Subject of Follow-up Report

Documenting further development and implementation of an assessment process that:

1. Furthers the implementation of the College’s new institutional assessment system with the evidence that assessment impacts planning, budgeting and resource allocation (Standard 7).

2. Continues the College’s implementation of the general education assessment approach in all areas with emphasis on the use of assessment results to enhance teaching and learning; creation of an oversight structure for general education assessment to enhance the integration of assessment information within the respective student learning outcomes; continued implementation of the program learning outcomes assessment process to use results to enhance teaching and learning (Standards 12 and 14).
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Overview of the Monitoring Report
The MSCHE Team visit in April 2014 commended the College at Brockport for its leadership on focusing human and fiscal resources on institutional assessment as well as student learning outcomes assessment; for developing a comprehensive institutional assessment process; for its transparency and accessibility of information on activities of the Institutional Effectiveness and Accountability Committee (IEAC) and its subcommittees, divisional assessment and strategic plan documents; for its recognition and understanding the use of assessment findings to enhance instructional strategies at the course level; and for its engagement with the assessment process. The Middle States Team did express concerns with and issued recommendations with respect to the following:

**Standard 7:** The College will further the implementation of its new institutional assessment system with the evidence that assessment impacts planning, budgeting and resource allocation.

**Standards 12 and 14:** The College should continue its implementation of the general education assessment approach in all areas with emphasis on the use of assessment results to enhance teaching and learning. The College should create an oversight structure for general education assessment to enhance the integration of assessment information within the respective institutional learning outcomes. The College should continue its implementation of the program learning outcomes assessment process to use results to enhance teaching and learning.

The College at Brockport has conscientiously endeavored to address the Middle States Team recommendations. As a result of the work that has been done and continues to be in progress, the College continues to refine and implement an inclusive assessment process that evaluates student learning outcomes (SLOs); plans assessments (both academic and administrative); 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.
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 49 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.
• Dr. Heidi Macpherson (who had been the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs at the
  University of Wisconsin-LaCrosse) became the College at Brockport’s new President on July 16,
  2015, after Dr. John Halstead, President since 2005, retired.

Institutional Profile

• The College has four divisions: Academic Affairs; Enrollment Management and Student
  Affairs (EMSA); Administration and Finance; and Advancement (see The College at
• Is funded by the State of New York and student tuition, and has a 2014-2015 state operating
  budget of $64M, composed of $17.9M direct State support and $47.1M tuition revenue, which
  has remained relatively static over the past six years. Enrollment trends stemming from
demographic shifts coupled with unfunded mandates to campuses (e.g., unfunded personnel
raises, Title IX compliance) combine to create a challenging fiscal environment. The College is
actively monitoring these trends and planning for potential contingencies.
• Recent and ongoing expansion and renovation of the campus: $44M Special Events Recreation
  Center; the new $30M Liberal Arts Building (opened September 2014); renovations to
  Thompson and MacVicar residence halls completed, the Smith (science) building completed;
  and Lathrop Hall (started Spring 2014 with expected completion date of Summer 2015).
• Enrolls over 7,000 undergraduate and 1,000 graduate students, of which 55% of the
  undergraduate and 67% of the graduate students are women. Roughly 16% of undergraduate
  and 15% of graduate students are from underrepresented populations (Fall 2014).
• An incoming undergraduate class (Fall 2014) of 1,090 first-time, full-time students, 1,012
  transfer students, with a full-time to part-time ratio of approximately 9:1, and a student-to-
  faculty ratio of 17:1.
• Awarded 1,771 bachelor’s degrees and 357 master’s degrees in 2012-2013.
• Awarded 1,885 bachelor’s degrees and 325 master’s degrees in 2013-2014.
• Undergraduate full-time equivalent enrollment (FTE) was 6765; graduate FTE was 633 for the
  2012-2013 academic year. Undergraduate FTE was 6786 and graduate was 569 for the 2013-
  2014 academic year.
• The faculty is comprised of 330 full-time faculty and 267 part-time faculty (597 total) with 70%
  of instruction offered by full-time faculty; 95% of tenured or tenure-track faculty hold terminal
  degrees (Fall 2014).
  ○ Faculty were active in scholarship, publishing eight scholarly books, 111 journal articles
    (9% co-authored with students), 22 chapters in scholarly books, one monograph, and 11
conference proceedings. Faculty also produced 29 art works, 35 dance performances, seven pieces of non-fiction and four pieces of fiction writing, and 3 theater performances.

○ Faculty also submitted 117 grant proposals, totaling $9,036,122 and received 90 awards, totaling $5,127,099 (2013-2014 academic year).

• Houses nearly 2,700 students in 12 residence halls and one apartment complex (Fall 2014).
• 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 2011-2016 Strategic Plan (SP). 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 to 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>Provide a transformational learning environment, including a culture of student engagement.</td>
<td>2.2 Increase programmatic accreditation where available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1 Increase student involvement in faculty scholarship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 Incorporate high impact educational practices into the curriculum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Co-Curricular Programming and Support Services

**Implement a cohesive student development program and a cohesive academic support structure.**

4. Enrichment programs and services that are designed to promote student development, engagement in learning, engagement with the institution, and augment the educational enterprise.

4.1 Implement engagement practices into all four years of the student leadership program.

4.2 Complete the Academic Success Center.

4.3 Complete the full-scale launch of the Institute for Engaged Learning.

4.4 Increase diversity across all populations of the campus.

4.5 Expand Health and Wellness Programming to encompass a broader range of issues and programming.

### Learning Environment and Quality of Place

**Ensure the development of our physical assets and implement an effective and efficient operational and policy environment.**

5. High quality facilities that our students live and learn in.

6. High quality facilities that support co-curricular programming.

7. Engagement of the campus in the community.

5.1 Implement the Facilities Master Plan.

5.2 Promote best practice in sustainability.

6.1 Create the capacity to further develop residential life facilities.

7.1 Increase partnerships with K-12 schools.

7.2 Increase partnerships with regional businesses.

7.3 Increase campus participation in the community.

### A Culture of Philanthropy and Connectedness

**Cultivate community engagement in the life of the college.**

8. Graduates remain engaged in the life of the campus.

9. Investment by stakeholders in the institution as a quality place.

8.1 Increase outreach to alumni locally and across the country through a variety of activities.

9.1 Launch and complete the $25M comprehensive campaign.

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 in year four of the five-year SP. The December 2014 Progress Report on the College Strategic Plan 2011-2016 identifies the progress to date and the efforts which will continue throughout the next year ([http://www.brockport.edu/planning/2011/docs/2014_2015-IEAC-sp-progress-report.pdf](http://www.brockport.edu/planning/2011/docs/2014_2015-IEAC-sp-progress-report.pdf)). The data analyzed in Chapters 2, 3, and 4 of this Monitoring Report provide evidence for and analysis of the college’s increasing integration of assessment practices with the SP.
### SUMMARY CHART OF INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS CHAPTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEAM REQUIREMENT</th>
<th>ACTION TAKEN/EVIDENCE</th>
<th>PAGE NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Further the implementation of its new institutional assessment system with the evidence that assessment impacts planning, budgeting and resource allocation.</td>
<td>1. Made organizational changes to better sustain the Institutional Assessment System (IAS), including creating and staffing the Office of Accountability and Assessment.</td>
<td>1. Pg. 9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Campus Climate Task Force compiled climate survey results and input from campus forums on recommended priorities/action items for final report submitted to Cabinet; President issued action items in letter to campus (February 4, 2015).</td>
<td>2. Pg. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Assessment of high impact practices by committees/task forces resulted in increased funding to support such practices; established baseline data from which to monitor future developments; established and filled new position: Assistant to the Provost for Applied Learning.</td>
<td>3. Pg. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Information from several task force reports contributed to plan for developing an Academic Success Center. Securing partial funding allowed the college to move forward; Academic Success Center Planning Committee formed January 2015 to carry plan forward.</td>
<td>4. Pg. 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. IEAC reviewed data and recommended that EMC revise retention and graduation goals set forth in original Strategic Plan. New goals set forth in IEAC 2014 Progress Report</td>
<td>5. Pg. 18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Annual periodic administrative unit assessment activities in a variety of administrative units led to changes in programming for Welcome Week, submission of an RFP for new procurement software, and changes in HR practices, among other actions.

7. Initial periodic administrative unit assessment resulted in Advancement’s periodic unit assessment results showed it exceeded fundraising target in the Strategic Plan but also that there were opportunities for improvement. Plans include revising some of the unit’s internal processes, working to enhance alumni relations, and develop improved metrics for leadership giving on campus, among others.

8. Results from annual and periodic assessment of student learning for institutional learning outcomes as well as programmatic ones is discussed in leadership groups within Academic Affairs and developed into various actions such as providing funding for closing the loop activities, reallocating staff resources to support assessment, and supporting faculty/staff participation in conferences/workshops.
Chapter 2: Standard 7 – Institutional Assessment

Monitoring Report Visiting Team recommendation regarding Standard 7:

The College will further the implementation of its new institutional assessment system with the evidence that assessment impacts planning, budgeting and resource allocation.

I. Overview

The College at Brockport Institutional Assessment System (IAS) evaluates overall effectiveness in achieving its mission and strategic plan goals and compliance with accreditation standards. Since the submission of the February 26, 2014 Monitoring Report, the College has continued its refinement and implementation. Assessment results show that the College is making substantial progress in realizing goals framed in the 2011-2016 Strategic Plan; students are accomplishing key institutional and programmatic learning outcomes; and the College is integrating results of its assessment more strongly with planning, budgeting, and resource allocation.

This chapter details the bases for the items below, emphasizing developments since the previous Monitoring Report:

- Summarizes the organizational changes provided to better sustain the IAS;
- Outlines the IAS structure and processes;
- Summarizes significant accomplishments: monitoring progress with the Strategic Plan, conducting unit-level assessment, and assessing student learning with reference to institutional and programmatic learning outcomes; and
- Lists key challenges ahead with recommendations and timelines for addressing them.

II. Organizational Changes Made to Sustain the IAS

The following organizational changes were implemented since the submission of the February 26, 2014 Monitoring Report to further the sustainability of the IAS:

- Creation of the Office of Accountability and Assessment

In summer 2014, the College hired Frances Dearing to lead the newly created Office of Accountability and Assessment. Comprised of 3.5 FTEs, this office is charged with guiding institutional, general education, and programmatic assessment efforts. Ms. Dearing brings a wealth of training and experience which she has communicated widely and effectively to numerous faculty and staff.
• Research, Analysis and Planning
   As referenced in the previous Monitoring Report, to better support and sustain data-informed decision-making, the Office of Research, Analysis and Planning (RAP) was organizationally moved to a direct reporting relationship to the Provost. This change, which took place in late winter 2014, provides a direct link between the highest level of decision making (i.e., Vice Presidents and President) and data analytics.

• Accountability Website
   The Institutional Effectiveness and Accountability website, created in 2013, was redesigned in summer 2015 to consolidate the information and make it more accessible to various stakeholders.

• Evolution of the Institutional Effectiveness and Accountability Committee (IEAC) to foster greater integration and information-sharing
   o Four faculty assessment coordinators were appointed to the IEAC to provide more faculty input/involvement in IEAC actions/deliberations.
   o Two college-wide standing committees (General Education Assessment Committee and Academic Program Review Committee) were created to replace the IEAC subcommittee on academic assessment. These two committees will work closely with the Director of Accountability and Assessment and provide reports to the Provost.
   o College leaders have been reviewing past processes and reconceptualizing the relationship between the IEAC and the Budget and Resource Committee (BRC) to better unite assessment, planning, and resource allocation.

III. The College at Brockport’s Institutional Assessment System – Structure and Process

The College Mission and 2011-2016 Strategic Plan continue to guide the IAS. The IAS structure and processes are evolving due to continual efforts to assess the assessment and incorporate feedback from Middle States’ visiting teams. While institutional decision-making is centralized in the President’s Cabinet (hereafter Cabinet), planning and assessment activities are more organic and decentralized, occurring in college-wide committees and task forces; specific units, both academic and institutional; and sometimes with assistance from external consultants. The following describes these groups, related processes, and most recent developments.
A. **College-wide Advisory Committees.** These standing committees, each related to a key institutional area/priority and featuring broad representation of campus constituencies, gather and review information, provide commentary, and make recommendations to the functionally-related offices/officers as well as the Cabinet.

1. **Institutional Effectiveness and Accountability Committee (IEAC):** This committee ensures that institutional effectiveness plans are aligned with the SP, that assessment results are used to support institutional renewal and improvement, and evaluates effectiveness and comprehensiveness of College assessment planning and resource allocation.

The IEAC is responsible for producing annual reports charting institutional progress in meeting goals within the current SP. Reports have been produced for the past two years through the following process. During the fall, IEAC members gather the necessary data to address the SP’s goals. After review and discussion, a final report is typically given to Cabinet by the end of the fall semester. Cabinet reviews and responds to the IEAC in the spring semester. Depending on the nature of the feedback, where applicable, appropriate parties are identified and assigned responsibility for implementing decisions/changes that are recommended. Subsequent to this year’s report, the IEAC, in consultation with Cabinet, created an executive summary chart to more efficiently capture this process and aid closing the loop.
2. **Budget and Resource Committee (BRC):** This committee reviews and makes recommendations to Cabinet about the annual operating budget for the college (e.g., divisional budget requests, student fees, etc.). Recently, the BRC has been asked to prioritize and recommend strategic investment/priority needs requests from each division within the college. The BRC represents a strategic conduit for linking together assessment, planning, and resource allocation. Therefore, collectively rethinking its responsibilities is another part of the continued development of the IAS. Initial sharing of reports from BRC and several of the other college-wide committees described below with the IEAC served as a catalyst for extensive conversations within and among IEAC and BRC members and Cabinet. As a result of these conversations, in February 2015, the following documents were drafted and will be evaluated and discussed by the BRC in fall 2015 for possible implementation: Campus Planning and Resource Allocation Calendar; Budget and Resource Allocation Principles and Guidelines.

3. **Enrollment Management Committee (EMC):** This committee monitors data related to new student enrollment, retention, and graduation rates and makes recommendations to leaders in Enrollment Management and Student Affairs (EMSA) and Cabinet related to annual enrollment targets, strategic investments, and program planning.

4. **College-wide Facilities Planning Committee (FPC):** This committee monitors progress on the College Facilities Master Plan and makes recommendations to Cabinet at key decision points for major renovation and construction projects, some of which are critical in the context of the SP. Examples include: the recently completed Liberal Arts Building, ongoing Lathrop Hall remodel, implementation of the Residential Life Master Plan, and the impending renovation of the AW Brown Building, which will house the future Academic Success Center.

5. **Diversity Committee (DC):** This committee provides leadership to the strategic direction for the college in reference to equity, diversity, and inclusion (EDI). The group coordinates the annual Diversity Conference and provides analysis and recommendations to Cabinet derived from key performance indicators (KPIs) related to EDI. In April 2015, in response to the campus climate survey recommendations and awareness of the changing demographics of the student body at the college, the Provost asked the DC to reassess its roles and responsibilities with implementation in fall 2015.

6. **General Education Assessment Committee (GEAC):** This faculty-based committee is responsible for sustaining the progress of general education assessment by developing an assessment plan for the college and supporting the implementation of the general education initiative. In May 2015 the committee finalized and submitted a college-wide general education assessment plan and a list of recommendations to the Provost. In addition, a subcommittee developed general education rubrics and closing-the-loop documentation forms and recommended web site revisions. Five committee members (four faculty members and one administrator) participated in the AAC&U General Education Institute in June 2015, during which time they developed an action plan to support the implementation of the general education
assessment plan. Faculty teams have been created for the areas chosen for assessment in the 2015-2016 academic year. Each team member received a summer stipend (provided by the Provost’s Office) and training by committee members. The initiation of faculty teams will continue throughout the four-year scheduled general education assessment rotation to ensure appropriate faculty participation. (See Chapter 3 for additional details regarding previous efforts.)

7. Academic Program Review Committee (APRC): This faculty-based committee is charged with sustaining the periodic program review process, which is described in greater detail in Chapter 4. The committee’s main responsibilities include implementing the revised Periodic Program Review (PPR) process and an annual review of the PPR reports with suggestions for improvement to the respective programs. Specific functions of the APRC are described in Chapter 4.

B. College Unit-level Assessment: Another locus of assessment at the college is unit-level, both administrative (administrative refers to all college units that are not academic departments) and academic; both are very similar in their objectives and reporting. There are two layers to these efforts (annual assessments and comprehensive periodic unit reviews) representing different scope and time spans.

Both administrative units and academic departments have been doing annual assessments for some time. Historically, academic departments have engaged in periodic reviews; more recently, the college initiated a periodic review process for administrative units. Annual and periodic assessments are reciprocally related to one another. Annual work feeds into the periodic review in part by providing evidence of assessment and closing-the-loop results. The periodic unit review process serves as a springboard for further development of the annual processes that drive resource allocation/reallocation and prioritization within the division. Due to its recent implementation, administrative review is summarized in some detail below while more complete descriptions of academic unit assessment are discussed in Chapters 3 and 4.

1. Administrative Unit Assessment
   a. Annual Unit Assessment: Units produce annual reports that document assessment efforts which could include highlighting KPIs, examples of closing the loop, and the connection between unit goals and the SP. These reports are presented to the appropriate personnel in the organizational chart and ultimately to the Vice President of the division in which that unit is located. The reports inform decisions related to potential reallocation of existing, or requests for new, resources within each division. Examples may be found in Section IV. B. below.

   b. Periodic Administrative Unit Assessment: In fall 2014, the college introduced a comprehensive quality and improvement assessment process: Periodic Administrative Unit Assessment (PAUA), the purpose for which is continuous assessment of administrative and educational support units. This process enables administrative units to assess the effectiveness of their operations on a five-year schedule. The Director of Assessment chaired the IEAC Administrative Assessment Subcommittee, which is comprised of representatives from various administrative units. This subcommittee worked
with the director to establish the administrative units to be reviewed on the five-year schedule as well as the self-study format. As of summer 2015, six administrative units (Campus Recreation, Facilities and Planning [Maintenance], Student Learning Systems, Student Learning Center, Division of Advancement [Capital Campaign], and Undergraduate Admissions) have completed periodic administrative unit assessment.

There are several components to this assessment process:

i. **Unit Review/Self-Study**: The PAUA is a candid and comprehensive assessment process which includes documentation of the unit’s mission statements and its link to the college mission and the SP, unit goals and measurable outcomes, and strengths and weaknesses. Selected goals and desired outcomes are assessed using a variety of tools and/or existing metrics (including direct and indirect measures) and an analysis of assessment results is provided. Three electronic templates detail the information for units to complete for the unit review. Those templates are as follows:
   - **Administrative Unit Assessment (Document 1)**: This template guides the unit through the narrative portion of the process (i.e., unit profile, audit of resources, and administrative assessment summary).
   - **Administrative Assessment Documentation (Document 2)**: This template is used to guide the unit with articulation and documentation (i.e., identification of the goal and outcomes for assessment, demonstration of alignment of the college mission and SP with the selected goal(s); data sources, method(s) of data collection; assessment results; dissemination of results and key finding(s) of the assessment process for each goal assessed).
   - **Closing the Loop Documentation (Document 3)**: This template is designed to document the unit’s action plans based on assessment data, the SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats) analysis and additional key findings. This document is kept on file in the Office of Accountability and Assessment as well as the respective administrative unit office and provides for updates every six months regarding the status of the action plans.

ii. **Final review and recommendations**: Results of the PAUA are presented in a preliminary report that is then reviewed by the unit’s administrative team and staff from the Office of Accountability and Assessment no later than the end of April. Upon approval, a final report is made available to the division vice president. The division vice president (or his/her designee), unit administrative team, and Director of Accountability and Assessment will receive the final report with the agreed upon recommendations by the end of September. The Office of Accountability and Assessment will follow up with the unit each semester to ensure the action plans are implemented.

2. **Academic Unit Review**: The annual and periodic assessment and reporting efforts of academic units are described in more detail in Chapters 3 and 4.
C. Task Forces and Other Groups: Other groups also play important roles in the college assessment and planning environment. Internally, the college utilizes task forces and other ad hoc groups that are typically created and charged by senior leadership to study and make recommendations on specific issues of strategic importance to the college. In addition, senior leadership uses external consultants who study and advise on critical campus issues in those cases where the college has need of additional expertise and/or resources. Reports from these groups/organizations, while often available to the campus community, typically are presented to appropriate leadership groups (e.g., President's Advisory Council, Dean's council) and/or divisional vice president or other body (e.g., College Senate) responsible for assigning those tasks. The reports potentially inform institutional actions and resource allocation. Recent examples include several subcommittees assisting the Institute for Engaged Learning (IEL) (e.g., Subcommittee on High Impact Practices; Service Learning Subcommittee) and Rankin and Associates, a campus climate consulting organization. Some of their accomplishments are presented in Section IV below.

IV. Significant Institutional Assessment Accomplishments

This section focuses on the three key components for assessing the college’s institutional effectiveness: strategic plan assessment, unit level assessment, and the assessment of student learning.

A. Strategic Plan Assessment

In its 2014 Progress Report, the IEAC concluded that the college met four (4) of 17 SP goals and is making satisfactory progress towards the remainder. Furthermore, assessment results generated via the IAS were used to track progress on the SP goals; revise goals and metrics where appropriate (for use in future assessment); and allocate resources to further support the college’s strategic goals. The chart below summarizes some key examples with more narrative detail following:

**Selected Examples of Actions on Strategic Plan Goals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Goal (#)</th>
<th>Accomplished</th>
<th>Resulting Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase programmatic accreditation where available (2.2)</td>
<td>Five programs reaccredited since 2012 Self Study</td>
<td>College continues to invest human and financial resources to support accreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase service learning within the curriculum (1.1)</td>
<td>Subcommittees collected data and reported on existing college efforts and recommended a variety of actions</td>
<td>Increased funds available for student research opportunities and for faculty wishing to incorporate more service learning opportunities in classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plan Goal (#)</td>
<td>Accomplished</td>
<td>Resulting Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase student involvement in faculty scholarship (3.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of students engaged in undergraduate research activities increased year over year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate high impact practices in curriculum (3.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Established database of courses’ high impact activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete launch of Institute for Engaged Learning (4.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institute for Engaged Learning launched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Created position for Assistant to the Provost for Applied Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sent leadership team to WACE Institute for High Impact Experiential Education for strategic planning around undergraduate research, internships, and service learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Academic Success Center (4.2)</td>
<td>Resources acquired and need for planning identified</td>
<td>Created Academic Success Center Planning Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase diversity across all populations of the campus (4.4)</td>
<td>Increased workload relative to increasing diverse campus identified.</td>
<td>Title IX Coordinator hired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completed Campus Climate Study (CCS); recommendations made</td>
<td>Followed up on CCS recommendations by 1) Revising orientations for new faculty, staff, and students and 2) Exploring viability of “common hour”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global measurable outcomes (global measures in addition to AP goals; see Chapter 1)</td>
<td>Reviewed trend data for retention and graduation rates and revised strategic plan targets for same</td>
<td>Revised SP retention and graduation rate goals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Completed the Campus Climate Study Project**: A previous strategic plan of the DC called for a campus climate study in support of the strategic goal of fostering a welcoming and inclusive college community which, in turn, should promote better retention and graduation outcomes among all student groups. The college hired Rankin and Associates, a climate consulting firm, to conduct the study, and a Campus Climate Task Force was formed to assist in the project. The survey was administered in fall 2013 and results were disseminated in spring 2014. The task force then hosted campus forums in fall 2014 to gather feedback on the report and to help set action priorities. Feedback was reviewed and reported to Cabinet. As a result, in a letter to the college community in winter 2014, the President announced the following action items: hire Title IX Coordinator (started May 2015); enhance orientations for new faculty, staff, and students, especially transfer students (begin fall 2015); and explore the viability of establishing a college “common hour” (task force established spring 2015).

2. **Continued Progress on Goals Related to High Impact Practices (both academic and co-curricular)** (referred to subsequently as HIPs/CHIPs respectively): Since 2009, nearly one-third of the SP goals are devoted to promoting student participation in HIPs/CHIPs with the creation of the IEL. The college has invested both human and financial resources in a variety of initiatives to foster cross-divisional involvement. The college commitment is guided by research demonstrating the benefits of such activities and the SUNY strategic plan emphasis on applied learning (a term that subsumes many high impact practices). Continued developments since the last monitoring report are provided here:

   a. Increased funding and student participation in the Summer Undergraduate Research Program, demonstrating College investment in this activity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students and Dollars involved in UG Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   b. As reflected in the 2014 NSSE data, the college has some of the highest levels of involvement by both first year and senior students in community-based and service learning compared to other SUNY comprehensive colleges.

c. The IEL increased its service learning grant awards to faculty by over 30% from $5,250 in 2013-2014 to $7,000 in 2014-2015.

d. Collected baseline data from multiple sources (i.e., student academic records, NSSE, and faculty activity reporting system) to monitor future progress.

e. New leadership for the IEL was identified in summer 2015. Priority has been given to enhancement and reporting of applied learning activities such as internships, undergraduate research, student employment, service learning and community service. A cross-divisional team attended the 2015 WACE Conference. WACE is an international organization dedicated to developing and advocating for cooperative and work-integrated educational programs that has partnered with SUNY to advance this work. A report with recommendations for action by the IEL and several
departments closely tied to its work (e.g., Career Services, Community Development, Research and Sponsored Activities) is forthcoming.

3. **Continued progress on the Project for Establishing an Academic Success Center**: With a financial contribution from the New York State Assembly, the college has been able to advance the development of the Academic Success Center project which had been stalled due to lack of funding. Several task force reports have informed this work as an institutional priority. In January 2015 the Provost and the Vice President for Enrollment Management and Student Affairs appointed and charged the Academic Success Center Planning Committee to continue studying the physical space and propose changes to the process, policies, and organizational structure related to the promotion of students’ academic success which, in turn, can improve retention and graduation rates. Project completion is slated for August 2017.

4. **Revised Strategic Plan Benchmarks for Retention and Graduation Rates**

   After reviewing retention and graduation rate trend data, the IEAC recommended, and Cabinet concurred, that goals set for these rates at the inception of the SP be revised (2013 Strategic Plan Progress Report, p. 21). This task was given to the EMC who used analyses provided by the institutional research office to set new retention and graduation goals which were then included in the 2014 Strategic Plan Progress report. In similar fashion, the college has revised its aspirant peer group as a result of analyzing IPEDS data for institutions that had similar input parameters (e.g., sector, size) but more positive outcome measures. This was used as one of the comparison groups for the 2014 NSSE reports.

5. **Expanded Use of NSSE Results to Aid Assessment of Varied Strategic Plan Goals**: The IEAC judged it appropriate to expand the range of NSSE items used since the initial creation of the SP because the items provide relevant, if indirect, measures to aid assessment of progress with various goals, including those related to the General Education Program, faculty/staff/student engagement, and diversity. 2014 results were shared and discussed in the IEAC and President’s Advisory Council. In spring 2015, NSSE reports were disseminated to school deans who began to review with their respective departments and the Office of Residential Life/Learning Communities. Also established in spring 2015 was a committee (whose work will begin in fall 2015) to promote further efforts for using/disseminating NSSE and other student survey data results which the college possesses.

6. **Maintained programmatic accreditation; seek new accreditation as opportunities become available**: The college continues to achieve and build quality academic programs through national and professional accreditation processes. Brockport is accredited by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education and 13 professional accreditation organizations: [The College at Brockport National Accreditation Bodies](#). The college is assessed by these organizations on a regular schedule and responds to recommendations accordingly. Those programs receiving reaccreditation since the 2012 Middle States Self-Study include the following:
a. The School of Business Administration and Economics: AACSB (Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business) – Reaccreditation completed in 2013.


c. Computer Science: Advanced Computing Track and Computer Information Systems – ABET (Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology) – Successfully completed self-study and site team visit October 2014; waiting for final decision from ABET on reaccreditation decision.


e. Dance: NASD (National Association of Schools of Dance) – Successfully completed self-study and site team visit April 2015; waiting for final decision from NASD on reaccreditation decision.

B. Unit-level Assessment: The following presents some key accomplishments stemming from either annual or periodic administrative assessment processes across the college:

1. Annual Administrative Unit Assessment

a. Welcome Week: Annual assessment of the new student welcome programs by Student Union and Activities has resulted in multiple improvements to engage students and to impact their student learning. Examples include the move of academic convocation from Sunday to Friday, increasing faculty participation and to serve as a more symbolic kick-off of the students’ career at the college; integration of the introduction to the first-year experience class and the community service activity reflection; and further refinement of the educational programs related to sexual assault, intimate partner violence, and healthy decisions related to alcohol and other drugs to ensure student learning.

b. Living Learning Communities (LLC): The LLC Program, housed within the Office of Residential Life/Learning Communities, has grown exponentially in its seven years of existence. In recent years, however, there has been a decline in participation by returning students. Results from the mid-year residential life survey and focus group discussions with returning students who did not participate in a LLC in their second year revealed that physical facilities, not program, was the driver of their decision. The results have informed a decision to modify the location of the returning LLC program for future years and have provided additional data to support the strategic goal of implementing a master plan for residential facilities.

c. eProcurement: SUNY campuses in western New York and SUNY System Administration’s Office of Business Operations and Procurement are working collaboratively to transform the current SUNY Procurement environment from its heavily transactional state to one that is conducive to more strategic activity. The
goal is to optimize SUNY procurement processes so that procurement staffs are able to spend more time on higher level activity, such as: strategic sourcing, including spend analysis; procurement development; and contract negotiations. Data collected revealed that currently almost two-thirds of staff time is devoted to transactional activity. As a result of this analysis, a formal SUNY Western New York Campus Collaborative RFP for eProcurement Software Solution and Related Maintenance, Support and Professional Services was issued and vendor selection process is being finalized going into the 2015-2016 fiscal year. Estimated savings from eProcurement for Brockport ranges from $385.5k to $1,157.4M.

d. **Human Resources Service Delivery Initiative**: An operational assessment of the college HR Office based on data analysis and institutional risk was conducted which resulted in a proposal to reengineer practices and/or establish structures, systems, processes and policies as well as establish priorities and goals. The college commissioned an external review between March and June of 2014 to conduct extensive research. The results informed the work of a team of HR and campus leaders (convened in March 2014) who have been meeting biweekly since that time to develop working plans and recommendations for making operational changes and improvements to the HR organization. This work is ongoing heading into the 2015-2016 fiscal year and includes, among other things, the restructuring of the HR Office and redesigning of strategic recruitment and retention processes to streamline, develop short- and long-term strategies, and enhance search committee development and orientation.

2. Periodic Administrative Unit Assessment Summaries

a. **Student Learning Systems**

**Overview**: The Learning Systems team is responsible for all activities required to support the college’s Learning Management Platform including application, systems, database and user support. This unit participated in the unit assessment/self-study process during the 2014 fall semester and 2015 spring semester.

**Assessment Description**: The assessment focus involved the SUNY standards for the prescribed phase-in of Blackboard LMS for a pilot faculty cohort (12) and pilot courses (24); and a second faculty cohort (50) and second cohort of courses (100). Additionally, the assessment included the evaluation by faculty regarding the quality of the Blackboard training program for the second semester of implementation.

**Results**: The metrics for both outcomes involving the SUNY standards for the prescribed phase-in of Blackboard were exceeded. However, the qualitative faculty-opinion survey yielded the following areas of concern:

i. Pace of the workshops;
ii. Language used in the workshops; and
iii. Clarity of the workshop presenter.

**Dissemination of results**: These key findings were disseminated in report format and discussed among members of the Learning Systems Team during weekly project meetings. Additionally, the findings were delivered in presentations to the College Technology Council and the Library, Information, and Technology Services (LITS) staff. Campus-wide communication of key findings was presented in the Daily Eagle, the college’s electronic newsletter.
Action plan summary: After the dissemination and discussion of the assessment results, the unit team decided to continue with the assessment process for the final implementation phase of Blackboard in fall 2015 with the following methods:

i. Professional staff members received presentation coaching from a faculty member in the Department of Theatre to enhance their communication skills. Several changes were made to the training sessions based on data received in the survey. A reassessment of the changes will occur at the conclusion of the next training cycle in fall 2015.

ii. Add a qualitative survey to measure faculty success with training and adoption.

iii. Explore opportunities to seek student feedback and to measure student success with the transition to Blackboard after the 2015 fall semester.

b. Advancement (Capital Campaign)

Overview: The College’s Advancement unit focuses upon the planning and raising of private support from a variety of sources (i.e., alumni, faculty/staff, emeriti, organizations and parents) through major gifts. Advancement participated in the unit assessment process in the 2015 spring semester

Assessment Description: Advancement’s assessment goal involved the comprehensive fundraising campaign and quantitative outcomes based on the following segmentation:

i. Support and Enrichment

ii. Faculty, Schools and Support Program

iii. Campus Facilities and Enhancements

iv. The Fund for Brockport

Additionally, a feasibility study was implemented among campaign donors to determine possibilities for additional fundraising.

Results: The overall results indicated the fundraising target amount and timeline were exceeded. However, the assessment results by segment indicated opportunities for improvement. The unit’s data (dollars contributed) for the Faculty, Schools and Support Programs segment fell significantly below expectations ($2.7M), even though this segment supported an online fundraising effort. Additionally, the unit’s historical lack of investment in alumni engagement negatively impacted the anticipated donor breakdown with a significant proportion of funds donated by emeriti and faculty/staff.

Dissemination of results: The key assessment findings were disseminated to the following college constituents between February and March 2015:

i. Foundation Board

ii. College Senate and College Council

iii. Alumni Board

iv. Brockport campus via Daily Eagle (the college newsletter)

v. Mass alumni base via Campaign web site

Action Plan Summary: Based on assessment results and feedback, the Advancement unit’s team agreed on a multi-faceted action plan which includes the following highlights:

i. Revamping of internal processes (i.e., implement Academic Works with user feedback and align with agreements).

ii. Create scholar policies and procedures document.
iii. Enhance relationships with alumni through a series of events and communications.
iv. Determine future funding priorities among the five schools and the graduate school.
v. Develop improved metrics for leadership giving on campus.

c. **Student Learning Center**

**Overview:** The Student Learning Center reports to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs. Productive and trusting relationships with faculty, tutor training in current learning center pedagogies, and high caliber student tutors contribute to the unit's success. Assessments are implemented each semester within the center to ensure improvement of service delivery.

**Assessment Description:** Based on current assessments, the Student Learning Center Director and staff focused on the goal of “providing academically enriching experiences outside of the classroom.” The two outcomes focused on analyzing and evaluating tutoring services via surveys, which included a Likert scale for rating 11 items and two open-ended response questions: the first question concerned the environment; the second question requested information regarding potential resources for the center which would enhance the tutoring process. The surveys were designed for each target audience. Tutors and students were asked to complete paper and electronic surveys for the 11 items. Tutors received the two open-ended questions on their survey.

**Results:** Key findings for Outcome #1 (Analyze and evaluate tutoring services) indicated that students believed tutoring helped improve their grades; students learned writing and/or problem-solving strategies; felt a high degree of confidence in their tutors’ knowledge and competence and indicated their tutors are following protocol designated by the center.

The tutors’ responses indicated that they experience a deeper understanding of the subject they tutor and the study strategies they teach; observe improvement in their students’ problem-solving and study strategies; and understanding the relationship between the Student Learning Center mission and the College Mission as they relate to student success.

The two key findings for Outcome #2 (Identify environmental factors to improve delivery of services and quality of place for students and tutors) indicated that tutors felt the center would be more effective with small break-out rooms for small group tutoring. Additionally, some tutors favored tutoring one-on-one in small quiet rooms.

**Dissemination of Results:** The key findings were disseminated through paper reports and discussion with the Vice Provost, the Student Learning Center professional staff, tutors, groups of students during tutor training, and other external stakeholders, including area transfer student professionals and high school guidance counselors.

**Action Plan Summary:** Several of the Student Learning Center’s action plan recommendations are listed below:

i. Begin to distribute student surveys in the third week of the 2015 fall semester to increase the total number collected.

ii. Collect student testimonials and publish on the SLC web site.

iii. Update SLC mission (has not been updated since 1999).
iv. Run focus groups with tutors to discuss tutoring pedagogy.
v. Implement focus groups (student and tutor) to discuss quality of place needs and disseminate the findings to the Academic Success Center Planning Committee.
vi. Develop a succession plan.

d. **Campus Recreation**

**Overview**: The Campus Recreation unit resides within the Enrollment Management and Students Affairs division. In the 2014-2015 academic year, the unit realized an increase in the number of underrepresented students hired to work with the Campus Recreation programs. The assessment goals were derived from the unit’s strategic plan, developed in 2013, which closely aligns with the college strategic plan.

**Assessment Description**: Campus Recreation’s assessment plan featured two goals: 1) Demonstrate increased knowledge and confidence of student employees through an employee training program; and 2) Increase the number of student employees to reflect the diverse population of the college community.

The Assessment measures were primarily quantitative. However, the “Job Performance Evaluations” were peer-to-peer evaluations for the employee training program. Additionally, personal interviews were used to collect demographic data for the number of underrepresented employees.

**Results**: Campus Recreation met or exceeded their goals. One hundred percent of the Campus Recreation student employees were trained through The All Employee Training Workshops. Ninety-eight percent of their student employees succeeded in passing the Aid/CPR/AED training on their first attempt.

**Action Plan Summary**: Campus Recreation’s action plan included the following:

i. Continue to ensure to facilitate more “red shirt” drills to test students’ emergency preparedness skill throughout the year.

ii. Develop a more consistent performance method/evaluation for all student employees.

iii. Develop a more robust officiating program for the student intramural staff.

C. **Student Learning Assessment**: Specific assessment results documenting evidence of student learning, related to both institutional learning outcomes and program-specific outcomes, are provided in Chapters 3 and 4. These results reveal both progress on outcomes and areas for continuous improvement.

Moreover, the college has clearly invested financial and human resources to support teaching and learning in furtherance of the college’s mission and goals. Examples include:

1. Creation and staffing of the Office of Accountability and Assessment.
2. Financial and human resource support for seeking accreditation for programs, which is part of the college’s strategic plan goals.
3. Work of the Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching.
5. Student learning assessment is coordinated, in collaboration with faculty and administrators, with the Office of Accountability and Assessment. To ensure integration at an institutional level, the Director of Assessment serves on the Academic Affairs Leadership Team and the Deans Council. Assessment is a regular agenda item for both groups. The Director discusses each area of assessment (general education, program,
and administrative) so all deans and directors are continuously informed and discussions
span across a wide sector of the college community.
6. The Provost’s office has made funds available to support closing the loop activities by
academic units and established in the Center for Excellence and Teaching (CELT) a
CELT Assessment Fellow whose purpose will be to support CELT and the college’s
assessment program by helping faculty learn about developing, measuring, and analyzing
learning outcomes.
7. Sponsoring faculty and staff to attend conferences and workshops.

V. Recommendations

Recognizing that the effective integration of assessment to planning and the distribution of
resources (financial, human, technical, physical, or other) is critical for the IAS, the following
recommendations are made. These efforts are key in a challenging fiscal environment as the
college will be deciding where to invest, reallocate, or look for efficiencies in support of fulfilling
the college mission.

A. Refine roles, including possible integration, of IEAC and BRC. Leadership of the two
committees will work on this in fall 2015 and prepare recommendations for the
improved integration of these groups by January 2016. This plan will allow the new
president of the college (who arrived mid-July 2015) the opportunity for full review,
input, and implementation as appropriate.
B. Revise timeline of IEAC strategic plan progress reporting to Cabinet. Revision to this
timeline should ensure reporting, feedback, and subsequent follow-through in a timely
manner so that budget presentations to BRC in spring can take this feedback into
account. The IEAC will revisit the schedule immediately this fall and make
recommendations to Cabinet by October 31, 2015.
C. Continue to refine systematic process for dissemination of information to promote the
coordination and integration of major components of the IAS (e.g., standing
committees, task forces, etc.). The IEAC will discuss this and have recommendations
ready by January 2016.
### Chapter 3: Standard 12 – General Education Assessment

**SUMMARY CHART OF INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS CHAPTER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEAM REQUIREMENT</th>
<th>ACTION TAKEN/EVIDENCE</th>
<th>PAGE NUMBER MONITORING REPORT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Continue
implementation of the
general education assessment
approach in all areas with
emphasis on the use of
assessment results to enhance
teaching and learning. | 1. Administered CLA to first-year students fall 2014 and spring 2015. | 1. Pg. 28 |
| | 2. Continued College
Composition and Mathematics annual assessments | 2. Pg. 27 |
| | 3. Continued Scientific Method
assessment. | 3. Pg. 28 |
<p>| | 4. New rubrics developed for Fine Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences. | 4. Pg. 29 |
| | 5. Used new rubric to assess Social Science knowledge area courses. | 5. Pg. 29 |
| | 6. Senior Writing Assessment in Contemporary Issues courses. | 6. Pg. 28 |
| | 7. Closing the loop funding for General Education. | 7. Pg. 28 |
| | 8. General Education Innovation Team developed an Integrative Learning rubric for Contemporary Issues courses. | 8. Pg. 38 |
| | 9. CELT sponsored Summer Institute on Integrative Learning with sessions on Integrative Learning rubric and Senior Writing Assessment Project results. | 9. Pg. 28 |
| Create an oversight structure for general education assessment to enhance the integration of assessment information within the respective institutional learning outcomes. | 1. Restructured General Education Administration with four distinct tasks: ensuring access, fidelity, assessment, and innovation. | 1. Pg. 29-30 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>General Education Assessment Committee develops new assessment plan, tools and resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>General Education Innovation Team led focus groups and campus discussions around proposed “Essential Learning at Brockport”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>General Education Innovation Team piloted Senior Writing Assessment Project and made recommendations for closing the loop actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Brockport Team attended AAC&amp;U 2015 Summer Institute on General Education and Assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Pg. 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Pg. 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Pg. 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Pg. 37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 3: Standard 12 – General Education Assessment

Monitoring Report Visiting Team recommendation regarding Standard 12:

The College should continue its implementation of the general education assessment approach in all areas with emphasis on the use of assessment results to enhance teaching and learning. The College should create an oversight structure for general education assessment to enhance the integration of assessment information within the respective institutional learning outcomes.

I. Overview

The General Education Program (GEP) at the College at Brockport has been revised several times since the 1970s. Three key documents summarize ongoing efforts to enhance student learning in the GEP:

- Academic Affairs Task Force on General Education (internal faculty report) - May 2010
- Provost’s General Education Team Annual Report – June 2014

Currently, Brockport’s GEP combines seven subject areas and two competencies from the SUNY Trustees’ approved General Education Requirements with three “local” requirements covering Diversity, Perspectives on Gender, and Contemporary Issues. Formal assessment processes for the GEP have been implemented since 2007 and continue to be reviewed and improved. In addition, the Honors College and Delta College Programs developed new assessment plans that include General Education student learning outcomes in 2012-2013 and began to implement them in 2013-2014.

The college has developed a two-pronged strategy that assesses student learning in the GEP at the course level and across the college career. Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) include those specified by SUNY Trustees, as well as locally developed outcomes. The assessment strategy emphasizes direct assessment of student performance using final exam problems, artifacts and portfolios of student coursework, and nationally validated instruments.

Course-Level Assessment

The College has developed annual course-level assessment for student performance in ENG 112 (College Composition) and MTH 112 (College Mathematics). The College Composition Program in the English Department has assessed student writing in research papers using teams of readers, well-developed rubrics, and a systematic process for closing the loop since 2007. Starting in 2013-2014, the Mathematics Placement Coordinator implemented an annual assessment for College Mathematics (MTH 112) that measures students’ performance in five distinct areas of mathematical problem-solving skills. Results have been used to adjust content covered in MTH 112.
In 2011-2012, the college began to implement a periodic assessment process for student learning for other general education SLOs. This process began with assessment of student understanding of the basic principles of the scientific method in Natural Science course offerings of the GEP. Students’ understanding of the scientific method has subsequently been assessed in 2012-2013 and 2014-2015. This process was extended in 2014-2015 with an assessment of students’ knowledge of core concepts and methods across Social Science course offerings in the GEP.

Assessment Across the College Career
The college has used a number of nationally validated tests to assess critical thinking skills. Earlier instruments included the California Critical Thinking Skills Test (CCTST) and the Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP) Critical Thinking Test. In 2010-2011, the college adopted the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) to assess critical thinking at first-year and senior levels. The CLA was administered again in 2014-2015 following the same protocols.

In 2014-2015, the General Education Innovation Team piloted an assessment of writing by Brockport Seniors in the Contemporary Issues courses in the GEP using the AAC&U Written Communication VALUE Rubric. The process entails the use of random samples of courses and students, norming of readers for inter-rater reliability, and the use of institutional data to identify patterns of difference across types of students.

Ongoing General Education Reform at Brockport
The Office of the Provost commissioned an external review of the GEP that was completed in May 2012. This review highlighted the need to more clearly communicate the purpose of the GEP to students, faculty, and other stakeholders.

Since fall 2012, the faculty and administration have worked together toward a more integrated and intentional GEP. In support of this goal, the Provost’s Office sent teams of faculty and administrators from the college to attend the AAC&U General Education and Assessment Conference and also to the Summer Institute in 2013.

The 2013 Summer Institute Team recommended:

A. Revise the institutional SLOs to more systematically define the intentions and value of the GEP as part of students’ entire college education.
B. Develop authentic assessment processes that adapt the VALUE Rubrics both to assess student learning and to establish shared meaning across the institution.
C. Explore options for e-portfolios as tools to enhance student learning through reflection and feedback, to provide rich artifacts for assessment, and to enable students to communicate their personal growth learning to external audiences such as employers.

Focus on Integrative Learning
Multiple committees and teams at the college have identified the ability to integrate and apply learning to solve problems as a student learning outcome of fundamental importance to the college’s educational programs. Integrative learning across knowledge areas (Arts, Humanities, Natural Sciences, and Social Sciences) already features prominently in Contemporary Issues courses, the college’s culminating GEP requirement. In response to the challenges of teaching students to integrate across knowledge areas, the college sent a team of faculty and administrators to the AAC&U’s Summer Institute on Integrative Learning in July 2014.
The 2014 Summer Institute Team recommended:

A. Enhance and expand offerings in the curriculum to systematically develop students’ ability to integrate and apply their learning to solve problems.
B. Adapt the VALUE rubric for integrative learning to the Contemporary Issues courses and use the assessment and General Education recertification processes to ensure fidelity to the learning outcomes.
C. Explore the potential for team-based integrative learning projects as interdisciplinary capstone experiences.

II. New General Education Administration Model

Following the appointment of a new Provost (July 2014) and hiring a Director of Assessment (September 2014), the college worked with renewed energy and commitment to continuously improve the GEP. Based on the need to coordinate general education activities and feedback from Middle States, the college has created a general education administration model with four components. This model, designed to promote a program of high quality, gives primary attention to the following major areas:

A. Course Scheduling and Communication
B. General Education Course Approval and Recertification
C. General Education Assessment Plan and Results
D. Innovation in Delivery, Assessment, and Communication

Major Initiatives since Reorganization

Senate General Education Committee
• Recertify Diversity courses to maintain currency and fidelity to learning outcomes (Fall 2015).
• Recertification schedule of all General Education to be developed.

General Education Assessment Committee
• Designate leadership and develop broad faculty membership for committee. (Completed November 2014)
• Develop a general education assessment plan, which emphasizes the role of faculty in assessment implementation, dissemination, and the use of assessment results to make changes that improve student learning. (Completed May 2015)
• Developed improved assessment documentation format for General Education Subject Areas, Competencies, and Local Requirements.
• Reviewed and recommended changes to the General Education web site.
• Recommendations to the Provost for the improvement of General Education assessment. (Under review by Provost)
• Developed the concept of “faculty teams” for assessment design and implementation of General Education assessment. (Completed June 2015)

General Education Innovation Team
• Used focus groups and campus discussion to revise institutional learning outcomes (Completed May 2015, ready for fall review by full faculty) – “Essential Learning at Brockport”
• Developed a rubric to assess integrative learning in Contemporary Issues courses (Completed April 2015) – Brockport Integrative Learning Rubric
• Pilot Senior Writing Assessment Project using AAC&U’s Written Communication VALUE Rubric (Completed March 2015) – Senior Writing Assessment Project Report

III. Detailed Description of General Education Program

Institutional SLOs and General Education
The college’s academic assessment of institutional goals has long been guided by the Institutional Student Learning Outcomes (ISLOs) and these are consistent with the college mission’s focus on student success. Reflecting the college’s commitment to best practices to advance that mission, the ISLOs developed in the undergraduate experience are based on the framework of the AAC&U’s Liberal Education and America’s Promise. These ISLOs are assessed through both the academic program assessment system and assessment in General Education.

Revision of Institutional Learning Outcomes
The College’s current Institutional Student Learning Outcomes (ISLOs) combine the most important GEP SLOs with advanced accomplishment in specialized studies (i.e., majors). The General Education Innovation Team has been tasked with revising the ISLOs to more clearly communicate the overall purpose and value of college education to students and other stakeholders. Central to this task is explaining how the GEP, a major program of study, and engagement in the campus co-curriculum combine to create an overall educational experience.

During 2013-2014, the Provost’s General Education Team created a draft of revised ISLOs entitled “Essential Learning at Brockport” which are clustered around three themes and contain 15 learning goals. The General Education Innovation Team used focus groups and open forums to receive feedback and make further revisions.

The current draft of “Essential Learning at Brockport” contains 10 broad learning goals grouped into three purposes: Confident in Yourself, Ready to Solve Problems, and Engaged in the World. Each learning goal has one to two more specific learning objectives. Learning goals and objectives were selected with relevant AAC&U VALUE rubrics in mind for each.
“Essential Learning at Brockport” will be discussed in campus-wide open forums at the start of the 2015 fall semester at which time the next steps in the process will be determined.

Basic Structure of the General Education Program
The structure of the traditional General Education Program combines General Education Requirements approved by SUNY Trustees with local requirements adopted by the college. The resulting GEP structure emphasizes core skills, foundational knowledge, critical perspectives, and the ability to integrate and apply learning that are central to a quality college education and enhance student success in the student’s major program of study and beyond. The GEP structure is consistent with and reinforces the major goals of the college’s Mission and Strategic Plan and specifically the goal of supporting student learning.

SUNY Subject Areas
• Basic Communication (Written and Oral Communication)
• Mathematics
• Foreign Language
• Social Sciences
• The Arts
• Humanities
• Natural Sciences

SUNY Competencies
• Critical Thinking
• Information Management

Brockport Local Requirements
• Perspectives on Gender
• Diversity or Other World Civilizations
• Contemporary Issues Course

Specialized Pathways through the General Education Program
Two specialized pathways through the GEP have been created for students in the Honors College and Delta College.

Delta College
The Delta College Program is an alternative to the college’s traditional GEP. Delta offers an interdisciplinary approach with specialized courses that integrate across the arts, humanities, social sciences, and natural science requirements. Selected GEP SLOs are assessed on an annual basis.

The Honors College
The Honors College Program provides an enriched program of study and fosters a dynamic learning community for academically talented undergraduate students. There are two “tracks” of Honors curriculum. Both tracks require Honors seminars, which are versions of General Education courses and satisfy college GEP requirements.
Transfer and General Education Requirements

The college’s GEP requirements are different for students entering Brockport as freshmen (“native”) and those students transferring from another institution to the college. While freshmen must complete all of the GEP requirements, transfer students can have many General Education requirements met or waived depending on their transcript evaluation. The requirements are summarized in the table “General Education Requirements Effective Fall 2011.”

All requirements are included in the college’s General Education assessment process. The college’s high proportion of transfer students can present issues in the interpretation of assessment data and in making decisions about actions to be taken for improvement.

IV. General Education Assessment Plan

The General Education Assessment Committee’s Planning Subcommittee developed the college’s formal general education assessment plan. This subcommittee was comprised of faculty members from the School of the Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences; the School of Science and Mathematics; and Delta College. As a result of the plan, the following was achieved:

A. Analysis of the current state of general education assessment at the college.
B. Established mission and goals for general education assessment.
C. Developed a summary curriculum map for general education skills and areas.
D. Designed a revised general education assessment timeline and rationale.
E. Proposed general education “faculty teams” to design and implement assessments for a given cycle.
F. Designed a revised General Education Program Assessment diagram.
G. Developed a process for data collection, analysis and reporting of results.

Dissemination Mechanisms

As a result of the major work completed and the continuing progress with respect to general education assessment, reform and innovation at the college, the following mechanisms will be used to fully inform the college community of the innovative work and changes with respect to the GEP:

A. General Education Assessment web site.
B. Daily Eagle (daily electronic college newsletter).
C. Faculty teams will meet with departments.
D. General Education Assessment Committee members will inform respective programs/departments.
E. General Education Assessment Committee members will meet with all departments during the 2015-2016 academic year.
F. Development of General Education faculty forums to review results and action plans (planning to begin fall 2015).
V. General Education Assessment Web Site

The General Education Assessment Committee Measures and Rubric Subcommittee collaborated with IT and web site developers to facilitate the creation of a central web-based location for all information related to general education assessment at the college. This subcommittee researched and developed the following topics/items:

A. Recommended strategies for web site feedback.
B. Developed a web site template.
C. Created a text to assist in templates for forms and reports and collect general education assessment data.
D. Recommended a list of future directions/action steps to maintain the effectiveness of the web site.

The web site was reviewed and approved by the Provost and was activated in July 2015.

VI. General Education Assessment Measures

Most of the college’s general education assessment measures are course-embedded and include a variety of tools such as projects, essays, oral presentations, and multiple-choice tests. The measures used reflect the general education area being assessed. For example, critical thinking is measured with a nationally normed test (the Collegiate Learning Assessment [CLA]) that is given to incoming freshmen and graduating seniors.

Rubrics are used in a number of areas; i.e., the assessment of College Composition (Written Communication) and the senior writing assessment project (AAC&U Written Communication VALUE rubric) for rating student work. Rubrics were also developed in fall 2014 for courses that meet the Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences requirements.

When assessing student performance with rubrics, a minimum of two faculty evaluators assess student work and participate in norming sessions to ensure the inter-rater reliability of the assessments. In scoring students’ work, all general education evaluators use the same framework for assessing proficiency in terms of one of four levels: “exceeded standard,” “met standard,” “approached standard,” and “did not meet standard.” In some instances, a numeric score is assigned to each of the four categories. Each standard correlates with proficiency levels determined by the faculty.

VII. Using General Education Assessment Data to Improve Student Learning

A. College Composition (SUNY General Education: Basic Communication-Written)

Closing the Loop

The college’s Coordinator of Composition plans the assessment process with the English professors for ENL 112 College Composition. Essays were collected from all students in ENL 112 in both the spring and fall 2014 semesters. At the conclusion of each semester, students provided two versions of the essay. The first version was a draft on which they received feedback from any or all of the following:

• the instructor of the course
• peer writing groups
• Student Learning Center tutors

The second version was the revised essay in response to feedback. A random sample of 60 essays (both version 1 and 2) were selected for review. The essays were evaluated by three rubrics (one rubric per designated SLO: Basic Communication-Written). Each pair of essays (version 1 and 2) was evaluated by two instructors.

The Coordinator of Composition’s final report on the spring and fall 2014 assessment recommended the following based on assessment results:

Recommendation #1
During the fall 2015 English faculty orientation the Coordinator of Composition will discuss the 2014 assessment results and focus discussion on communication of the Basic Communication-Written SLO via the following:
• the course syllabi;
• class time devoted to teaching the principles and practices of writing revision; and
• inclusion of SLO 1 (Students will demonstrate the ability to produce coherent texts within common college level forms) should be explicitly mentioned on the assessment sheet to remind students of the importance of achieving this outcome on all assignments.

Recommendation #2
Spring semester 2016 workshop will be held by the Coordinator of Composition regarding refutation and responding to secondary sources for ENL 112 faculty.

B. College Mathematics Closing the Loop

The Mathematics Department assesses the MTH 112 College Math course for general education assessment each fall and spring semester. The 2015 spring semester is the most recent assessment period. Data was collected for arithmetic, algebra, geometry, data analysis and quantitative reasoning. None of these areas met the benchmark of 70%. The weakest area of student performance was quantitative reasoning.

Recommendation #1
Revise the MTH 112 course with set theory and graph theory being removed. The course will cover the following areas: general problem solving, statistics, logic, probability and financial math. It is anticipated that students will be better able to demonstrate basic proficiencies with a smaller number of topics assessed. These changes will be in place for the 2015 fall semester.

C. Senior Writing Assessment Project Closing the Loop

The General Education Innovation Team gathered a random sample of 100 student papers from 10 randomly selected Contemporary Issues in the 2014 fall semester. The AAC&U Written Communication VALUE Rubric was chosen as the assessment instrument. An interdisciplinary team of 12 readers participated in a norming session and then each paper
was scored by three readers using the rubric. Student performance data was combined with institutional data on students to identify patterns.

The Senior Writing Assessment Project Report made the following recommendations based on the results of the Senior Writing Assessment Project:

**Recommendation #1**
Articulate the particular skills and levels of achievement for writing expected of students throughout the relevant part of the General Education curriculum.

**Action:** The College Senate General Education Committee will develop specific outcomes for written communication to attach to knowledge areas and contemporary issues courses during the 2015-2016 academic year. These outcomes will be derived from the AAC&U Written Communication VALUE Rubric.

**Recommendation #2**
Anticipate the needs of students admitted with lower GPAs (particularly transfers).

**Action:** The college will pilot a program to offer writing-intensive courses for first-semester transfer students with transfer GPAs in the lowest quartile. The vice provost’s office will oversee a committee that will identify a pool of majors for the pilot project, appropriate courses, and necessary faculty development with a goal of launching the pilot in the 2016 fall semester.

**Recommendation #3**
Provide instructors across the curriculum with training on the roles of different general education courses in teaching written communication and the features of assignments that address the different skill areas.

**Action:** CELT (in collaboration with colleagues from the College Composition Program and Drake Library) was able to create faculty development programs and events in support of Recommendation #3. Recent activities include the following:

- March 27, 2015 CELT Brown Bag Discussion: “Using Senior Writing Assessment Project Results to Improve Writing Assignments” with 26 participants from 15 academic departments and 4 schools.
- April 17, 2015 CELT Brown Bag Discussion: “How can we help students learn to use and cite evidence successfully?” with 17 participants from 8 academic departments and 4 schools.
- June 9, 2015 Summer Institute on Integrative Learning Session: “Senior Writing Assessment Project Results” with 20 participants from 11 academic departments and 4 schools.
- June 10, 2015 Summer Institute on Integrative Learning Workshop: “Writing to Learn” led by Curt Nehring-Bliss of Finger Lakes Community College and Bard College’s Institute for Thinking and Writing.
- 2014-2015 Faculty Learning Community on “Writing and Learning in the Disciplines” extended for a second year with 13 participants from 9 academic departments and 4 schools (~50% new faculty participants registered for 2015-2016).
• CELT developing “Learning to Write, Writing to Learn Resources” online
• Additional faculty development opportunities will be offered in 2015-2016.

Addressing Recommendation #4
Reach out to sending institutions to potentially extend this developmental model.

Action: This recommendation requires completion of Recommendation #2 Action first.

Addressing Recommendation #5
Consider the assessment model used for measuring other key general education outcomes.

Central features of this model include: collecting authentic student work, using a well-designed and validated rubric, norming an interdisciplinary team of raters, random selection of courses and students, and use of institutional data on students to look for patterns in student performance.

Action: During 2015-2016 the GEAC will identify three other General Education SLOs that should be addressed as students approach graduation and create a plan for conducting senior assessments on each over the next three years.

D. Modern Languages and Cultures – February 2015

Assessment results indicated a significant weakness in the areas of writing and reading. Therefore, the following actions were suggested:

• Implement more guided practice for reading and writing in all 111 classes (Spanish, French, Japanese, Arabic, Italian and Chinese)
• Provide students with clear expectations for reading and writing skills.
• Collect data from all exams offered during the semester instead of the final exam. This will result in formative and summative assessment measures to better evaluate students’ progress and overall achievement across reading and writing skills.

E. Social Sciences Assessment-Political Science (PLS 112 Comparative Politics – February 2 015)

This multiple choice assessment was given at the end of the semester, unannounced, for information covered during the first three weeks of the course. The assessment results indicated weak student performance. The following actions were suggested:

• Alter the testing mode to include fundamental concepts of political science and provide students an opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge. Develop some questions in a short-answer format.
• Offer students a practicum that would assist them on how to read social science tests and take notes effectively.
F. Natural Sciences – Biology (BIO 111 Principles of Biology – Spring 2015)

The assessment was a post-lab quiz administered after the laboratory. Based on the results, a significant number of students approached or did not meet the criterion (10 students did not complete the assignments). The following action plan was recommended:

- Targeted models (in Mastering Biology) to enhance performance.
- Additional pre-lab work and homework assignments.
- Request closing the loop funds to create specific, repetitive targeted modules to improve student learning.
- Consider more credit for completion of work to incentivize students.

VIII. General Education Professional Development Activities

A. Office of Accountability and Assessment orientation for GEAC members via an instructional notebook and the book Assessment Clear and Simple: A Practical Guide for Institutions, Departments and General Education by B. Walvoord for each member. Each member was requested to read the book and notebook prior to starting work on the plan and other related activities.

B. Attendance for the two GEAC subcommittee chairs and the Director of Assessment at the “Assessing the Assessment” Middle States Workshop in March 2015.

C. Four faculty members from the GEAC and the Director of Assessment attended the AAC&U Institute on General Education Assessment – June 2015. The Brockport team developed an implementation plan and communication strategies to support the General Education Assessment Plan.

In addition to the general education assessment professional development activities listed above, the Provost has supported future professional development for the 2015-2016 academic year by providing release time for a CELT Assessment Fellow. The Assessment Fellow will collaborate with the Director of CELT and the Director of Assessment to facilitate faculty training throughout the college community. A faculty member who is familiar with general education assessment has accepted the position and plans are in progress for a comprehensive assessment training calendar for faculty and staff. Additionally, the CELT Assessment Fellow will assist with the General Education faculty teams discussed earlier in this chapter.

IX. Resource Allocations to Support General Education Assessment 2014-2015

A. Allocation of funds for General Education assessment, specifically earmarked for closing the loop efforts requiring monetary support and summer faculty team stipends: $9,600

B. Provost’s office provided funding for several members of the GEAC (four faculty members and one administrator) to attend the AAC&U General Education Assessment Institute in June 2015 for further development of faculty general education practices: $11,220

C. Provost provides funding for CELT Assessment Faculty Fellow for faculty training: course release plus stipend.

D. Faculty stipends for English Composition readers/reviewers – yearly basis: $1,200
E. Funding for Senior Writing Assessment norming and reading sessions: $4,000

X. Assessing the Assessment Process

The college’s General Education Assessment Plan details the plans for “assessing the assessment.” A formal audit will be conducted after year one of the plan (2016) to determine the following:

A. Completed assessments.
B. Incomplete assessments and opportunities to complete.
C. Strengths of the plan.
D. Areas of improvement for the assessment plan.
E. Student performance in relation to the assessment benchmark.

The GEAC will conduct similar assessment audits every year, although the goals will vary as General Education assessment becomes part of the Brockport campus culture. Plan modifications will be implemented by the GEAC as required. These results will be disseminated via the General Education Assessment web site.

XI. Achievements:

A. Establishment of the Office of Accountability and Assessment to support general education assessment processes.
B. Establishment of a faculty General Education Assessment Committee to review and develop a faculty-driven general education assessment plan and supporting processes (i.e., a web site, rubrics, forms, etc.).
C. Initiation of “faculty teams” to design and implement general education area assessment on an annual basis.
D. Support from CELT for ongoing general education activities (Innovations in Delivery) as well as general education assessment activities.
E. Implementation of the Senior Writing Assessment via the general education knowledge area Contemporary Issues (fall 2014).
F. Continuous general education assessment in Delta College and Honors Program.
G. Participation (four faculty members/one administrator) in AAC&U General Education Assessment Summer Institute – June 2015.

XII. Recommendations:

A. Implement the General Education assessment plan developed by the GEAC including the revision of the general education portion of the Accountability web site (GEAC – Summer/Fall 2015)
B. Continue to develop ISLOs which are separate and distinct from the general education outcomes. Assessment of the ISLOs will provide evidence of continued growth/learning of students’ knowledge and skills beyond their general education courses. (Provost’s designee – Fall 2015/Spring 2016)
C. Continue to share assessment data and provide faculty training regarding general education assessment to ensure improvements in teaching and learning.
D. Continue to explore interdisciplinary opportunities with general education courses for solid student engagement. (Director of CELT – Fall 2015/Spring 2016)
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Chapter 4: Standard 14 – Assessment of Student Learning

Monitoring Report Visiting Team recommendation regarding Standard 14:

The College should continue its implementation of the general education assessment approach in all areas with emphasis on the use of assessment results to enhance teaching and learning. The College should create an oversight structure for general education assessment to enhance the integration of assessment information within the respective institutional learning outcomes.

I. Overview

Since its inception in the late 1980s, the assessment of student learning at the college has been the responsibility of the individual academic departments. Departmental responsibilities have included maintaining a set of departmentally-approved SLOs reflecting the chief learning objectives of the major program(s) housed in the department. Until 2012, the departments had been charged with carrying out assessment of at least one of their SLOs each year and reporting on the assessment to their faculty and to the vice provost’s office. Usually the department chair, with the assistance of an assessment coordinator (for larger departments), had organized the department’s assessment projects. Assistance with all aspects of the assessment process was provided by the vice provost’s office such as assisting with the writing of SLOs, assisting with the selection of direct assessments, and developing forms for collecting and reporting data. The budgetary resources assigned to the vice provost’s office also provided financial support for assessment through extra-service funding for faculty to work on assessment projects, travel to assessment conferences, and for the purchase of testing instruments. Typically, the nationally-accredited programs were most invested in maintaining assessments that would allow them to meet their accreditors’ standards.

Following the 2012 Middle States visit, the request by Middle States for a Monitoring Report focused on Standards 7 and 14 brought the college to two realizations: (1) that regional accreditors had moved to significantly raise their standards for program assessment, and (2) that the college would be required to substantially increase investment in assessment processes. As a result, the college engaged in an extensive effort to revise and improve the assessment of institutional and academic outcomes as reported to Middle States in the Monitoring Report submitted in February 2014. Central to those efforts, the college hired Dr. Ruth Andes, a consultant experienced in assessment and knowledgeable in the area of Middle States standards. Dr. Andes carried out an extensive effort, meeting with all the college’s academic departments to help them revise their SLOs and develop better ways of assessing these outcomes. These revised SLOs in all academic programs were reviewed and approved by the Academic Assessment Subcommittee of the IEAC. New reporting procedures for documenting and disseminating assessment data and analyses as well as closing the loop actions were developed and implemented. Middle States accepted the Monitoring Report and responded by requesting an additional Monitoring Report due September 2015 focusing again on Standards 7 and 14, and adding Standard 12 as well as a subject of this
report, to ensure that the college continued developing and implementing assessment activities and using assessment data to close the loop.

In its request for the September 2015 Monitoring Report, Middle States requested documentation of assessment results that provided “sufficient and convincing evidence” that students were achieving program learning outcomes. In September 2014, Dr. Sean McKitrick, Middle States Vice President, visited the college and clarified for campus constituents the specifics of additional assessment processes and activities necessary to fully comply with Middle States' requirements.

II. Assessment Activities for Programmatic Assessment Since 2014 Middle States Visit

The college has implemented a comprehensive and sustainable system for programmatic assessment, supported by the following activities:

A. Establishment of the Office of Accountability and Assessment. Staffed by the Director of Assessment (full-time permanent); two Assessment Specialists (one full-time and one full-time, temporary); and a Secretary (full-time permanent).

B. Offered a series of Open Assessment Forums. These were held for faculty and staff to meet with the Director of Assessment and to provide assessment support. The forums were held October 28, 29 and 31, 2014.

C. Provided monetary resources to fund closing the loop activities for program assessment and general education assessment action plans in the five schools: The Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences (TAHSS), Health and Human Performance, Education and Human Services, Business Administration and Economics, and Science and Mathematics.

D. Revised the Guiding Principles for the Periodic Program Review 2015-2020 cycle.

E. Revised the Periodic Program Review process to shift to a program focus versus a previous department focus.

F. Establishment of Academic Program Review Committee.

III. Periodic Program Review (PPR) of Academic Programs

The college’s revised PPR is a summative assessment method (based upon SUNY Faculty Senate’s revised 2012 guidelines) for assessing the effectiveness of academic programs. The PPR schedule has been revised from a seven-year cycle to a five-year cycle and focuses on program review, versus departmental review, in response to the Middle States’ recommendations. The college is currently in the sixth year of its 2009-2016 cycles of reviews). The 2015-2016 academic year will be the first year of the next five-year cycle. Areas addressed include program outcomes and their relation to the college’s mission, assessment planning (include direct and indirect measures), implementation, results/action plan, curriculum coherence, faculty, students, and graduation and retention data. Comprehensive assessment documentation will also be included in each PPR. The culminating report also includes program strengths, challenges and recommendations for the future. A course
assessment survey is conducted to explore students’ perceptions of the program and the extent to which the curriculum is meeting their expectations.

**External Reviewer Visits:**
For each program area assessed, two external reviewers from peer institutions (usually one SUNY institution and one non-SUNY institution) visit the campus to examine the self-study report and independently review academic programs. The reviewers’ program reports are issued to the department within several weeks of their campus visit and are circulated to the assessment coordinators, school dean, vice provost, and provost. In their on-campus visit and review of the self-study document, reviewers are asked to investigate and comment on the general status of the academic programs (majors) and to respond to a series of standard questions formulated by the administration in addition to any specific questions that the program faculty may have formulated.

**Closing the Loop/Action Plan:**
After receiving the external reviewers’ report, and in consultation with the school dean, the department prepares a draft Joint Action Plan which addresses actions for improvements based on assessment results and the reviewers’ recommendations. The Provost, Vice Provost, Assessment Director, and the School Dean(s) meet for a presentation by the department/program chair regarding the proposed Joint Action Plan. When the PPR is concluded, a letter from the Provost to the department confirms completion and acknowledges the ways in which the college administration has agreed to support specified actions. The department/program and school dean are responsible for the implementation of the Joint Action Plan. To ensure a comprehensive closing the loop process, the Director of Assessment will follow up each semester to track the progress of the Joint Action Plan. A yearly progress report on this plan is expected as part of the Departmental Annual Report.

**Closing the Loop: Using PPR Findings to Enhance Student Learning:**
The self-study process, assessment results, and consultants’ reports together provide a comprehensive range of data to consider for improving student learning at the course, program and institutional levels. Recommendations emanating from the five-year reviews, previously a seven-year cycle, address such areas as student engagement, technology, facilities, curriculum and pedagogy. Several examples of recommendations resulting from the PPR process which have been implemented are as follows:

A. **Visual Studies Workshop (Graduate Program) Periodic Program Review Joint Action Plan 2012**
The Visual Studies Workshop joint action plan specified the need for the following:

1. Allocate funding for annual software updates
   **Response:** Visual Studies received the following in equipment replacement funding:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>$2,251.00</td>
<td>Power-lit Pro Projector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>$9,815.69</td>
<td>Web and video broadcast equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>$2,397.97</td>
<td>Digital projectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>$5,551.48</td>
<td>Two digital video cameras, lighting equipment and microphones</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Bring diversity to the education environment through the Visiting Artists/Historians program

Response: More than 100 visiting artists have been part of the Visual Studies Workshop programs, given critiques, lectures, exhibitions and completed projects since the 2012 Joint Action Plan was issued.

B. Communication (Undergraduate Program) Periodic Program Review Joint Action Plan 2010-2011

The Communication joint action plan specified the need for the following:

1. Discuss and draft major specific student learning outcomes
2. Assessment committee will review assessment process and suggest improvements

Response: In FY 2011-2012 the Communication department created a comprehensive program assessment plan. Additionally, the Communication faculty developed rubrics for programmatic courses (2012-2013) and General Education assessment (Fall 2014). An assessment committee was appointed in fall 2011 and charged with the task of reviewing the assessment process and recommending revisions. The revised assessment processes included development of measurement tools and execution of assessment follow through including action plans and closing the loop activities.

3. Request to reconfigure Holmes Mac Laboratory for improved instructional opportunities and additional equipment.

Response: Department has submitted a proposal to the Provost’s Investment Priorities Plan to fully renovate the broadcast studios in Holmes: $10,000.00+

Additionally, the department received funding for equipment replacement for the following items:

a. Field production camera
b. Camcorders
c. Character Generator


Response: During the past five years professors were hired in the following areas:

a. Rhetoric
b. Media Studies
c. Journalism

d. Broadcast Journalism

e. Public Relations

C. Art Program (Undergraduate Program) Periodic Program Review Joint Action Plan 2010-2011

The Art joint action plan specified the need for the following:

1. Identified the need for additional faculty.
   **Response:** A faculty member was moved from a split position into a full-time position in the Photography area. The department is in the process of searching for a tenure track Graphic Design position.

2. Need to close the loop with assessment results
   **Response:** In 2011-2012 the department created a comprehensive programmatic assessment plan. Rubrics were developed and implemented for the 2012-2013 programmatic assessment period. During this assessment period, ART 403 Mixed Media (BFA Thesis course) faculty found that the students were proficient in their oral defense and presentations, but were not meeting the benchmark in the area of visual, physical presentation of their work. As a result of the assessment, the action plan featured the need to establish a “clean room” for students to provide them with a designated space for the matting and framing of their artwork. The Art faculty applied for and received $6,348.00 in support though the 2014-2015 closing the loop funding to supply the proper equipment and tools for students. In spring 2015, a designated space was identified and equipped for the “clean room.”

Professionally Accredited Programs

Brockport is accredited by 13 professional accreditation organizations: The College at Brockport National Accreditation Bodies in addition to Middle States national accreditation. The college is assessed by these organizations on a regular schedule. In the event of an extended (beyond a five year schedule) accreditation cycle, nationally accredited programs will report every five years on assessment progress and closing the loop progress. Academic assessment standards are regularly reviewed by the Office of Accountability and Assessment to ensure compliance with Middle States standards. The reaccreditation report serves as the Periodic Program Review and the accreditation team visit corresponds to the external review process. In fall 2015, all nationally-accredited programs will participate in the Joint Action Plan process.

IV. Annual Program Assessment Process:

Brockport’s annual program assessment process was revitalized in the 2012-2013 academic year following the complete review and approval of all departments’ program learning outcomes with Dr. Ruth Andes, assessment consultant. Each year the five schools (Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences, Health and Human Performance, Education and Human Services, Science and Mathematics, Business Administration and Economics) assess at least one program learning outcome in each degree program. A single, direct measure of student learning is used in these assessments. They include the review of student projects, portfolios, exams, and final course work.
using departmentally formulated rubrics. Results reflect the extent to which students are meeting, exceeding, or approaching the program standards.

The annual assessment is implemented during the fall and spring semesters of each academic year. Faculty, led by “Assessment Coordinators” analyze the results and develop an action plan to close the loop. During the following fall semester, the dean of each of the five schools sponsors a Dean’s Forum to review and highlight the year’s work in assessing the major program(s) using a PowerPoint presentation with a standardized format. Faculty present their assessment plans, findings, results and closing the loop plans to the respective school as well as key college administrators. The plan for program improvement in the offering of the courses(s) supporting that program outcome will be analyzed during the next year. Additionally, the information is discussed and department faculty and administrators share ideas on possible improvements. Closing the loop recommendations are discussed and there is an opportunity to request additional resources, if needed, by completing a form documenting assessment results, dissemination of results, action plan funding required.

The department chairs and deans then use the information in their planning and budgeting cycle, identifying any assessment results which indicate the need for funding within the next budget cycle. This information is also available to the Provost and the Director of Assessment for consideration and prioritization.

In fall 2014, the Provost allocated $84,000.00 for program closing-the-loop activities based on assessment results. Several examples of the funded activities are detailed below.

A. Dance – Spring 2014
Assessment results regarding development movement patterns to organize and coordinate movement phrases indicated an opportunity to improve the integrity of the peer and self-assessment model for the analysis of movement patterns. Smart televisions and a state-of-the-art camera would allow instructors to actually teach the analysis process more effectively with the student by filming and then analyzing with the student in initial rounds of assessment. The new camera would provide for portability of the camera, which became an issue in undergraduate assessment of choreography (DNS 430) with site-specific projects.

**Action Plan**
The faculty requested and received funds ($6,465.00) to purchase a Digital SLR camera and equipment, plus a smart television. This equipment will serve as a mechanism to record students’ works and pieces and to assess/evaluate their progress visually. Equipment has been purchased and will be used immediately for the end of spring 2015 assessment. New data and information will be collected by the department in spring and fall 2015 to verify the action plan.

B. Anthropology – Spring 2014
Assessment results indicated the need to support and reinforce students’ understanding and memory concerning basic concepts and methods in the introductory courses (ANT 201 Introduction to Cultural Anthropology and ANT 203 Introduction to Physical Anthropology) for the following outcome: Define basic concepts and methods in archaeology, biological and cultural anthropology.
**Action Plan**

The faculty requested and received funds ($2,896.00) to purchase a variety of skulls and bones in order to assist student comprehension and retention of key concepts. These will be hands-on, heuristic devices for use in the courses to reinforce subject matter contained in the lectures. New data and information will be collected by the faculty in April 2015 and Fall 2015 to verify the action plan.

**C. Visual Studies Workshop (Graduate Program) /Spring 2014**

The Visual Studies Workshop students participated in the assessment of three SLOs related to the following:
1. Producing video exercises and a final video.
2. Production of a body of photographs.

Assessment results indicated that students met the benchmark for all three outcomes. However, when faculty met to review the results, they agreed upon an action plan to enhance student performance.

**Action Plan**

Based upon the annual program assessment results, Visual Studies Workshop faculty recommended the following action plan:
1. Institute additional broad range technical skill training through the workshops.
2. Time-based media is lacking faculty leadership and needs to be resolved for students to exceed in this area.
3. Core curriculum workshop should be expanded to include more technical training, there will be more consistent faculty presence, and the expectations will be increased for the final critiques.

**Closing the Loop Actions**

The Visual Studies Workshop faculty have been successful in the following efforts to implement their action plan:

1. In Summer 2014 initiated a time-based media workshop. In Fall 2014, a nine-month, previously one-month) artist-in resident was hired to teach workshops in film/video and provide a consistent advising presence for students.
2. Applied for and received closing the loop funding in fall 2014 of $8,000.00. This allocation will fund the following:
   a. Establishment of digitization stations and a strong digital storage capacity (at least three years’ worth of space).
   b. Implementation of a one-day extracurricular symposium, led by digitization experts, to review best practices in software, storage, metadata and copyright issues available to all Visual Studies Workshop faculty and staff. The symposium will be offered in the first month of every semester for the academic years Fall 2015 through Spring 2018.

A variety of other closing the loop actions were taken which involved non-monetary resource allocation. Revision of course materials was the most typical closing the loop
proposed action not requiring monetary resources. Several examples of these activities are detailed below:

Chemistry - Fall 2013/Spring 2014
The Chemistry program faculty selected a series of questions from the American Chemical Society exams to review a series of program outcomes. The assessment results indicated that many students underperformed, especially in the lower level courses. There was minimal differentiation between chemistry majors and non-chemistry majors. Evidence of improved student performance for students with extra tutoring was noted in the assessment results.

Action Plan
The action plan will be multi-faceted and feature the following efforts:
1. Continued tutoring through the Student Learning Center for underrepresented target group enrolled in Chemistry.
2. Study skills sessions for CHM 205 College Chemistry I and CHM 206 College Chemistry II and CHM 467 Biochemistry I and CHM 468 Biochemistry II.
3. Concerted departmental effort to schedule office hours distributed over the week.
4. New course CHM 302 Inorganic Chemistry offered first time Fall 2013. Assessment for positive effects in Fall 2015.

Alcohol and Substance Abuse Program - Spring 2014
Assessment results for identifying the various foundations for addiction professionals failed to meet the desired benchmark of 90% exceeding or meeting expectations. The Alcohol and Substance Abuse Studies assessment coordinator and department chair met to review the results and consider the action plan. This plan was presented during the Dean’s Forum in fall 2014 to the school faculty for review and discussion.

Action Plan
The action plan featured the following elements:
1. Alcohol Substance Abuse Program assessment coordinator standardized elements of the introductory courses across all instructors (i.e., common textbook and assessments).
2. Review of the 90% benchmark is under consideration.

V. Academic Program Review Committee (APRC)
In August 2015, the Provost charged a faculty-based committee with sustaining the PPR process. The Committee’s basic responsibilities include implementing the revised PPR process and an annual review of PPR Reports (plans, results and actions) with suggestions for program improvement. Specific functions of the Committee are as follows:

A. Recommend faculty training for the revised program review and annual program review.
B. Develop a rubric to ensure thorough completion of all components of the program review process and annual program review.
C. Recommend an “assessing the assessment” process for PPR and annual program review
D. Recommend improvements to the Accountability website for comprehensive dissemination of program review assessments.

**Assessing the Assessment Process**

Evaluation of program assessment activities is based in the school dean’s office. The dean is asked to comment on and rate the departments’ yearly efforts on a standardized form with a four-point scale rubric.

The Director of Assessment has proposed several improvements regarding the Deans’ Forums and the PPR format which have been implemented for fall 2015.

The college recognizes the need for a more inclusive rating process, including systematic input by assessment coordinators, faculty, and students. Given the establishment of the APRC, it is expected that a formal assessing the assessment process will become an annual assessment activity.

**Resource Allocations for Program Assessment**

A. PRR Middle States Conference March 2014 - $6,830 (total for #1 and #2)
B. Assessing the Assessment Middle States Workshop March 2014
C. CELT Assessment Faculty Fellow - $4,641.45
D. Closing the Loop Funding for Program Assessment - $84,000

**VI. Interactions between Program/Annual Assessment and the Overall Planning Cycle**

As discussed earlier, the IAS integrates programmatic assessment results into budget planning and, ultimately, the process of continuous institutional improvement. Assessment data collected in the fall and spring semester can be used to justify curricular change, new staffing, facilities upgrades and other changes during the subsequent budget process. After the School’s Assessment Forum, 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 the 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 BRC. Recommendations from the BRC are reviewed by the IEAC and forwarded to the Cabinet. Thus, there are multiple avenues through which the assessment process can inform planning, budgetary decision-making, and influence the allocation of resources.

**VII. Achievements:**

A. History of periodic program review cycle with external reviewers' feedback.
B. Portfolio of professionally accredited programs in excellent standing.
C. Program learning outcome assessment on an annual schedule with Dean's Forums designed to disseminate assessment information and discussion throughout the designated school.
D. Allocated funding for annual closing the loop activities.
VIII. Recommendations:

A. Implement continuous training for program review (five-year cycle) faculty groups at least six months prior to the start of the program's Periodic Program Review period: Director of Assessment and Vice Provost – Fall 2015.

B. Define the role of Assessment Coordinators. Provide a formal description, training and recognition for Assessment Coordinators: Director of Assessment and CELT Assessment Fellow – Fall 2015/Spring 2016

C. Establish the role of the APRC to revitalize the role of faculty with program review/assessment: Provost and Director of Assessment – Fall 2015