



AESAC Annual Report - AY2020-2021

Table of Contents

AESAC Support for AES Assessment (AY2020-2021)	3
Professional Development Workshops	4
AES Assessment Statistics and Meta-Assessment.....	5
Periodic Assessment Completion – AES Program Reflection Process	5
Annual Assessment Completion – Annual Planning and Assessment Report Templates (A-PARTs)	5
Outcomes Assessment	6
Review of AY2020-2021 AES A-PARTs.....	8
Lessons Learned from AY2020-2021 AES Assessment Efforts.....	10
Recommendations.....	11

AESAC Support for AES Assessment (AY2020-2021)

In AY2020-2021 Hostos Community College, primarily via the AES Assessment Committee (AESAC), made substantial progress in solidifying the infrastructure for AES assessment, including the reimagining, redesigning, and implementation of multiple aspects of AES assessment. Below is a summary and timeline of the myriad efforts that progressed last year, organized by the category/aspect of AES assessment infrastructure building.

AES Program Review Process (Redesigned Periodic Assessment)

- *August 2020* – Redesign of newly reimagined AES Program Reflection Process completed
- *September 2020* – Kick-off and orientation to new process via webinar
- *October 2020* – Inaugural cohort of AES units begin pilot of new process (Units: STEP/CSTEP/Proyecto Access, CUNY Edge, CUNY Fatherhood Academy, Student Leadership Academy, Athletics and Recreation, Library)
- *January 2021* – Inaugural cohort wrapped up the AY2020-2021 process

Annual Planning and Assessment Report Templates (A-PARTs)

- *October 2020* – AES units began 2nd year of the new Annual Planning and Assessment Reporting Process
- *November 2020* – AES units participated in workshops on developing outcomes led by Meredith Reitman (layering on new learning from 1st year implementation)
- *February 2021* – AES units participated in second, redesigned set of workshops on developing outcomes, led by AESAC
- *March 2021* – AES units submitted drafts to AESAC
- *April 2021* – AESAC returned drafts with feedback
- *May 2021* – Present – AES units are assessing their identified Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and/or Support Outcomes (SOs)

Institutional Advisement Outcomes (IAOs)

- *September/October 2020* – Conversations and potential plan for determining a way to assess student outcomes across advising units began
- *November 2020* – Leadership of AESAC and CDAC formally met with Meredith Reitman to begin planning a workshop to engage advisement units in the process of developing outcomes
- *December 2020* – First draft of new Institutional Advisement Outcomes (IAOs) developed in cross-advisement unit workshop
- *January 2021* – Draft of IAOs refined
- *February 2021* – Second draft of IAOs shared back with advisement units and CDAC via workshop and “finalized”
- *March 2021* – IAO to be assessed this year identified and shared with advisement units in first workshop on methods of assessing IAOs

AES Assessment Committee (AESAC)

- *July 2020* – Formal establishment of the college's first ever AES Assessment Committee (AESAC)
- *September 2020* – Colleagues were invited to be members of AESAC
- *October 2020* – AESAC membership was finalized and new committee was kicked off (Co-chairs: *Dereck Norville-Bowie & Dean Babette Audant*; Members: *Pearl Shavzin, Elbagina Bonilla, Silvia Reyes, Maria Cano, Sam Byrd, & Carlos Rivera*)

Professional Development/Resource Development Efforts

- Development of the curriculum (and implementing cohort meetings) for the inaugural AES Program Reflection process cohort
- Development of additional resources to support implementation of the Annual Planning and Assessment Report Templates (A-PARTs)
- Planning and delivery of multiple workshops to support AES units develop student learning outcomes (SLOs) and support outcomes (SOs)
- Development of the college's new [AES Assessment Website](#)
- Development of a process to provide systematic feedback to AES units on A-PART drafts

Professional Development Workshops

In AY2020-2021, professional development workshops for the A-PART process were one of the primary delivery methods of support for the process. The focus of the workshops was the development of support outcomes (SOs), student learning outcomes (SLOs), and assessing newly developed institutional assessment outcomes (IAOs). An initial set of workshops was delivered in November 2020 and then (informed by learnings gleaned from the initial set of workshops) a new set of workshops were designed and delivered in February 2021; these workshops were designed/tailored for 3 different (and newly delineated) categories of AES units/programs:

1. **Support units** (*units that have little systematic student interaction*)
 - a. Focus will primarily be developing and assessing support outcomes (SOs)
2. **Student-facing units** (*units whose primary function is to serve students directly*)
 - a. Focus will primarily be developing and assessing student learning outcomes (SLOs)
3. **Advising units** (*student-facing units that have a clearly defined advisement function*)
 - a. Focus is on assessing the newly developed institutional advisement outcomes (IAOs)

In total, **7** workshops were delivered to AES units in AY2020-2021 (3 in Fall 2020; 4 in Spring 2021). Of the approximately **58** AES units across all divisions in the college:

- **38** (out of 58) AES units were represented at the first set of A-PART workshops in November 2020.
- **36** (out of 58) AES units were represented at the second set of A-PART workshops in February 2021.

AES Assessment Statistics and Meta-Assessment

As part of AESAC's work this year in building and implementing a redesigned AES Assessment infrastructure, the committee kept track of data related to the completion and quality of periodic and annual assessment documents. Since a bulk of AESAC's efforts were spent on the Annual Planning and Assessment Report Template (A-PART) process and, specifically, the development of SOs and SLOs, AESAC also conducted its own assessment of the outcomes of these efforts. Below are completion statistics from this year as well as the results of AESAC's own support outcome (SO) assessment.

Periodic Assessment Completion – AES Program Reflection Process

The newly redesigned AES Program Reflection process (AES PR) was piloted in Fall 2020. Eight AES units were scheduled to pilot the inaugural process. For more information about the AES PR process, visit the "[Periodic Assessment \(AES\)](#)" webpage. Below is a breakdown of the completion status for the AES PR process:

Division	AES Unit	Completed	Notes
ADM	Campus Operations	No	<i>Had discussion with assessment liaison for ADM and determined that AY2020-2021 would be challenging for this unit given the unit's role in Covid-19 response</i>
SDEM	Athletics and Recreation	Yes	<i>SDEM units also completed previous periodic assessment process in 2017</i>
SDEM	CUNY EDGE	Yes	<i>SDEM units also completed previous periodic assessment process in 2017</i>
SDEM	Student Leadership Academy	Yes	<i>SDEM units also completed previous periodic assessment process in 2017</i>
CEWD	Adult Learning Center	No	
CEWD	CUNY Fatherhood Academy	Yes	
OAA	Library	Yes	
OAA	STEP/CSTEP and Proyecto Access	Yes	

Annual Assessment Completion – Annual Planning and Assessment Report Templates (A-PARTs)

For the Annual Planning and Assessment Report Templates (A-PART), AESAC tracked data about submission and completion, and about completion of specific components of the A-PARTs as well, particularly the inclusion of draft outcome statements as this was a new aspect that AESAC supported in AY2020-2021. AESAC tracked A-PART submission twice during the academic year: in March 2020 (as part of AESAC's review of draft outcome statements) and at the end of the academic year. Below are a few tables presenting data on submission and completion.

Mid-Point Submission of Draft A-PARTs (by Division)

Overall, **43** out of **59** AES units (**73%**) submitted draft A-PART documents in March 2020. Of the **43** drafts that were included, **36 (84%)** included draft outcome statements. Below is a breakdown by division:

Division	Total # of AES Units	# of units that submitted drafts	% of units that submitted drafts	% of submitted drafts that included outcomes statements
ADM	10	7	70%	71%
SDEM	17	13	76%	77%
CEWD	10	6	60%	83%
IA	3	3	100%	100%
OAA	14	13	93%	92%
Pres. Office	5	2	40%	50%

End of Year Submission of A-PARTs (by Division)

Overall, at the end of AY2020-2021, **43** out of **59** AES units (**73%**) submitted a final, completed A-PART document. Below is a breakdown by division:

Division	Total # of AES Units	# of units that submitted final A-PARTs	% of units that submitted Final A-PARTs
ADM	10	10	100%
SDEM	17	15	88%
CEWD*	10	0	0%
IA	3	3	100%
OAA	14	13	93%
Pres. Office	5	2	40%

**Note that at the end of AY2020-2021, after unpacking some learning related to the implementation of A-PARTs across divisions, AESAC co-chairs had a discussion with CEWD leadership about a different approach for the division to engage in this process in the upcoming academic year; this will have implications in the future for the total number of AES units (including what is considered a unit within CEWD).*

Outcomes Assessment

As shared above, because AESAC spent a substantial amount of effort in AY2020-2021 on professional development (PD) for AES units related to the development of SO and SLOs, the committee engaged in assessment activities (including assessing its own support outcome) to better understand the extent to which the PD improved AES units' ability to develop quality SOs and SLOs.

Outcome Statement

AESAC assessed the following support outcome (SO) in AY2020-2021:

- Through targeted workshops, supports, and resources, AES units will develop clear and appropriate support outcomes and/or student learning outcomes and adequately assess them this academic year.

Method of Assessment

Using a previously developed rubric, AESAC assessed each unit's drafted outcomes statement after submission of the first drafts in March 2020 (submission occurred after the second set of PD workshops on developing outcomes). The rubric has 3 categories ("needs work", "emerging", "developed") to help determine the quality of each component of the A-PART documents. For the "Outcome" component of the rubric, below is the description of each category:

- Needs Work - Outcome does not include an impact of an activity.
- Emerging - Outcome describes an impact of an activity, but that impact is not specific.
- Developed - Outcome describes a specific impact of an activity.

After rating each unit's outcome statement based on the rubric, AESAC provided feedback to each AES unit to help them refine their outcome statement. When final A-PART documents were submitted at the end of the academic year, the AESAC co-chairs re-assessed and categorized the units' outcomes statement using the same rubric (*note that, unlike the first time, the second assessment of draft outcomes was conducted only by the AESAC co-chairs because of time constraints*).

AESAC tracked how many units' outcome statements fell into each category at the time of the first assessment and the second assessment and (additionally) tracked the change in rubric ratings across the units to determine how many units' outcome statements improved.

Results/Findings

The college has 59 AES units throughout the college. AES units were asked to submit mid-year drafts of their APART documents (including their draft outcome statements) in March and then their final documents were due end of June. Because the bulk of AESAC's support efforts were in helping AES units develop SOs and SLOs, this is where we focused our assessment. In March, AESAC used the APART rubric to assess the draft outcomes. Of the **43** units that submitted mid-year drafts, **36** AES units (**84%**) submitted drafts that included outcome statements. Based on rubric, the outcomes across divisions fell in these categories:

- "Needs Work" - **23%**
- "Emerging" - **29%**
- "Developed" - **49%**

At the end of the academic year, **39** total units submitted final APART documents and **37** of those included outcomes; the outcomes across divisions fell in these categories:

- "Needs Work" - **46%**
- "Emerging" - **27%**
- "Developed" - **27%**

The final part of the analysis compared only the AES units that submitted a draft outcome in March and then an outcome statement in their final document in June and tracked if their rubric rating “improved” (moved from one category up to the next), remained the “same”, or “declined” (moved from one category down to the next) from March (in total **35** units); this was the breakdown:

- “Improved” - **21%**
- “Same” - **48%**
- “Declined” - **30%**

Because we wanted to better understand the “Same” and “declined” categories, we also looked at some stats for those categories specifically. Of the 10 units whose rating declined, 7 of them were previously rated “developed”. Of the 16 units whose rating remained the same, only 4 of them had a rating of “Needs work”; the majority were rated either emerging or developed.

Overall, **more than half (54%)** of the outcome statements by the end of the year were either “emerging” or “developed”. However, the goal was to see improvement in those who were rated “needs work” (especially) and “emerging”; more research would need to be done to better understand why the high % of decline; one hypothesis is that although AESAC went through a process of norming the rubric, and had 2 members rating and (ultimately) agreeing on a rubric rating for each unit, the norming process may not have fully yielded a common understanding of what would make an outcome statement fall in each category. Still, the results seem to indicate at least modest success in supporting AES units in developing outcome statements, but with a potential need for more targeted support.

Proposed Actions

Based on the findings from this assessment AESAC proposed a few potential next steps:

- Conduct a sub-analysis and/or qualitative analysis to better understand why some units’ progress on their outcome statements declined
- Develop a more targeted support model for AES units whose outcome statements were rated “Needs work” or “Emerging” (differentiated by category)

Review of AY2020-2021 AES A-PARTs

At the end of the academic year, AESAC engaged in a focused review of all the final A-PARTs that were submitted (with each member reviewing a specific subset of reports). The purpose was to try to glean important lessons learned, patterns, and trends to help determine what adjustments, improvements, and/or recommendations need to be made for next academic year. The review focused on trying to identify any potential themes in challenges/barriers and/or opportunities that might have been flagged by units; trying to understand if there was a resource/support need that seemed more prevalent across units; and understanding the fidelity with which AES units completed the AY2020-2021 A-PART process.

Observations

From the review of the final A-PART documents a few key patterns/observations arose:

- Most of the A-PART documents reviewed were complete (all components were filled in), but the fidelity with which the components were completed varied across units. In other words, what units entered into particular components varied even though guidance documents to help complete each component were provided (e.g. some units added results into the column that was designated for their outcome statement only; others added resources/support needs without indicating what proposed action they were aligned with; etc.
- Many units included a statement of support outcomes (SOs) and/or student learning outcomes (SLOs); however, very few units outlined a clear method of assessing their identified outcome statement.
- Although many units' reports indicated some sort of resource/support request, for most units it was unclear what data point/assessment they were using to inform the need for the request. In other words, the link between assessment, a proposed action based on that assessment, and a related resource/support request was tenuous for most units.
 - It is also worth noting that many units' reports did include analyses of some type but in many cases, they weren't clearly linked to an outcome statement (e.g. a unit having a student learning outcome but presenting faculty survey results)
- Many units flagged some sort of need or desire for collaboration (either internally or externally) related to proposed actions.

Resource/Support Needs

A sub-analysis of the review of A-PARTs looked specifically at the frequency of types of resource/support needs that were being flagged by AES units; the purpose was to try to better understand if there is a type of resource/support need that seems most prevalent across AES units. The resource/support needs are categorized into 5 categories:

- **Human Resources** – administrative, academic and non-academic staff, college assistants, work study students and external stakeholders. This may include reallocation of responsibilities, changes to organizational charts/supervisory structures, etc.
- **Physical/Material Resources** – the tangible resources such as the structures and facilities (classrooms, laboratories, library, offices, theaters, studios and recreational areas), hardware, software, vehicles, equipment and supplies that directly and indirectly contribute to the organizational goals.
- **Financial Resources** – sources of funding and a budgeting system that provides a comprehensive framework to identify the academic and fiscal strategy for accomplishing the college's mission and goals.
- **Time Resources** – maintaining or increasing the effectiveness and efficiency of academic and administrative operations.
- **"Other" Resources** – anything that does not fit in one of the categories above (e.g. professional development; networking connection, identification of an opportunity, etc.)

Below is a count of the number of AES units that made at least 1 resource/support request that fell into one of these categories.

Category	Number of AES Units that Made a Request in the Category
Human Resources	25
Physical/Material Resources	15
Financial Resources	18

Time Resources	9
"Other" Resources	19

Related to the "Other" category, upon further analysis, AESAC found that there were 2 most common type of resource/support that units requested in this category:

- **Professional development (PD)** – most of the units flagged a particular need for professional development of some kind (typically, more technical PD such as learning how to use a particular program or platform)
- **Collaboration/networking** - the second most common need that was flagged in this category was the desire to have collaboration, primarily with other units internally; in some cases, units flagged a need for external collaboration and/or the need for a networking connection to be made.

Lessons Learned from AY2020-2021 AES Assessment Efforts

Since the A-PART process impacts each AES unit every year, AESAC primarily focused on trying to glean lessons learned from this process in AY2020-2021; however, lessons learned from the periodic assessment process (AES PR) are also included in this summary. Below is a summary of some key points of learning that AESAC gleaned over the past year (either from our own assessment activities or structured debrief conversations); they are presented in no particular order.

- Through AESAC's debriefs/conversations/discussions, and through conversations with AES unit leaders that participated in various AES assessment activities, AESAC learned that the blanket approach to professional development around developing support outcomes (SOs) and student learning outcomes (SLOs) posed particular challenges in learning this key AES assessment concept; this learning is what led to the second set of differentiated workshops on developing outcomes, for the different types of AES unit back in February/March 2020.
- AESAC spent a bulk of effort on the component of the A-PART that we anticipated would have the highest learning curve; however, in doing so, we also learned that there were 2 key aspects of the process that may have needed extra attention:
 - Helping AES units understand what an assessment method is and how to engage in it (to assess their developed outcomes)
 - More clarity/professional development on what exactly should be entered into each component of the template (e.g. clarity on what the "results" column is really asking for; how the "proposed action" should be scoped; etc.); although there was a guidance document that was referenced heavily, this may not have been enough.
- The connection between the A-PART documents, the college's operational planning process, and college-wide resource allocation is not clear to most stakeholders; there is confusion about how this process connects to other key college-wide processes
- Noting the prevalence of tenuous connections between assessment, proposed actions, and related resource/support requests, there is an opportunity to re-center AES units around the core aspect of the A-PART templates: clearly documenting what was assessed (related to specific activities and outcomes), what were the key data points/findings (qualitative or quantitative), and what does a unit propose to do next based on that finding.

- Related to the above, AESAC realized that the current AES A-PART template could be improved to help make this through-line more evident to everyone.
- The AES Program Reflection (AES PR) process was piloted using a structured cohort model, which seemed to be a useful and beneficial approach to ensuring AES unit leaders were adequately guided through the process and were able to engage with, and learn from, each other; considering a cohort model for supporting the A-PART process could be an equally beneficial strategy, especially considering the learning curve involved with certain aspects of the process (and the relative importance of the annual process in the college's larger institutional effectiveness framework)

Recommendations

Based on all the assessment, reflection, and learning from the past academic year, AESAC as a few key recommendations to help strengthen AES assessment (processes and practices) for the upcoming academic year:

- Redesign the A-PART template to make the connection between assessment, proposed actions, and resource/support requests more clear
- Develop a professional development (PD) schedule for AY2021-2022 to intentionally include:
 - Overview of, and expectation-setting about, what should go into each component of the A-PART (beginning of the year)
 - More focus on methods of assessing SOs and SLOs
 - Clear discussion about how the A-PARTs inform operational planning and resource allocation (end of the year)
- Development of a common, web-based space to house A-PARTs and AES PR documents so that units can work on their annual/periodic assessment processes and collaborate with/learn from each other in the process
- Work with AES units to identify an AES assessment deputy (other than the unit leader[s]) to learn about the AES assessment process and support their implementation within units.
- Engage in a closer examination of the types of resource/support needs that AES units are requesting and consider if there are more broader implications.