February 26, 2014

Dr. Sean A. McKitrick, Vice President
Commission Staff Liaison
Middle States Commission on Higher Education

Dear Dr. McKitrick:

I am pleased to send the attached Monitoring Report as a follow-up to The College at Brockport’s MSCHE self-study and review in 2012. As you are aware, the Commission requested this report to further document our effectiveness in meeting MSCHE accreditation standards 7 and 14.

In early 2013, I charged a Monitoring Report Committee to study, document, and report on updates to our Institutional and Academic Assessment procedures. The committee discovered that several improvements had been made already, and since then, more have been added and implemented in sustainable ways, as noted in the Monitoring Report.

The completed report describes Academic and Institutional Assessment at the College in detail, with particular attention to changes since 2011 and to the data that demonstrate effective assessment procedures across the College. All data are electronic and links within the report take readers to sets of data, most of which now reside on the College’s Accountability website. The website itself is one of the important improvements to documentation and transparency in assessment at the College. Some other highlights of our improvements in assessment practices include:

- a newly designed and fully implemented Institutional Assessment System;
- activation of an Institutional Effectiveness and Accountability Committee that ensures linkages between mission and goals on the one hand, and budgeting, planning, and allocations on the other;
- improved efforts to promote a campus-wide culture of assessment among faculty, staff and administrators, including new annual School-based Deans' Assessment Forums and administrative assessment training sessions;
- completing a review and re-approval of systematically defined learning outcomes and implementation of new three-year assessment plans now underway for all academic programs;
- a revised and updated General Education assessment system;
- implementation of a fully sustainable Planning and Assessment Cycle in which closing the loop both ends one assessment cycle and begins the first stage of the following one.
We look forward to working with you as you review the Monitoring Report. I am proud of our faculty, staff, and administrative team and of the very significant progress that we have made in a relatively short amount of time. I firmly believe that we are submitting a strong culture of evidence documenting our concerted efforts to address the specific recommendations for both Standards 7 and 14.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

John Halstead, PhD
President
Subject of Follow-up Report

Documenting further development and implementation of an assessment process that:

1. Evaluates the institution's overall effectiveness in achieving its mission and goals with evidence that information is used in budgeting, planning, and allocating resources (Standard 7).

2. Documents assessment results that provide sufficient, convincing evidence that students are achieving key institutional and program learning outcomes, including in educational offerings and general education (Standard 14).
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Mission Statement

The State University of New York, College at Brockport:

Is committed to providing a liberal arts and professional education—at both the undergraduate and graduate level—for those who have the necessary ability and motivation to benefit from high quality public higher education;

Has the success of its students as its highest priority, emphasizing student learning, and encompassing admission to graduate and professional schools, employment, and civic engagement in a culturally diverse society and in globally interdependent communities; and

Is committed to advancing teaching, scholarship, creative endeavors, and service to the College community and the greater society by supporting the activities of an outstanding faculty and staff.
Chapter 1: Overview

Introduction

The College at Brockport, State University of New York (SUNY)
www.brockport.edu

Overview of the Monitoring Report

The MSCHF Team visit in April 2012 commended The College at Brockport for its work on fulfilling its mission and ensuring student success. The Middle States Team did express concerns with the structure and sustainability of Standards 7 and 14. In particular, the Middle States Team issued two recommendations:

**Standard 7:** “The Middle States Team recommends that The College at Brockport move promptly to design and implement a sustainable institutional assessment system. Full implementation requires evidence that results are shared with the campus community; used in decision-making; and, more importantly demonstrate that students are achieving institutional and programmatic goals. The Middle States Team strongly endorses the self-study recommendations 2, 3, and 4.”

**Standard 14:** “The Team recommends that the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment (SLOA) system at The College at Brockport needs to be fully developed and established. A sustainable culture of SLOA is not evident in many programs and needs to be fully developed campus-wide. The College needs to assign a person or office to assist, train and advise programs in this effort.”

The College at Brockport has diligently endeavored to address the Middle States Team recommendations by streamlining the Strategic Plan (SP), then using it to anchor the newly revised Institutional Assessment System (IAS), which incorporates the many components already operational at the College but not fully coordinated into a clear design. The College has also refined and implemented a more robust assessment process that evaluates student learning outcomes (SLOs); plans assessments; documents assessment results that provide sufficient, convincing evidence that students are achieving key institutional and program learning outcomes; and closes the loop to ensure continuous renewal of courses and programs based on assessment results. The revised, sustainable Institutional and SLO Assessment systems, as delineated in this report, facilitate the use of assessment information to inform budget decisions and ultimately to foster institutional renewal.
Overview of the Institution

Background

- 1835-1866: the Brockport Collegiate Institute offered teacher training
  - 1866-1942: Brockport State Normal School, one of four in New York
  - 1948: joined the SUNY system
- Today: comprehensive master's institution with 47 undergraduate major programs and 41 master's programs, 13 post-Bachelor's Certificates, seven post-Master's Certificates. The most heavily enrolled undergraduate programs are Nursing, Business Administration, and Criminal Justice; graduate programs leading in enrollment are Social Work, Educational Administration, Public Administration, and all Teacher Education programs.
- Located in upstate New York, the 464-acre main campus is in the village of Brockport, approximately 25 miles from downtown Rochester, NY
- MetroCenter extension center located in downtown Rochester
- Led by Dr. John Halstead, President since 2005

Institutional Profile

- The College has four divisions: Academic Affairs; Enrollment Management and Student Affairs (EMSA); Administration and Finance; and Advancement.
- Is funded by the State of New York and student tuition, and has a 2013-2014 state operating budget of $63.8M, composed of $17.6M direct State support and $46.2M tuition revenue, which has remained relatively static over the past six years.
- Recent and ongoing expansion and renovation of the campus: $44M Special Events Recreation Center; the new $30M Liberal Arts Building (opening in mid-2014); renovations to Thompson and MacVicar residence halls, the Smith building and Lathrop Hall (beginning 2014).
- Enrolls approximately 7,100 undergraduate and 1,040 graduate students, of which 55% of the undergraduate and 67% of the graduate students are women. Roughly 14% of undergraduate and 12% of graduate students are from underrepresented populations (Fall 2013).
- An incoming undergraduate class (Fall 2013) of 1,080 first-time, full-time students, 976 transfer students, with a full-time to part-time ratio of approximately 8:1, and a student-to-faculty ratio of 18:1.
- Awarded 1,668 bachelor's degrees and 350 master's degrees in 2011-2012. Awarded 1,771 bachelor's degrees and 357 master's degrees in 2012-2013.
- Undergraduate full-time equivalent enrollment (FTE) was 6,731.3; graduate FTE was 635.2
in Fall 2012. Undergraduate FTE was 6,466.7 and graduate was 563.6 in Fall 2013.

- The faculty was comprised of 335 full-time faculty and 255 part-time faculty (590 total) with 64% of instruction offered by full-time faculty; 95% of tenured or tenure-track faculty hold terminal degrees (Fall 2013).
- Publications/grants/awards (Academic Affairs Annual Report, 2012-2013):
  - Faculty were active in scholarship, publishing four scholarly books, four textbooks, 132 journal articles (ten [7.6%] co-authored with students), 23 chapters in scholarly books, three chapters in textbooks, one monograph, and 25 conference proceedings. Faculty also produced 29 art works, 44 dance performances, six pieces of non-fiction and ten pieces of fiction writing, and 26 theater performances.
  - Faculty also submitted 103 grant proposals, totaling $8,022,883 and received 74 awards, totaling $5,350,165. Of these, 30 were research grants totaling $1,509,072.
- Houses nearly 2,400 students in 12 residence halls and one apartment complex.
- Boasts award-winning student affairs programs for student leadership development and wellness. This includes grant awards from the US Department of Education and AVON Foundation for Women, as well as regional and national recognition from NASPA–Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education, ACPA–College Student Educators International, Association of College Unions International, National Intramural & Recreational Sports Association, SUNY and The BACCHUS (Boosting Alcohol Consciousness Concerning the Health of University Students) Network.
- Supports nearly 600 student athletes who participate in 23 Division III intercollegiate athletic teams.

Mission and Strategic Planning

The College at Brockport emphasizes three essential elements in its mission:

- A commitment to providing a liberal arts and professional education—at both the undergraduate and graduate level—for those who have the necessary ability and motivation to benefit from high quality public higher education;
- The success of its students as its highest priority, emphasizing student learning, and encompassing admission to graduate and professional schools, employment, and civic engagement in a culturally diverse society and in globally interdependent communities; and
- Is committed to advancing teaching, scholarship, creative endeavors, and service to the College community and the greater society by supporting the activities of an outstanding faculty and staff.
To operationalize the mission, the College, with cross-college representation, developed the SP 2011-2016. The SP has the overarching goal of becoming “a nationally recognized comprehensive master's institution focused on student success evidenced by significant gains in select benchmarks.” Four Strategic Constructs derived from the mission anchor the SP and define the College’s Priorities and Goals.
The College at Brockport
Strategic Plan 2011-2016

College Goal: To be a nationally recognized comprehensive master's institution focused on student success.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIC CONSTRUCTS</th>
<th>COLLEGE PRIORITIES</th>
<th>COLLEGE GOALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACADEMIC QUALITY AND ENGAGEMENT</td>
<td>1.  Active student engagement in learning both in and out of the classroom.</td>
<td>1.1 Increase service learning within the curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.  Rigorous curricular programs.</td>
<td>1.2 Grow and sustain Living/Learning Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.  Active faculty/staff engagement in student learning and development both inside and outside of the classroom.</td>
<td>2.1 Implement a cohesive and intentional general education program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.  Enrichment programs and services that are designed to promote student development, engagement in learning, engagement with the institution, and augment the educational enterprise.</td>
<td>2.2 Increase programmatic accreditation where available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.  High quality facilities that our students live and learn in.</td>
<td>3.1 Increase student involvement in faculty scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.  High quality facilities that support co-curricular programming.</td>
<td>3.2 Incorporate high impact educational practices into the curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.  Engagement of the campus in the community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO-CURRICULAR PROGRAMMING AND SUPPORT SERVICES</td>
<td>8.  Graduates remain engaged in the life of the campus.</td>
<td>8.1 Increase outreach to alumni locally and across the country through a variety of activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.  Investment by stakeholders in the institution as a quality place.</td>
<td>9.1 Launch and complete the $25M comprehensive campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPLEMENT A COHESIVE STUDENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM</td>
<td>4.1 Implement engagement practices into all four years of the student leadership program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AND A COHESIVE ACADEMIC SUPPORT STRUCTURE</td>
<td>4.2 Complete the Academic Success Center.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3 Complete the full-scale launch of the Institute for Engaged Learning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.4 Increase diversity across all populations of the campus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.5 Expand Health and Wellness Programming to encompass a broader range of issues and programming.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEARNING ENVIRONMENT AND QUALITY OF PLACE</td>
<td>5.1 Implement the Facilities Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2 Promote best practice in sustainability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.1 Create the capacity to further develop residential life facilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.1 Increase partnerships with K-12 schools.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.2 Increase partnerships with regional businesses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.3 Increase campus participation in the community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.  Investment by stakeholders in the institution as a quality place.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.1 Increase outreach to alumni locally and across the country through a variety of activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.1 Launch and complete the $25M comprehensive campaign.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the nineteen College Goals derived from the nine College Priorities, the SP also has more global measurable outcomes that link to the four Strategic Constructs:

- Better than predicted graduation rates
- Better than predicted retention rates
- Better than predicted outcomes on select NSSE and GSSE indicators
- Phase 1 of the Facilities Master Plan prioritized and implemented
- A policy and process environment that efficiently and effectively supports the mission of the College is developed and implemented
- Successful completion of the $25M Comprehensive Campaign
- Establishment of up to six regional alumni chapters

This plan is now the guiding force as the College moves forward to fulfill all elements of the plan as documented by a comprehensive and sustained academic and administrative assessment focus that ensures institutional effectiveness across the campus. Brockport is at the mid-point of the five-year SP. The Progress Report on the College Strategic Plan 2011-2016 identifies the progress to date and the efforts that remain (SP Progress Report http://www.brockport.edu/accountability/diagrams/IEAC_SP_ProgressReportCabinet.pdf). The data analyzed in Chapters 2 and 3 of this report, together with the Conclusion section, provide evidence for and analysis of the College’s increasing integration of assessment practices with the SP.
Chapter 2: Standard 7

**MIDDLE STATES 2012** Team Recommendation: “The Middle States Team recommends that The College at Brockport move promptly to design and implement a sustainable institutional assessment system. Full implementation requires evidence that results are shared with the campus community; used in decision-making; and, more importantly demonstrate that students are achieving institutional and programmatic goals. The Middle States Team strongly endorses the self-study recommendations 2, 3, and 4.”

**RESPONSE:** The College at Brockport has developed and implemented an assessment process that evaluates its overall effectiveness in achieving its mission and goals, and its compliance with accreditation standards.

**Organizing for Action: Brockport’s Response to Middle States Standard 7**

The institution has created a comprehensive and sustainable Institutional Assessment System (IAS) that:

- Coordinates many already operational components into a clear design;
- Streamlines the SP;
- Anchors the IAS to the streamlined and updated SP 2011-2016;
- Builds into the IAS the use of assessment information to inform budget decisions and institutional renewal;
- Maintains an Accountability Website that makes assessment information readily available.

**Outcomes of Action**

The revised IAS system is operational in 2013-2014. Again, the efforts tied to the SP have been underway in each unit for the past two years; it is now organized into a systematic whole that will enable comprehensive viewing of the data for decision-making purposes.
The Committee that coordinates institutional assessment at the College is the Institutional Effectiveness and Accountability Committee (IEAC). Information from the IEAC is then communicated to the President’s Cabinet where final decisions are made on budget and institutional renewal initiatives. All assessment activities across the campus are driven by the mission and the four Strategic Constructs derived from the mission.
The IEAC was reformulated in Summer 2013 with a new charge to more fully define the range of responsibilities and to include representatives from across the campus

The Institutional Effectiveness and Accountability Committee

- Monitors institutional effectiveness, ensuring its alignment with the mission and SP on an annual basis. IEAC’s Strategic Plan Progress Report was completed in December 2013.
- Ensures that assessment results are used to support continuous institutional renewal and improvement;
- Evaluates the effectiveness and comprehensiveness of the College assessment plans and processes annually;
- Publishes IEAC membership and subcommittee minutes on the IEAC Assessment Web page (www.brockport.edu/accountability/ieac.html);

The IEAC has two subcommittees:
- **Academic Assessment Team** (www.brockport.edu/accountability/diagrams/Academic%20Assessment%20Team.pdf) approves SLOs and assessment plans, provides feedback to departments on SLOs and assessment plans, and advises departments on assessment techniques and methods.
- **Administrative Assessment Team** (https://www.brockport.edu/about/accountability/ieac_committee/ieac_academic_assessment_team_2013-2014.html) approves unit assessment plans and Key Performance Indicators (KPIs); provides feedback to units on assessment plans and KPIs; and advises units on assessment techniques and methods.

The Academic Affairs, Enrollment Management and Student Affairs, Administration and Finance, and Advancement Divisions all organize and complete assessments, then collect data and analyze results to recommend actions that close the loop. These are then reviewed and monitored by the subcommittees with reports to the IEAC.

In addition to the committees already discussed, four College-wide committees provide information to the IEAC on major aspects of the institution.
- Budget and Resource Committee
- Enrollment Management Committee
- College-wide Facilities Planning Committee
- Diversity Committee
Administrative staff to these College-wide committees will present a report each semester for analysis and comment to be forwarded to the IEAC. The IEAC reviews and comments on the reports before forwarding them to President’s Cabinet. (Institutional Effectiveness and Accountability www.brockport.edu/accountability/ieac.html).

In order to support and sustain data-driven decision-making amongst College administration, the Office of Research Analysis and Planning has been moved organizationally from the area of Library Information and Technology Services to directly reporting to the provost. This structural change is designed to provide a direct link between the highest level of decision making (i.e., VPs and President) and data analytics.

**Timeline**

**Fall 2012**

- Academic Assessment Subcommittee began work on developing a fully operational academic assessment system (see Chapter 3, Standard 14 of this report).
- President's cabinet held two IAS-focused workshops led by assessment consultant Ruth Andes with experience as a Middle States evaluator for Standards 7 and 14. With these workshops in mind, The President’s Cabinet revised and streamlined the SP, and designed a system for assessment data reporting.
- Based upon the results of these workshops, and in collaboration with EMSA, which had been using an established assessment system, a form for Administrative Assessment (Templates & Forms, http://www.brockport.edu/accountability/templates.html) was developed, which includes:
  - The current year’s plan;
  - Closing the loop on the current year’s plan; and
  - Developing the plan for next year based upon the results of the assessment.
- The form links all divisional priorities/KPIs to one of the four Strategic Constructs, with subsequent links to the College Priorities and Goals.

Each plan must also include measurable objectives, resources required, timeline, and person responsible. This provides the necessary data to analyze how the objective was met and how it was funded, and directs the ways that the outcomes are used to fuel institutional renewal and thus fulfill the mission of the College (see Outcomes of Action, below, for examples).
Spring 2013
- A pilot group of the Cabinet members’ direct reports began using the Administrative Assessment form.
- All units completed the form for 2011–2012, 2012–2013, and 2013–2014. Since the units had been working under the SP since 2011, forms were completed for all three years to measure progress on the SP from its beginning date of 2011.
- The Administrative Assessment Subcommittee reviews all forms, provides feedback, and reports findings to the IEAC.

The IEAC is charged with preparing a report each year that summarizes the work of the two subcommittees and this report is disseminated to all units at the College and to the Accountability Website (www.brockport.edu/accountability).

Fall 2013
- The Accountability Website was reformatted to include all components of institutional assessment.
- The College became a College Portrait (www.collegeportraits.org/NY/Brockport) institution, a voluntary system of accountability, to allow for direct comparison of Brockport to other colleges and universities for benchmark purposes.

Analysis and Use of Results
To illustrate the utility of the current system, a shortened example of the 2012-2013 assessment reports are provided below from the School of Health and Human Performance (H&HP) (www.brockport.edu/accountability/divassessment/Health%20Human%20Performance%202012-13.pdf).

In each case,
1. The objectives and measures are stated and then, when appropriate, are repeated for the next year and new objectives (KPIs) are added (2013-14);
2. The activities that require additional funding become part of the fiscal plan for the next year;
3. Each plan follows the process of review by the supervising vice presidents, the Administrative Assessment Subcommittee, and eventually the IEAC. Each plan is considered by the President’s Cabinet for continued funding.
The section summarizes the departmental/office plans for progress toward strategic goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Construct</th>
<th>Divisional Priority/ Objective(s)</th>
<th>Assessment Objective</th>
<th>Assessment Measures</th>
<th>Resources Needed</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Person Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Academic Quality and Engagement</td>
<td>Offer high quality, rigorous academic programs</td>
<td>Attain Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs (CAAHEP) accreditation for exercise science program</td>
<td>Finalize self-study, submit to CAAHEP, and request site visit; search for new faculty line in exercise science</td>
<td>Site visit will cost approx. $1500; faculty salary is budgeted at $55K + start-up and search costs</td>
<td>Submit self-study in spring semester initiate search in fall semester</td>
<td>F. Short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Learning Environment and Quality of Place</td>
<td>Improve diversity and inclusion throughout the division</td>
<td>Increase the percent of students (National Survey of Student Engagement baseline = 49%) who report that the College has contributed to their understanding of people from other backgrounds</td>
<td>National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) question 11L; interim measure: # of Rochester City School District (RCSD) high school students brought to campus for day-long shadowing experience will meet or exceed 2011-2012 baseline of 75</td>
<td>$1500 budgeted from dean’s Supplies &amp; Equipment (S&amp;E) account</td>
<td>Host RCSD students during AY 2012-13</td>
<td>F. Short</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2012-2013 Closing-the-Loop Summary Report: This section reports the results of the year’s efforts in meeting the stated objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Objective/KPI</th>
<th>Assessment Measures</th>
<th>Data/Results</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Proposed Action Items</th>
<th>Person Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Attain CAAHEP accreditation for exercise science program</td>
<td>Finalize self-study, submit to CAAHEP, and request site visit; search for new faculty line in exercise science</td>
<td>Self-study completed and submitted; successful search for new faculty member</td>
<td>Expect CAAHEP to conduct site visit during the fall 2013 semester</td>
<td>Follow-up and follow-through with CAAHEP early in the fall</td>
<td>Schedule and conduct CAAHEP site visit</td>
<td>Exercise Science faculty; S. Petersen; F. Short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Increase the percent of students (NSSE baseline = 49%) who report that the College has contributed to their understanding of people from other backgrounds</td>
<td>NSSE question 11L; interim measure: # of RCSD high school students brought to campus for day-long shadowing experience</td>
<td>Our partner school, Jefferson HS closed and our RCSD contact apparently left the district</td>
<td>This initiative failed; no RCSD students were brought to campus in 2012-13</td>
<td>Establish a new contact in RCSD and find a different school in the district which might be interested in partnering with us</td>
<td>Contact RCSD in fall semester and attempt to schedule a shadowing experience in the spring</td>
<td>F. Short</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IMPACT:** The Commission on Accreditation for Allied Health Education Programs will ensure prospective students and other constituents that the exercise science program meets national standards for excellence. The Rochester City School District has one of the lowest graduation rates in NY. By bringing students to campus they will be introduced to the benefits of going to college, meet people on campus, and see an actual college campus in operation. Subsequent enrollment will contribute to the diversity on campus. Furthermore, Brockport students (many of whom are from suburban and rural backgrounds) will have an opportunity to interact with peers from an urban background in a low-stress environment. Many students in H&HP, following graduation, potentially could teach or provide other services to their students in urban settings, so these interactions on campus can be very helpful.
2013-2014 Assessment Plan: This section summarizes the departmental plans for progress toward strategic goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Divisional Priority/Objective(s)</th>
<th>Assessment Objective (KPI)</th>
<th>Assessment Measures</th>
<th>Resources Needed</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Person Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. AQ&amp;E</td>
<td>Offer high quality, rigorous academic programs</td>
<td>Schedule and conduct CAAHEP site visit</td>
<td>Site visit conducted and report received</td>
<td>Funding for visit</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Goal: 2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exercise Science faculty; S. Petersen; F. Short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. LE&amp;QP</td>
<td>Improve diversity and inclusion throughout the division</td>
<td>Increase the percent of students (NSSE baseline = 49%) who report that the College has contributed to their understanding of people from other backgrounds</td>
<td>NSSE question 11L; interim measure: # of RCSD high school students brought to campus for day-long shadowing experience; establish new baseline with new school in 2013-14</td>
<td>$1500 budgeted from dean’s S&amp;E account</td>
<td>Host RCSD students during 2013-14 academic year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Goal: 7.2/4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A second example is provided below to exemplify the current administrative assessment system. The example is a portion of the 2012-13 annual report for the Student Leadership Development Program (Strategic Goal 4.1).
### 2013-2014 Assessment Plan

This section summarizes the departmental plans for progress toward strategic goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co-curricular programming and support services.</th>
<th>Divisional Priority/Objective(s)</th>
<th>Assessment Objective</th>
<th>Assessment Measures</th>
<th>Resources Needed</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Person Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College Priority and Goal: 4.1</td>
<td>Leadership and civic engagement</td>
<td>Through involvement in the Capstone Certificate, students will synthesize concepts learned throughout the leadership program and create positive social change.</td>
<td>Capstone students will articulate an understanding of leadership as a process for social change through student reflections, completed through video placement rates.</td>
<td>Unit funds to provide regular dinners, end of year celebration, and honor cords for graduation.</td>
<td>May 2013</td>
<td>K. Piatt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co-curricular programming and support services.</th>
<th>Divisional Priority/Objective(s)</th>
<th>Assessment Objective</th>
<th>Assessment Measures</th>
<th>Resources Needed</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Person Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College Priority and Goal: 4.1</td>
<td>Leadership and civic engagement</td>
<td>Through involvement in the Organization Leader Certificate, students will examine and apply the fundamental skills needed to successfully manage a student organization and articulate an understanding of the five practices of student leaders.</td>
<td>Reflection and feedback of students in first year of OLC. Involvement/completion rates.</td>
<td>Staff time will be utilized to present workshop and myBrockport will be used to track student progress</td>
<td>Dec 2012</td>
<td>K. Piatt and A. Kruppenbacher (Community Development)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2012-2013 Closing-the-Loop Summary Report: This section reports the results of the year’s efforts in meeting the stated objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Objective</th>
<th>KPIs/Benchmark</th>
<th>Outcome/Results</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students in the Green Certificate will be satisfied with their participation and will have developed their understanding of Consciousness of Self, Congruence and Commitment</td>
<td>Overall Satisfaction: 85%</td>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consciousness of Self:</td>
<td>• Identify Strengths and Weaknesses: 85%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify Values and Beliefs: 85%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mentor Average: 2.75 out of 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence:</td>
<td>• Value based decision making: 80% most/all of the time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mentor Average: 2.75 out of 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment:</td>
<td>• Involvement in organization: 75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify an issue or idea: 80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Investment in an idea or issue: 50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mentor Average: 2.75 out of 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 40% Extremely Satisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 59% Satisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the Green Leadership Certificate continues to be successful. A student survey asked students to identify their strengths and weaknesses, frequency of values based decision making and identification and involvement with an issue of importance to them.

This year, mentors were also asked to evaluate their mentees based on a rubric. Findings showed that students believed they were more proficient in the areas than the mentors did.

Small changes can be made here and there, but overall the certificate continues to make its desired impact.

The closing-the-loop summary is found within the LDP annual report. EMSA found the chart format limiting in illustrating how the units closed the loop. Therefore, the form was revised for the 2012-13 annual report to include a narrative describing how the data are used to inform continuous improvement or re-direction within the unit, as well as tables and graphs related to key performance indicators and benchmarks.
Other key performance indicators are shown here in graphic form.

**IMPACT:** The Leadership Development Program (LDP) was created in 2009 and has reached hundreds of students with activities that connect students with faculty, staff, and the community outside the classroom. The LDP involves nearly 150 faculty and staff who serve as mentors, advisors, and presenters.

The growth of the program not only supports the co-curricular programming and support services strategic construct, but its focus on engagement also complements the College priorities and goals related to engagement and high impact practices. Students are satisfied with the program, and the results from the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership suggest that students involved in the program are more engaged in activities that have been shown to promote college student growth and development. The growth of the program and student learning assessment is articulated in the LDP annual reports (www.brockport.edu/emsa/assessment/reports.html).

These examples—one from Academic Affairs and one from EMSA—demonstrate the IAS process overall. The full set of assessment reports is available at the Divisional Assessment Website (www.brockport.edu/accountability/divassessment.html)
Interactions Between Assessment and the Overall Planning Cycle

The Annual Planning and Assessment Cycle illustrates the College’s multi-layered reporting system within the Institutional Assessment System.

Inner ring (lilac): assessment of faculty and staff. Within this cycle, the work of the faculty and staff is assessed by department chairs and supervisors using annual reports for faculty and performance programs for staff. The individual performance of faculty and staff is related to the mission-driven-strategic priorities and objectives that are assessed at the department and unit levels.

Middle ring (yellow): assessment by faculty and staff. Student learning is assessed in a course or a program in one semester. Academic data are analyzed in the semester following assessment, with implementation or closing the loop the next semester. Administrative assessment planning typically...
occurs during the summer with implementation during the academic year. However, unlike academic departments, administrative units may close the loop at any time during the academic year.

**Outer ring (green):** Financial planning cycle. Each April, divisions present their budgets to the Budget and Resource Committee. These budget proposals will include any assessment data available to support significant changes in allocations, new student fees, and requests for new funds. Proposals will be analyzed and commented on by the Budget and Resource Committee as well as IEAC before they are presented to President’s Cabinet. The budget is finalized and approved in the summer and allocations are communicated to departments and units in August.

The College's revitalizing of the IEAC has established the infrastructure to provide important linkages between academic and administrative assessments, the SP, and budgetary decisions at the level of President’s Cabinet. The streamlined IAS identifies the communication between the various assessment levels at the College. The [Administrative Assessment form](www.brockport.edu/accountability/ieac.html) that is now being used by all administrative units ensures that assessment data are analyzed and linked to divisional priorities and objectives (KPIs), each of which must be justified, with measurable outcomes and impact statements. All objectives are linked to the College’s Priorities and Goals and ultimately to one of the four Strategic Constructs.
A Sustainable System: Summary/Conclusions

The College at Brockport has developed a comprehensive Institutional Assessment System that ensures continuous assessment and improvement. Attention to actions, timeline, responsible parties, and adequate funding ensures continuous assessment and improvement, which renders the system sustainable. This system provides a moving timeline that begins with plans for progress toward strategic goals, closes the loop on actions taken, and finally states the impact of the completed actions, building in a new benchmark for the next cycle’s plans, closing the loop on assessment, and identifying impact. With this system clearly demarcated, the IEAC is able to monitor, on a continuous basis, all funded activities and final outcomes.

The Middle States Team strongly endorsed self-study recommendations 2, 3, and 4. Reviewing each, it is evident that the College has addressed the expressed concerns of the Middle States Team and has put into place a comprehensive assessment initiative that reflects the fundamental elements and meets the requirements of Standard 7.

**Recommendation 2.** Improve attention at all levels to documenting and making assessment information available for decision-making processes at all levels, KPIs, and data (e.g., showing evidence of such use in committee minutes and records of other decision-making groups). **Accomplished.**

Assessment is now mandatory for all activities at all levels of the College. The various forms generated to record assessment data are standard across departments involved in academic and administrative assessment, though they are not the same in appearance because they assess different data points. The IEAC and the two subcommittees provide minutes for each meeting. It is important to create an assessment trail so that the use of data for decision-making is clearly documented. When the IEAC makes specific recommendations and the President’s Cabinet determines budgetary allocation, the record must show how assessment data/outcomes were used to reach the decisions and thus to support institutional renewal and fulfill the mission. The newly developed reporting system is designed to capture these decisions.

**Recommendation 3.** Complete the SP 2011-2016 by assigning assessment for each goal, determining who is responsible for completing assessment, and implementing a formalized reporting structure. **Accomplished.**
The SP was streamlined and more detailed objectives were incorporated so that assessment outcomes could be tied directly to fulfilling the goals. The newly developed form for planning, closing the loop, and moving the objectives to the next year as needed is the crucial element in fostering a comprehensive assessment initiative. This form links each objective being assessed to one of the goals of the SP, identifies who is responsible, and provides a formalized reporting structure to ensure that the information is widely disseminated and appears on the College’s Accountability Website.

**Recommendation 4.** Reconstitute the IEAC to work on further improving the College’s Institutional Assessment practices and monitor the progress of institutional-level goals derived from the SP 2011-2016. *Accomplished.*

The IEAC has been completely reconstituted with a new charge and revised membership; minutes are taken at each meeting and available on the Accountability Website as a public record of the actions of the IEAC.

- The IEAC, through the work of its two subcommittees, monitors the progress of all institutional–level goals.
- The chairs of the IEAC will compile a summary report each summer, highlighting the work that has been accomplished during the year.
- Recommendations are made to the President’s Cabinet for action, using assessment data in support of the goals of the SP.

The Middle States Team report stated that

> It is time for the College to take the necessary steps to design institutional learning goals and an institutional assessment plan that clearly delineates the system and who is responsible. Further, the various forms of assessment across campus are not coordinated under a single plan or office.

The design and implementation of the system has been accomplished. Further, the College has created an Office of Assessment with 4.5 FTE staff allocated to meet these coordination goals.

In summary, the faculty and staff at the College at Brockport have worked diligently to ensure that all the recommendations of the Middle States Team have been met and that the College “has developed and implemented an assessment process that evaluates its overall effectiveness in achieving its mission and goals and its compliance with accreditation standards.”
Chapter 3: Standard 14

MIDDLE STATES 2012 Team Recommendation: The Team recommends that the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment (SLOA) system at the College at Brockport needs to be fully developed and established. A sustainable culture of SLOA is not evident in many programs and needs to be fully developed campus-wide. The College needs to assign a person or office to assist, train and advise programs in this effort.

RESPONSE: The College at Brockport has refined its academic assessment process to ensure campus-wide compliance in thorough assessment of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), including revised SLOs, systematic and sustainable assessment plans from all programs, and full participation in closing-the-loop practices. Dr. Ruth Andes has been hired as Assessment Consultant through these revisions, and the Office of Assessment is being created, consisting of 4.5 staff members including responsibility for programmatic and Gen Ed (ISLO), assessment, specialized program accreditation-related assessment (e.g., CAEP), support for Tk20 implementation and student placement testing. Two of these positions are being searched.

Previous Academic Assessment Model
The College has been engaged in the assessment of student learning outcomes in both departmental SLOs and the General Education (Gen Ed) Program for more than thirty years. The College has long had assessment processes characterized by:

- Consistency with Institutional SLOs;
- An extensive written procedure to guide department chairs in the assessment process;
- A set of forms for assessment project design and reporting;
- A requirement for annual departmental assessment reports and closing-the-loop forms.

However, as recognized by the Middle States Team in 2012, getting the committed attention of all programs on implementation of assessment has been a challenge. Providing proper administrative feedback on and attention to monitoring the assessment process and closing-the-loop actions has also been an issue. Commitment to assessment in the non-accredited programs has varied widely from one department to another. As might be expected, accredited departments have been the most
responsible in carrying out assessment, perhaps because their external, accrediting agencies have been more vigilant and prescriptive about their requirements for assessment. We now understand that another important issue has been neglecting to adequately involve the leadership of the schools (dean's level oversight) in effective ways to reinforce the importance of assessment and to assist programs in the implementation of their assessments. Both of these important issues have been addressed as follows.

Organizing for Action: Brockport’s Response to Middle States Standard 14

In asking for a Monitoring Report by March 2014, MSCHE has shown concern about the assessment process and the quality/quantity of evidence of achievement of assessment goals offered in the self-study. The observations of the MSCHE Review Team and the required Monitoring Report have provided an opportunity to improve our academic assessment procedures. In response, during the 2012-2013 Academic Year, former Provost Anne Huot directed the academic areas to set aside the usual assessment procedures and formally engage in a thorough review of The College's approach to the assessment of SLOs. As a result, The College has made substantive improvements in both structure and implementation of academic assessment processes.

The Monitoring Report requirement has also stimulated a campus-wide, heightened awareness of and interest in our assessment processes. One benefit has been re-energizing the administration and the faculty/staff to quality improvement and to more centrally position assessment processes in all aspects of campus life. The major actions performed since The College received the request for a Monitoring Report have addressed MSCHE’s concerns and produced a systematic process for sustainable assessment.

Outcomes of Action

The College at Brockport has implemented a comprehensive and sustainable Academic Assessment System that:

- Ensures that all academic units (programs) and Gen Ed have a set of student learning outcomes reviewed and approved by the department, school dean and the Academic Assessment Subcommittee of the IEAC;
- Translates learning outcomes into three-year program assessment plans in which all learning outcomes are to be assessed within the three-year assessment cycle;
- Assigns written roles and responsibilities for all phases of the assessment cycle from department chair through all administrative levels;
• Provides for structured reporting of data and closing-the-loop actions that are communicated at the department/program level, the school dean level, and, through the Academic Assessment subcommittee, to the administrative decision-making groups;
• Provides multiple opportunities for feedback to academic programs and Gen Ed on their assessment processes and action plans;
• Provides information and opportunities to link assessment results with the deployment of institutional resources at the dean's level, the provost's level, and the level of President’s Cabinet;
• Provides for good communication about assessment methods, results, and closing-the-loop action within the schools of the Division of Academic Affairs;
• Is sustainable by virtue of the systematic planning and assignment of roles, responsibilities, and timelines for the various functions;

As The College has worked to improve assessment of Institutional (Gen Ed) and programmatic SLOs, the Academic Assessment System has been developed to incorporate these improvements into a formal set of sustainable procedures. The Academic Assessment System is described in writing at this link on the Academic Assessment System procedures Web page (www.brockport.edu/accountability/images/AA_System.pdf) and is diagrammed on the next page:
Timeline

The steps involved in improving the College’s assessment of student learning outcomes and implementing it for the first year and a half are summarized in this section.

Fall 2012

- Dr. Ruth Andes hired by Provost Anne Huot as assessment consultant.
- Dr. Andes held five assessment workshops attended by 122 people in early September to describe the assessment process. ([Andes Assessment Workshop](#), FC2)
- Dr. Andes met with all departments/programs, a total of 227 people, to advise on the development of their SLOs.
  - Gave departments/programs guidance as they completed the revision of their SLOs. (See [Andes fall Appointments FC2](#) for a record of visits as evidence.)
- Re-established the Academic Assessment Committee.
  - A committee of faculty and staff advises on assessment issues, reviews all departmental SLOs, plans, results; discusses and advises on assessment procedures ([Committee minutes](#)).
- Developed forms for submitting departmental/program SLOs for approval.
- Established a uniform format for submitting SLOs for Academic Assessment Committee review and subsequent action.
- Academic Assessment Committee reviewed SLOs from individual departments/programs.
  - Reviewed SLOs from all departments/programs for meaning, accessibility, completeness, clarity. ([Committee minutes](#))
- Academic Assessment Committee returned comments on SLOs to the chairs of departments/programs.
  - Gave the departments/programs constructive feedback on their SLOs prior to implementation. ([School Deans Assessment Presentations](#))
- All departmental/program SLOs entered into the Tk20 database.
- Continuation of College effort to use Tk20 as the repository of assessment information. ([Implementation of Tk20 Assessment System](#))
- Developed forms for submitting departmental/program assessment implementation plans and an Assessment Report & Closing-the-Loop form.
- Established a uniform format for submitting assessment implementation plans and assessment reports to the vice-provost.
Spring 2013

  - Plans were accepted in two sets: Spring 2013 plans ensure that departments were getting a good start on the new assessment cycle, and the complete three-year cycle plans for departmental/program assessment. (See Accountability Website www.brockport.edu/accountability/divassessment.html)
- Departments implemented Spring 2013 assessment projects based on their assessment plans.
  - Assessment plans for Spring 2013 (www.brockport.edu/accountability/divassessment.html)
- Dr. Andes continued to be available to departments/programs in a consultant capacity through Spring 2013/Summer 2013.
  - Provided continued guidance on the implementation of the first semester of the new assessment cycle. (See Andes Email Examples, FC2 of feedback as evidence)
  - Reviewed and commented as three-year plans were submitted. They represent the general plans for assessment throughout the cycle.
- Academic Assessment System Protocol for all stages of assessment completed and approved by the Provost’s Council and President’s Cabinet.
  - This protocol specifies and formalizes the actions to be taken in the assessment of departmental/program SLOs; it defines the duties of all administrators from the level of department chair to College President. (See Academic Assessment System)
- Spring 2013 Assessment Reports & Closing-the-Loop forms submitted by departments/programs.
  - These reports represent the assessment data and analysis for the Spring 2013 semester. (www.brockport.edu/accountability/divassessment.html)
- Three-Year Program Assessment Plans from all departments/programs submitted by end of Spring 2013 semester.
  - These are the plans for how each department/program will complete the remainder of the three-year assessment cycle. (www.brockport.edu/accountability/divassessment.html)

Summer 2013

- Spring 2013 Assessment Reports & Closing-the-Loop forms reviewed.
  - As noted above, these reports are the results and actions planned by departments/programs to close the loop on assessments done in Spring 2013.
- Deans’ feedback letter to departments/programs based on their review of assessment results.
  - Dean’s feedback is required by The College Assessment System as a response to
departments/programs on their assessment efforts for the Spring 2013 semester. (School Deans Assessment Presentations www.brockport.edu/accountability/divassessment.html)

- Assessment reporting for Spring 2013 semester follows the Academic Assessment System for assessment reporting and information flow.

The Academic Assessment System (see p. 30) approved in Spring 2013 formalized the required reporting pathways for assessment information. Copies of these reports, for all levels, are posted on the Divisional Assessment Web page (https://www.brockport.edu/about/accountability/academic_assessment.html).

**Fall 2013**

- Completion of Assessment Report submission from 2012-2013 and deans’ feedback letters to departments.
- Completed the reporting cycle for Academic Year (AY) 2012-2013.
- The interim provost set the goal of “Moving beyond compliance to a culture of assessment and data-driven decision making,” and held open, school-based deans’ assessment forums attended by the interim provost and vice provost. Programs made PowerPoint presentations of their SLOs and Spring 2013 projects, summarized data, gathered and identified closing-the-loop action planning (See School Dean’s Assessment Presentations www.brockport.edu/accountability/divassessment.html). These forums had robust attendance and ensure the work of sustainability in academic assessment by keeping assessment in the consciousness of the faculty as a body.
- Assessment projects for AY 2013-2014 begin in departments according to their three-year assessment plans. (www.brockport.edu/accountability/divassessment.html)
- Follow the Academic Assessment System steps according to plans for “beyond the department” reporting steps by dean and provost.
  - Annual reports filed at the various levels of administration based on 2012-2013 data. (https://www.brockport.edu/about/accountability/docs/ieac/college_wide_committee RESP.pdf#search=accountability%20annual%20reports)

**Analysis and Use of Results**

Analysis of program learning outcome(s) requires a review and discussion by the department as confirmed by department chair signature and list of participating faculty, and this is noted on the report form.

The dean of each of the five schools then brings together the department representatives within that school in an Assessment Forum for an assessment review, at which time their results are reported, (summarized on a series of PPT slides) discussed, and ideas shared among the participants (dean,
provost, and vice provost attend these meetings). (School Deans Assessment Presentations www.brockport.edu/accountability/divassessment.html)

The department chairs and the deans then use the information in their planning and budgeting cycle, identifying any assessment results that indicate the need for funding within the next budget cycle, and this information is also available to the provost. During the first set of reports for Spring 2013 there were no requests for additional funding based on assessment findings. Revision of course materials was the most typical closing-the-loop proposed action.

The Program SLOs, assessment plans, Results and Closing-the-Loop forms, and PPT presentations from the School Assessment Forum are posted on the Accountability Website and are available to the Academic Assessment Subcommittee and the IEAC for use in their assessment monitoring functions.

In each department, the results of the Spring 2013 assessment effort to assess at least one program learning outcome were reported and used to close the loop and to plan for program improvement in the next offering of the course(s) supporting that program outcome. The following Results and Closing-the-Loop form illustrates those plans:
## 2012-2013 Assessment Results and Closing-the-Loop Actions

### Department of Theatre

Directions: For each department/program student-learning outcome, the department will provide the following information on the results of assessment completed during this current academic year. What has been learned about curriculum, pedagogy, student learning? What percent of students – exceeded, met, approached, did not meet – the criteria of success? What specific actions will the department initiate for improvement (“Closing-the-Loop”), including budget requests? Enter this information in the table below. Submit this form at the end of each academic year during the three-year assessment cycle. This table has space for reports on only one outcome; copy it for additional outcomes in this report.

**Results and Closing-the-Loop actions were discussed with faculty — Chair Signature:**

May 21, 2013

**Faculty Present:** Gail Argetsinger, Davida Bloom, Oh-Kon Cho, Ruth Childs, Michael Krickmire, Gary Musante, Francis X Kuhn, Natalie Sarrazin, Richard St. George

### Outcome assessed: THEATRE SLO #4 Apply critical thinking skills to the discipline of Theatre

| List all courses providing assessment data on this outcome (one row for each) | Specific Assignments/Task Evaluated in each course listed | Results of Assessment: n= ______
(total number of all assessments)
[% Exceeding; Meeting/ Approaching; Not Meeting Criterion of Success] |
|---|---|---|
| THE 111 Intro to Theatre (Bloom) | Production Critique Paper #1 graded by a rubric | Total number of students assessed in the course – all sections (n): 149
Percent exceeding: 61.7% (92)
Percent meeting: 22.8% (34)
Percent approaching: 5.3% (8)
Percent not meeting: 10% (15) |
| | Production Critique Paper #2 graded by a rubric | Percent exceeding: 94.6% (142)
Percent meeting: 4% (6 students)
Percent approaching: 0%
Percent not meeting: 1.3% (2)
Total enrollment was 153 |
**Closing-the-Loop**: Maintain assignment and benchmark. Evidence of significant improvement from the first to the second production critique papers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE 201 Theatre Arts (P. Ralph)</th>
<th>1. Students write a critical response paper after viewing a main stage production.</th>
<th>Total number of students assessed in the course – all sections (n): 23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent exceeding: 22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent meeting: 72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent approaching: 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent not meeting: 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Students will produce a final project</td>
<td>(n) 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent exceeding: 22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent meeting: 72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent approaching: 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent not meeting: 4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Closing-the-Loop**: Actions to be taken as a result of assessment: Raise the benchmark to 85% - with 22% exceeding the benchmark it is set too low. Add to the complexity of the final project evaluative tool. The core of the critical thinking aspect of the final project is the relationship of production concept to explication of text. Addition of a critical thinking-specific tool to the project will tease out these data. The course currently includes a related project assignment, formalizing the task, instrument and evaluative tool should put focus on the creative thinking part

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE 201 Theatre Arts (M. Krickmire)</th>
<th>1. Students write a critical response paper after viewing a main stage production</th>
<th>Total number of students assessed in the course – all sections (n): 41</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent exceeding: 65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent meeting: 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent approaching: 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent not meeting: 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Students will produce a final project</td>
<td>all sections (n)= 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent exceeding: 90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent meeting: 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent approaching: 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Closing-the-Loop Action

Actions to be taken as a result of assessment:

Benchmark for task #2 will be raised to 85% will achieve a grade of C or higher, this change has been agreed upon by both instructors of this course. My percentages above are based on full grades for the final project and not solely on the critical thinking component displayed in the presentation of that project, as it should be. I personally need to define what percentage of the final project involves “critical thinking” and adjust my rubric to reflect that change/addition.

See [www.brockport.edu/accountability/internal/loop_Theatre.pdf](http://www.brockport.edu/accountability/internal/loop_Theatre.pdf) for the complete report from the Department of Theatre.
Institutional SLOs and the Academic Assessment System

The College’s academic assessments have long been guided by the Institutional Student Learning Outcomes (ISLOs) (www.brockport.edu/accountability/divassessment/institutional%20slo.pdf) and are consistent with The College mission’s focus on student success. Reflecting our commitment to best practices to advance that mission, the ISLOs developed in the undergraduate experience are based on the framework of the American Association of Colleges and University’s Liberal Education and America’s Promise. These outcomes are assessed through the Academic Assessment System and our work with assessment in Gen Ed.

All program SLOs are linked to one or more of the Institutional SLOs. The ISLOs have been reviewed by the Academic Assessment Subcommittee. The six areas included represent the essential elements of a baccalaureate education: Critical Thinking, Quantitative Thinking, Global Perspectives, Human Ideas and Experience, and the Major Specialization. Each of these areas includes a selection of required courses so that no student graduates from The College at Brockport without experience in these crucial areas. Program outcomes data and data extracted from Gen Ed program assessments ensure student learning in these areas and all ISLOs are evaluated on an ongoing cycle. Assessment results are shared with the campus and posted on the campus Accountability Website (Divisional Assessment www.brockport.edu/accountability/divassessment.html).

To facilitate effective assessment and use of assessment data of the Gen Ed Program, The College has maintained a comprehensive assessment plan. This plan was updated in 2012-2013 for a new five-year cycle. The plan outlines Institutional SLO (ISLO) assessment, including both the SUNY Trustees’ Gen Ed SLOs expressed in the Implementation Guidelines of the SUNY Provost’s Advisory Task Force on General Education and a number of SLOs specific to The College’s Gen Ed Program (local requirements). The SLOs for The College’s traditional Gen Ed Program completely incorporate the Trustees’ outcomes and so by assessing those outcomes, The College meets both SUNY and Brockport requirements. The plan was developed by the Office of the Vice Provost and was reviewed and approved by the 2012 College-wide Assessment Committee. The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs administratively approved the plan in 2012.

Assessment of the twelve SUNY Board of Trustees-mandated Gen Ed areas is intended to take place in a cyclical manner with some assessments occurring annually and others on a three-year cycle. Currently, annual assessments include: Basic Communication, Foreign Language, Critical Thinking, Computer Literacy and Mathematics; on the longer term three-year cycle, starting in 2011-2012 are: Natural Sciences, Social Sciences, American History, Western Civilization, Other World Civilizations, Humanities, and the Arts. (Gen Ed Assessment Plan https://brockport.edu/academics/general_education/assessment/schedule.html)
For the past five years, Gen Ed assessment has focused most intently on the “skills assessments” because these are extremely important assessments and are cross-departmental in scope. The assessment of critical thinking has been a focus of intense assessment interest in view of the current national discussion of the issues related to the teaching of critical thinking skills and the importance of these skills to student achievement in and beyond the undergraduate years. (GenEd Assessment Reports, www.brockport.edu/accountability/divassessment.html)

Reports on assessments in the Gen Ed Program are discussed in the Academic Assessment Subcommittee with any recommendations for resources sent forward to the IEAC. Recommendations for curricular change can go from this subcommittee to the sponsoring department and school dean or, in the case of a recommendation for structural change in the Gen Ed program, to The College Senate's Gen Ed Committee.

**Periodic Program Review**

As stated in The College's recent MSCHE self-study, one of the best and most thorough assurances of academic quality in The College’s academic programs is The College’s Periodic Program Review process (PPR). This process requires all major programs to complete a structured, in-depth review on a seven-year cycle. A new PPR cycle began in 2009 and will continue through 2016. By the end of this current cycle, all academic programs will have undergone an in-depth review beginning with the preparation of a highly structured and comprehensive departmental self-study that addresses all aspects of department function. (PPR Guidelines, www.brockport.edu/acadaff/forms/Periodic%20Program%20Review%20Guidelines%20Draft%20for%202009-2016%20cycle%2001%2024%2013.pdf)

An important part of the PPR process requires departments to bring to campus two external reviewers from peer institutions (usually one SUNY and one non-SUNY) to examine their self-study and independently review the department and its programs. Reviewers’ written reports go to departments, and are circulated to the school dean, vice provost, and provost (See External Reviewers’ Reports, FC2).

In consultation with the school, the department prepares a draft Joint Action plan, which addresses actions for improvements to be taken by the department and specifies attendant resource needs. The Deans’ Council receives a presentation by the department chair and school dean, discusses the details of the draft Joint Action Plan, and formalizes the final Joint Action Plan.
When the PPR is concluded, a letter from the provost (FC2) to the department confirms completion and acknowledges the ways in which the College administration has agreed that it can support those actions. The department and the school dean are responsible for seeing that the elements of the Joint Action Plan are implemented and reported on in the Departmental Annual Reports.

**Interactions Between Assessment and the Overall Planning Cycle**

As noted in Chapter 2, the Institutional Assessment System brings assessment results into budget planning, and ultimately the process of continuous institutional renewal. Assessment data collected in the Fall and Spring semesters can be used to justify curricular change, new staffing, facilities upgrades, etc., during the subsequent budget process. After the School’s Assessment Forum (see Academic Assessment System) the dean may choose to allocate some funds for immediate needs as identified by the departments through their assessment reports. The provost has access to all of these reports and can also provide funding for short-term or long-term needs at any point in the budget cycle.

As the formal budget process is undertaken, the provost, informed by these recommendations and other information prepares the divisional budget for discussion with the Budget & Resource Committee. Recommendations from the Budget & Resources Committee are reviewed by the IEAC and passed along to the President’s Cabinet.

Thus, there are multiple avenues through which the assessment system can inform budgetary decision-making and influence the allocation of resources.

**A Sustainable System: Summary/Conclusions**

In responding to the MSCHE requirement for a Monitoring Report, the College has sought a solution to the very important question: “What makes an assessment system sustainable?” Our answer to this question is that a sustainable system must have:

- An established structure that specifies all the necessary actions needed for meaningful assessment;
- Assigned roles and ongoing responsibilities for all defined tasks involved in the assessment system;
- Monitoring functions assigned at the critical points for maintaining the functions of the system;
- Assigned points of data collection, analysis, reporting, and communicating the results in ways
that allow meaningful programmatic response; and,

- Resources to adequately staff the various assessment functions.

An examination of the Institutional Assessment System and the Academic Assessment System will show that these systems meet the above-listed criteria for sustainability. In practice, our experience with these systems over the 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 Academic Years indicates that they do function reliably. They generate meaningful information on curricular and pedagogical improvement. The assessment information reaches the decision-makers responsible for allocation of College resources. The system can be sustained in the long term.
Conclusion of Report

The College at Brockport has aggressively pursued establishing a culture of assessment on campus.

The Middle States visiting team made two very broad and inclusive recommendations that The College has worked in a strongly focused manner to address:

- Move promptly to design and implement a sustainable Institutional Assessment System; and
- Fully develop and establish a sustainable student learning outcomes assessment system.

We are confident that the College has implemented a comprehensive assessment system, described in this report, and that it is sustainable. This system will be the foundation of institutional renewal in the years to come. To highlight some of the elements designed and established over the last eighteen months:

- Streamlined Strategic Plan 2011-2016 with measurable outcomes;
- Newly designed Institutional Assessment System that includes a reconstituted Institutional Effectiveness and Accountability Committee with its two major subcommittees, and with clear lines of communication among the various constituencies on campus;
- Revised and updated the Accountability Website to house all the assessment data in an open, transparent method;
- Created and implemented a form for identifying administrative assessment efforts; the form tracks linkages to the Strategic Plan and Closing the Loop, thereby indicating impact in order to clearly link the assessment effort to budget and institutional renewal;
- Outlined a Planning and Assessment Cycle to illustrate the interconnectedness of planning, assessment, and budgeting in support of the Strategic Plan and mission of the College at Brockport;
- Implemented College-wide training for faculty and staff, including Deans’ Forums, to establish a common foundation for the culture of assessment and data-driven decision-making on campus;
- Hosted the first annual administrative assessment training session to present the 2013-2014 Annual Report template, including an outline of administrative assessment requirements;
- Worked to systematically define program learning outcomes for all programs, with a three-year cycle for assessing all outcomes;
- Clearly defined a method for closing-the-loop actions that are communicated to decision-making groups for linkages to the budget and renewal initiatives;
• Defined and streamlined a process to ensure open communication by the assignment of roles at each stage;
• Revised and updated the General Education Assessment system that is incorporated into the program learning outcomes; and
• Fully articulated a more operational and sustainable academic assessment system.

These elements establish a strong foundation for future success with assessment at all levels. The College at Brockport is prepared to sustain and augment these efforts to keep assessment in view as an integral component of academic and administrative decision making, thereby supporting the mission and ensuring that the success of its students remains the College's highest priority.
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## Acronym Guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AY</td>
<td>Academic Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAT</td>
<td>EMSA Assessment Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMSA</td>
<td>Enrollment Management and Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC2</td>
<td>FileCity 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>Full-time equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen Ed</td>
<td>General Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSSE</td>
<td>Graduate Student Satisfaction Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H&amp;HP</td>
<td>School of Health and Human Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAS</td>
<td>Institutional Assessment System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEAC</td>
<td>Institutional Assessment and Accountability Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLO</td>
<td>Institutional Student Learning Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>Key Performance Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDP</td>
<td>Leadership Development Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSSE</td>
<td>National Survey of Student Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPR</td>
<td>Periodic Program Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO</td>
<td>Student Learning Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLOA</td>
<td>Student Learning Outcomes Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>