Leadership Team has been led by two Faculty Co-Directors of Assessment, the Dean or Provost of Academic Affairs, and an Executive Associate of Academic Affairs. This

committee meets weekly and plans ALT meetings, Program Director meetings, and collegewide communications about assessment. They coordinate and organize the annual assessment of PLOs, and also problem-solve issues that arise from PPRs. They also occasionally consult about external grants, CTL seminars and grants, and support for ePortfolio and other technology. Over the past six or so years, they have also represented the College at CUNY Assessment Council meetings and organized presentations about assessment at national conferences and conventions.

Center for Teaching and Learning. The [Center for Teaching and Learning](#) (CTL) is equally important in supporting and sustaining assessment at the College. [29] The Center for Teaching and Learning conducts professional development seminars directly related to the assessment work at LaGuardia, such as Focus Seminars which offer sustained inquiry into a Gen Ed Core Competencies. According to the call for participants, these seminars "incorporate conversations and activities grounded in the specific Learning Matters rubric, defining practical ways to design assignments for key courses from any program at the College."

The CTL was instrumental in helping develop LaGuardia's Learning Matters Assignment Library (LMAL[),[LAML 383]](#) which was a direct outgrowth of faculty requests for examples of faculty-generated assignments that model ways of addressing clearly and concretely LaGuardia's Core Competencies and Communication Abilities and was supported by a Teagle Grant. The LMAL is framed by the idea that student artifacts that emerge from assignments intentionally aligned with the college-wide learning priorities will provide more meaningful information for improvement than other, more distant, forms of assessment. This assignment library is a unique model that has focused on the sustained development at the faculty level of assignments that are consistent with the College's GECC and CA's. According to the LMAL website, "The current contributions to the LMAL have all emerged from Center for Teaching and Learning seminars and assignment design charrettes Learning Matters Mini-Grants, and departmental assignment development workshops. Faculty [submit](#) their assignments, which include a reflective narrative that speaks directly to how the assignment aligns with the designated Core Competency and Communication Ability. The assignment is reviewed by the LMAL curator and peer, and then approved by the Department Chair/Program Director. Published assignments count as a college contribution." This robust, peer-reviewed process [Learning Matters Assignment Library Guidelines and Form 2020 683] for assignment submission speak to LaGuardia as a Learning College. Additionally, the public nature of the LMAL helps to make the work of outcomes assessment visible to the LaGuardia community through newsletters and showcases, as well as making the materials publicly available. [Nov 5 18 LMAL Showcase Agenda 657] [LMAL April 2020 Newsletters 685].

ALT also leads and organizes the Benchmark Assessment results and shares them at the institutional level, most typically during the Spring Instructional Staff meeting. These are also shared at Program Directors meetings which attempt to bring together the Program Directors for all majors and options.

Departmental Assessment Committees. Several departments such as Humanities and Natural Sciences have assessment committees consisting of faculty and they focus on the assessment of Core Competencies and Abilities, PLOs, and program readings within the department as evidenced by the [Philosophy Program PPR](#) (Humanities) and [Biology and Environmental Science 2018 PPR](#) (Natural Sciences). [47, 2] However, this is not a practice in all departments and we recognize that assessment practices are not consistent across

departments. This is somewhat rectified though, by having consistent program assessment as created through the PPR Process. Additionally, departmental assessment doesn't quite make sense within the context of LaGuardia's departmental structure since there are often between 3-10 individual programs within each department making the commonality of assessment beyond General Education and specific program learning outcomes challenging.

Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA). The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment has recently taken a larger role in the work of educational effectiveness assessment. [35] The primary role of this office in relation to Standard V in the past has been to assist programs with framing the quantitative data they provided to programs working on Periodic Program Reviews. These reviews all require that programs discuss enrollment, graduation, and student success data and programs often request other data in order to make specific points about the program. The Dean of Institutional effectiveness leads this office and supports assessment committees at the department and Collegewide levels. [940]

5.3 Consideration and use of assessment results for improvement

5.3.a Assisting students in improving their learning

The College regularly uses assessment to assist students in improving their learning. Academic Support Services are discussed in the Standard IV Chapter.

The assessment structure at LaGuardia uses strategies to engage all constituents in a meaningful process aimed at improving educational effectiveness. Student learning outcomes at the institutional, departmental, program, and course levels are designed to help students become critical thinkers and socially responsible citizens. These are related to the strategic plan priority of strengthening learning, especially to help students' build the knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed for 21st century success in education and careers.

5.3.b Improving pedagogy and curriculum

The College possesses, maintains, and implements an organized and systematic, faculty-led student learning assessment process that results in the collection of information used to demonstrate how students are achieving the stated learning outcomes. For General Education, such assessment sympathetic holistic scoring based on rubrics collectively designed and revised by committees of faculty and staff, as well as members of the Assessment Leadership Team (ALT). For Program Learning Outcomes, faculty designed and developed rubrics and other tools, and set outcome thresholds that are evaluated along with the annual assessment of PLOs.

Faculty are involved in the assessment of General Education student learning outcomes through the Core Competencies and Communication Abilities through the annual collegewide benchmark readings held in January. Faculty score artifacts and participate in a reflection about the process. The Teagle Report mentioned that around 150 faculty participated in the 2020 Benchmark Readings. [Learning Matters Project Year 2 Teagle Annual Report 595] Additionally, faculty participate in the assessment process by supporting the deposit of artifacts by students in Digication. Assignment design revisions largely occurred between 2016-2019. These artifacts are designated for the assessment of Gen Ed outcomes and used for the college-wide

benchmark readings. As noted in section 5.2.c we have seen a positive trend in the results of the College's reading data.

Faculty are also involved in the assessment of Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs). Faculty teams in many programs conduct program specific readings of student artifacts to assess PLOs. Program directors lead the PLO assessment work and submit PLO reports to Academic Affairs (AA). Periodic Program Reviews (PPRs) assess the whole program over time and are carried out by faculty teams led by the program director in annual assessments of one PLO. The college offers significant support in aiding programs in the assessment of PLO's. [Planning PLO Annual Assessment 2019-2020 663], [PLO Assessment Plan Worksheet 1 10.16/18 665], [PLO Assessment Plan Worksheet 2.12.19 664]. Data on PLO's is reported through PPR's. For example, the Early Childhood Education Program measures 6 PLO's mapped to the General Education Core Competencies. In their 2019 PPR they reported data on the PLO's and also reported how they would move to change their assessment of the PLO: "The Childhood Education Program assessedContent Knowledge (PLO3) in ELE110 (Arts in Education) via the Final Examination, Field Observation Reflection, and the Fine Arts Field Trip assignment. The Field Trip assignment also measured Integrative Learning competency and Written Communication ability. The Program measured competency in Field Experiences and Reflective Practices (PLO 4) via Field Observation Reflections, and Professional Dispositions (PLO 5) via Student Evaluations. Outcomes ranged from 77% to 92% across all assessments indicating students reached criterion and are moving in a positive direction. However, using multiple assessments across the various PLOs makes it difficult to determine exactly which PLO should be targeted for improvement. Therefore, next steps include linking one PLO to one key assessment in order to have greater clarity about PLO outcomes." [Education Program PPR 16].

In many programs, PPRs involve input and feedback from faculty in the program during the information gathering and writing stages of the report as well as during the implementation years when programs implement the actions recommended by the report. Another way faculty participate in the assessment process is through the Assessment Leadership Team (ALT).

Assessment results are used to improve pedagogy and curriculum at the College. While Benchmark Reading results are not often publicly disaggregated, through Periodic Program Review program directors often are able to compare the results of their programs in Benchmark readings to that of the college mean.

Additionally, program directors conduct qualitative assessment projects on program learning outcome through the PPR process to assess Program Learning Outcomes and other issues as descried in section 5.2.c.. The combination of these results are often used to make changes. For example, in the Biology program, the two-semester sequence of SCB 201-202 (General Biology 1 and 2) needed some assistance. Two faculty members wanted to develop two signature assessments for this program and formed this project around the GECC and CA's of Integrative Learning through Digital Communication and Global Learning through Oral Communication. Through a Mini-Grant, the faculty co-leaders developed a robust programmatic professional development experience that managed to increase the number of deposits the program had to assess, and to allow faculty space to reflect on the process and the projects that they were collecting from students. SCB 201-SCB 202 End-Year Report 2019-2020 (650). Further, a Mini-Grant (626) for ENG 259 (Technical Writing) sought to improve Global Learning demonstrated through Written Communication in an effort to help Engineering students develop a global mindset. Both of these projects resulted in shared learning now widely available

through the Learning Matters Assignment Library. Faculty at LaGuardia regularly use assessment results to improve pedagogy and curriculum.

5.3.c Reviewing and revising academic programs and support services

Assessment is used to review and revise academic programs and support services. Again, this work mainly happens when PLO or PPR assessments reveal gaps in curriculum that should be addressed.An integral part of the PPR process is doing a careful review of the program to determine if it needs any revision. These revisions can include changing curriculum or courses or developing collaborations with other programs. The assessment of PLO's may lead to curriculuar change. Faculty are deeply responsive to these discoveries and often pursue curriculum changes as soon as possible, within the confines of the bureaucracy that exists when program changes are sought. One example of this occurred with the Liberal Arts Program after its last Periodic Program Review. The last Liberal Arts Periodic Program Review discovered that Program Learning Objectives had not been modified since 2006, and that those objectives were not easily measurable through assessment programs. [43] The PPR recommended the adoption of five new Program Learning Objectives and the Liberal Arts Assessment Team has endeavored to acquaint faculty with these learning objectives, to develop rubrics for them, and to pilot rubrics to asses these revised PLOs.

All Administrative and educations support (AES) units submitted their annual 2019-20 assessment, and their executive summaries including results analysis and future initiatives are publically available in the IE website. [AES Executive Summary Assessment Reports_Final 874]

5.3.d Enhancing Professional Development

Educational effectiveness assessment has provided many opportunities for professional development among faculty. These opportunities are largely brokered through the CTL, which often is able to support funding faculty by using larger institutional grants (Title V, Teagle, etc) to support smaller faculty grants (Learning Matters and other CTL-funded grants). The large institutional grants the College receives enables the college to subgrant money directly to the faculty who are doing the work of creating and changing curriculum based on assessment outcomes. The work is made sustainable through this funding, then trickles down into departments where it reaches a large number of both full and part-time faculty who begin to engage in course-level, program level, or college-level assessment. For example, through Teagle funding the college was able to providing grants for Learning Matters Mini-grants to faculty teams. The Psychology program used a Mini-grant to work on strengthening Integrative and Global Learning in several courses through the oral and digitial communication abilities. The grant provided for workshops which all Psychology Program teaching faculty were expected to attend thus providing professional development at-scale to program faculty. [Psychology_MG_Report_2018-2019 674]

Since 2014, CTL seminars average 400 participants a year. The seminars focus on continually improving practices and on implementing high impact initiatives in line with the College's Strategic Plan Priorities (from the 2018-2019 evaluation report. [282] They include: advisement, assessment, ePortfolio, First-year initiatives, humanities alliance, scholarship of Teaching and Learning, Core Competencies, Writing in the Disciplines, and universal design. Seminars are listed on the CTL website. [29] The Assistant Dean, who the administration of the Center falls under, frequently solicits faculty feedback when deciding about seminars for the next academic year. Several seminars are faculty-led in exchange for release hours or other forms of

compensation such as professional development supply budget funds paid for from grant allocated funds.

Another source of professional development support is provided by Campus Life. They offer co-curricular and professional development learning opportunities facilitated by Campus life (e.g Project Dive, United Wounds of America, the Women's Center, to name a few). The office also funds co-curricular activities led by faculty and staff. [Campus Life Initiatives / Co-Curricular Activities 494 LaGuardia Campus Life-CoCurricular Funding 495]

Other opportunities are sponsored by the Senate Committee on Professional Development such as Stories of Diversity and Inclusion. [740, 944] Campus group such as FSOC and the SURJ host a variety of workshops, teach-in, and panels related to racial justice. [62, 53] The latter group coordinates with various stakeholders and campus groups to advance their mission and goals. [951]

5.3.e Assessment, planning, and budgeting for academic programs and services

The Standard V Working Group examined how the College uses assessment results to reinforce or re-evaluate Strategic Priorities. The colleges investment in the CTL in terms of budget and staff, as well as in the training of students for work as peer mentors and STMs are the result of assessment results. The Center for Teaching and Learning supports the Strategic Plan Priority of strengthening learning for students and faculty by providing faculty with multi-faceted opportunities related to assessment, including through "Learning Matters Mini-Grants," Learning Matters LaGuardia Teagle Proposal, and "Closing the Loop Mini-grants" 2018-2019 CTL Evaluation. [42, 645, 282]. The Closing the Loop Mini-grants were specifically aimed at helping programs implement a recommendation from their PPR recommendations while the Learning Matters Mini-grants served to enhance program work within General Education and PLO assessment. At Fall 2020 Opening Sessions, the College hosted an online Jam where faculty and staff advised the College's strategic goals and learning priorities *(*2019-2024 Strategic Plan Goals and Objectives, including a specific sub-goal related to assessment. [19] Many CTL seminars specifically require faculty to create assignments which assess a competency or a PLO.

5.3.f Informing Constituents

Results about General Education assessment are disseminated at Program Director meetings, Instructional Staff meetings, (twice a year) and Benchmark Reading reflection sessions, (annually) as well as through Periodic Program Reviews; they are sometimes disseminated at the department level, although practices and norms vary. Benchmark results appear in the assessment website, and are also used as strategic plan measures, and their progress in monitored and published annually

There seems to be a breakdown in the communication after Program Directors receive assessment results. There is not a clear chain of dissemination from that point. This speaks to a question about what role Departmental Chairs have in terms of sharing information about programmatic assessment with all constituents in a department, rather than only having that information shared within specific departmental programs, as noted in the Middle States Academic Chairs Survey. [868]

Assessment information, such as the definitions of the GECC and CA's, benchmarks reading data, and rubrics ar publicly and internally available on the College's Assessment Website (26) and the newly developed Institutional Effectiveness Website from Institutional Research.

5.3.g Improving Key Indicators of Student Success

Student Retention, graduation, and post-graduation success (do we have an older KPI report to look at? Some of the current one is measuring 2019-2024…. An older one might have better comparative data….)

LaGuardia regularly engages in the assessment of key performance indicators for student success as aligned to our Strategic Plan Priorities. [691] The University Performance Data Management book reports that preliminary 2019 data shows that 30% of LaGuardia's fall, full-time, first-time students earned 20+ credits in their first year. [15] Of this same group, 69% are passing their Gateway English class and just over 45% are passing their Gateway Math class in that time. This means that these are the students who are able to enter into classes that have ENG 101 or MAT 115/117 as a pre-requisite after their first semester at the college.

Over the last few years, the graduation rate of students earning a degree in two or three years has improved, with 19% of students earning an Associate's Degree in two years and 32.1% earning the degree within 3 years. For students in our ASAP program, this number is nearly double at 47.8% after 3 years. These are marked improvements as a result of the CUNY Momentum goals supported by several initiatives such as: encouraging students to completed 20 credits in the first year, remediation reform, ASAP, and advisement. [LaGuardia Momentum Monitoring Report Review 503]
Finally, 72.5% of fall, full-time, first-time students in any of our Associate's programs are transferring to a baccalaureate program. We have improved our Core Competency and Communication Abilities with all categories nearing competency as noted in section 5.2.c. The increased improvement in our GECC and CA's certainly has an impact on the readiness of students to transfer to senior colleges and to compete and graduate with their degrees at LaGuardia.

CUNY has changed math and English placement policies for entering students. A recent remediation report gives insight in students' placement and pass rates for related courses. [859] CUNY (e.g. Strong Start to finish invested resources to encourage the creation of co-requisite courses in order to help it meet its goals of doubling the graduation rates of students entering community colleges. [616, 751]

Data from the CUNY momentum campaign shows that while three-year graduation rates steadily increased from the fall 2012 (20%) to the fall 2017 (32.1%%) cohort for both LaGuardia and all CUNY community colleges, those of LaGuardia's increased at a faster rate. [436, 503] Peer programs and academic support services invested resources to help students succeed, especially those with developmental needs. [API Petrie Three-Year Report 949] Details of those programs can be found in Standard IV.

5.3.h Processes and procedures implemented to improve educational programs and support services

Assessment has resulted in several programmatic and support services improvements at LaGuardia. Elsewhere in the chapter we discuss mini-grants, CTL seminars and PPR Guidelines.

One of the most notable improvements is the better alignment of PLO's to General Education Core Competencies and Abilities. As programs have become more comfortable with assessment they have done better mapping to demonstrate how courses are connected to PLO's and how those PLO's are connected to GECC and CA'.s

Additionally, revising the way that PPRs are conducted and how Program Directors receive information has helped these constituents understand the purpose and usefulness of the PPR, which has resulted in stronger projects.

Accessibility and universal design principles are supported by the Center of Teaching and Learning. Details of those initiatives can be found in Standard II. [585] The Office for Students with Disabilities provides accommodations for students' diverse needs. [950] The College community identified building "an inclusive" community as a strategic priority, and the College's resources have been used to address this issue as detailed in Standard II.

Major grants allowed the College to invest in the First-Year Seminar, where students learned about Digital Communication through the building of an ePortfolio., [Project Outline and Related ocument FYS 858] They also are advised by a faculty from their major, and they create an educational plan to help them visualize progress towards their degree completion. This course is required of all First-Year students. In addition, the Office of Campus Life organizes orientation for all incoming students, as described in Standard IV. [108]

5.4 Assessment of third-party assessment providers

The College does not engage third-party assessment providers in educational effectiveness assessment and thus does not need to review their assessment services.

5.5 Periodic assessment of the effectiveness of assessment processes utilized by the institution for the improvement of educational effectiveness

Through the support of the CTL Learning Matters Mini-Grants, over the past three years 158 faculty from 35 programs participated in professional development after reviewing Benchmark Reading results that enabled them to develop or revise assignments to better align with the Core Competencies and Communication Abilities. [Teagle Foundation Year 1 Report 639, Learning Matters Project Year 2 Teagle Annual Report 595, Learning Matters Project Year 3 Teagle Annual Report 849] Separate from Academic Affairs, Adult and Continuing Education and Administrative and Educational Support Units conduct their own varied assessments using a parallel process to Academic Affairs. [902, 680, AES Guide 1] Adult and Continuing Education looks at outcomes that support the students' ability to leave their programs and successfully enter the workforce as prepared employees. Administrative and Educational Support units strive to facilitate the students' college experience and path to graduation. [874]

Assessment Culture and Continuous Improvement

Assessment is part of the College culture at all levels. The College is very effective at General Education Outcomes Assessment as measured by the numbers of artifacts we are reading, the

number of faculty involved in the processes and the ways that faculty are working to continually improve how their course materials are addressing the colleges General Education Core Competencies and Communication Abilities. The assessment of the PLO's has lagged a bit, but as there is now more institutional support and guidance around PLO's faculty are working to clearly assess their program learning outcomes. While there is no prescription to how we conduct assessment, the faculty and staff are guided by the principles of continuous improvement and best practices with input from constituents. The Self-Study itself represents an opportunity for self-assessment and an opportunity for all stakeholders across divisions to learn about all units with an eye on informing new actions and recommendations.

The ALT leads academic departments in strengthening learning, while AES Assessment Council leads the assessment of the support . [772, 874]. In addition to annual and general education assessment process, both academic programs and support units engage in Periodically assessment (PPRs and PURs) which are a form of large-scale assessment aimed at self-improvement for both the academic and support units, as detailed in the Institutional Effectiveness Plan [486]. Specialized program in the Health Science are also periodically assessed by external agencies. [312]

Faculty are driven by a passion to dare to do more, using evidence-based practices. They understand the diverse needs of students and are supported alongside their journey. As a learning College, newly hired faculty are required to participate in the Provost Learning Space where they are introduced to principles of classroom assessment techniques. Beginning in Fall 2015, about 131 faculty members have participated so far. The Center of Teaching and Learning provides ample opportunities for perfecting and improving assessment across different interests of faculty and staff.

Assessment with an eye on inclusion has been an integral part of our work. Recent CTL seminars have addressed elements of universal design as details in Standard II. All CTL activities undergo detailed assessment processes as detailed in their evaluation report. [282]

The 2017 Middle States Periodic Review Report provided an update on the recommendations following the 2012 Self-Study using assessment-driven processes. [844]

The following evidence illustrate how we periodically assess the effectiveness of the assessment processes.

1) The Institutional Effectiveness Plan [486]
2) The Assessment Guide of AES Units [1]; AES Executive Summaries [874]
3) The Academic Assessment Guide [279]
4) The CTL 2018-2019 Evaluation Report [282]
5) The annual monitoring of the 2019-2024 Strategic Plan Goals [746] and the annual strategic initiatives and targets [845]

Evidence and Analysis: Collaboration and Standards Overlap

Standard V acknowledges that there is potential overlap and strong connections to Standards I, III, IV and VII. *We feel like we can't flush this out until we have read other standards chapters.*

Conclusion

Strengths

There is a wide range of assessment conducted throughout the College, and participation in the assessment process is highly inclusive for all college constituents. The focus on continuous evaluation and improvement is a definite strength. Standard V has identified significant strengths in educational effectiveness assessment at multiple levels, continuing the culture of assessment of learning long established at the institution, and emergent from and organized by our Mission and Core Values. Assessments are conducted in all academic programs and support units, and there is a culture of recognizing the common goals and objectives of new and current programs with support system educational initiatives and interventions.

Information from the assessment of student learning outcomes is used to improve teaching and learning. For example, programs use the results from the Gen Ed assessments to revise assignments, curriculum, or pedagogy in order to strengthen student learning. In general, measuring student learning outcomes are well established and recognized externally, specifically the general education Core Competencies and Communication Abilities, including at both the college and the program level with annual benchmark readings and periodic program reviews, respectively. Additionally, the data informs curricular changes at the program level.

The College has a robust and comprehensive assessment with high faculty involvement whether it be depositing artifacts, benchmark readings, PPRs, or Learning Matters Mini-Grants. Faculty participation in assessment activities is strong and from looking at the Teagle reports, it seems to have increased in the past three years. Program Learning Objectives assessment is still developing and further faculty attention to PLO's is expected.

Another notable strength is the inclusion of cross-divisional collaboration with the creation of the Administrative and Educational Support Units (AES) assessment, fully supported with each unit's mission and goals, including the development of an assessment guide, and annual executive summaries.

Another strength is the Assessment Leadership Team (ALT). ALT has representation from every department at the College and the ALT members serve as liaisons for assessment processes and activities in their respective departments.

The College's approach to program review is thorough, and in several cases evinces successful trends in program effectiveness. Examples of this include a steady increase in the number of graduates in the Engineering programs over the past five years and transfer to four-year colleges that demonstrate a significant outcome of our Engineering Science program, as well as a significant enrollment trend of students of color in Biology and Environmental Sciences program. [17, 2]

Finally, the College's work in assessment has provided opportunities for faculty to engage in scholarly publications and presentations and thus supports faculty in their work towards tenure and promotion.

Challenges

As expected, challenges occur in a large institution with many constituents. One significant challenge is that Standard V believes there is room for improvement in the communication between the different college divisions about educational effectiveness assessment and how results and information are shared out beyond program directors and chairs. That is, faculty and staff are on the edges of knowledge when it comes to student learning outcomes and assessment beyond the course level unless they have chosen voluntary involvement in the many opportunities available such as: program assessment, PPRs, and/or General Education Benchmark Readings. In general, open calls are made for participation in these activities with regularity. Communication between constituents seems to be lacking, both within and across departments/divisions, about assessment results and the subsequent implementation of actions/changes. The assessment website which focuses of academic program and pedagogical assessment and the newly constructed Institutional Effectiveness websites will begin to rectify this. Even though faculty participation is strong in assessment activities, it seems that the same faculty participate. It would be good to elicit participation from more faculty, especially part-time faculty. For example, for PPRs and PLOs it's not especially clear if other faculty are involved in the process aside from the teams that lead the work.

Another weakness is that there might not be enough opportunities for conversations about assessment of student learning outcomes among all faculty. Often, informal conversations happen among faculty and happen within the context of CTL seminars and Benchmark Reading reflections but they need to happen on a larger scale with more definition and so more faculty are involved in understanding and supporting different assessment processes and activities. This is especially true about sharing assessment data, and implementation of changes or best practices for assessment. While there are connections made between student learning outcomes at different levels and the colleges' strategic priorities, many feel that these connections are not explicit. For example, in looking at the PPR reports, connections between the assessment of student learning outcomes and the strategic priorities were not explicit. This was also noticed in some of the department strategic plans. [Department Strategic Plan Report 2018-2019 892, Department Strategic Plan Report 2019-2020 813, Department Strategic Plan Report 2020-2021 814]

In departments that contain loosely related programs, it is unclear what the overarching department's role is in making curricular changes that are informed by the assessment of student learning outcomes at the program level. Curricular change is almost always in the program's purview; however, department faculty form curriculum committees from across different programs housed in specific departments or, in the case of Liberal Arts, the "departmental" curriculum committee is headed by the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs and comprised of the Liberal Arts Department Chairpersons.

While the PPR process is strong, there is concern about the feasibility of implementing recommendations from PPRs. For example, PPRs for Theatre and Music Recording Technology included testimony from external reviewers that stated that additional resources (space, funding, and equipment) are required to make the programs effective and competitive, and successful in preparing students for the respective fields. These recommendations are provided by field experts, and resources are essential for program effectiveness. While programs might receive funding, it would be beneficial for the college at large to be transparent in how money is allocated to programs and what the process is to apply for monetary allocations for needs that arise through Periodic Program Reviews. An additional complication is that , If

these recommendations can't be responded to in implementation years due to budgetary concerns a program will show the same patterns of limitation in each PPR cycle.

While assessment is relatively new to Administrative and Support Units (AES), there should be more collaboration between Academic Units and AES units to enrich the assessment process of both. In particular, the institution should not limit Academic Support Units possible collaborations with Academic Units based on the difficulty of assessing more qualitative educational experiences.

Recommendations

The primary challenge with educational effectiveness assessment at LaGuardia remains that the Standard V working group believes that there needs to be better communication and dissemination of educational effectiveness assessment processes and results. To this end, we recommend several strategies to accomplish robust and transparent communication with stakeholders:

- An organizational chart of how assessment is related to the strategic priorities and who is responsible for various elements of assessment.

- The development of an assessment communication flow chart (departments, divisions, and etc.)

- A more transparent method of communication for all constituents, including part-time instructors, about the assessment of collegewide competencies and abilities that affect curricular changes at all levels, especially the course learning outcomes and how these competencies and abilities are a reflection of the mission statement, the core values, and strategic plans of the college.

- A seminar for constituents through the CTL about assessment.

- Public sharing in the Faculty & Staff Portal of Periodic Program Reviews so that the other departments can learn from each other based on what they learned from programmatic learning outcome reports.

- An institution-wide assessment newsletter or another form of communication that includes faculty voices, program directors' voices, staff voices, and student voices about learning outcomes and assessment.

- More platforms to discuss assessment activities that involve larger numbers of faculty, including part-time faculty. These conversations should happen within programs/departments and between programs/departments.

- Opportunities for communication, collaboration and connection such as Professional Development seminars around assessment, assessment town halls (similar to the Middle States town hall), or a short series of assessment talks throughout the year where faculty can share best practices for assessment, assignments that align with Gen Ed outcomes or PLOs, curricular changes, or discuss evidence of student learning.

A second recommendation regards monetary support for the work of Assessment. Paid training is needed for Academic Support Units and for Academic Unit Adjuncts, particularly those on 3-year contract, to understand assessment and its vital role in the institution, particularly regarding ways of identifying and meeting goals and objectives. Indeed this recommendation is connected to two intended outcomes of the Self-Study: to integrate and improve the planning processes at the College to advance Institutional Effectiveness and student success and to engage the institutional community in an inclusive and transparent self-appraisal process that actively and deliberately seeks to involve members from all areas of the institutional community. A college that relies heavily on the labor of part-time faculty needs to actively engage them in the work of the college and to compensate them for the time they are spending on being engaged in that work.