



Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost
West Chester University
West Chester, Pennsylvania 19383-2000

610-436-3405
610-436-3406
www.wcupa.edu

August 3, 2004

Dr. Christoph M. Kimmich
President
CUNY – Brooklyn College
2900 Bedford Avenue
Brooklyn, NY 11210

Dear Dr. Kimmich:

As First External Reviewer, and on behalf of Dr. William L. Pollard, the Second External Reviewer for the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, I am pleased to enclose here our evaluation of the Periodic Review Report (PRR) for CUNY – Brooklyn College.

It has been a pleasure reading about the institution you are leading, and I hope that you find our suggestions and recommendations informative and beneficial. If you have any questions about this report, please do not hesitate to call me and I will be glad to have a discussion with you.

Best wishes to you as you continue to lead Brooklyn College forward into a promising and exciting future.

Sincerely,

Linda L. Lamwers

Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost

LLL/bih

cc: Vivian L. Ellis
William L. Pollard

8-4-04
2566

**Report to the
Faculty, Administration, Trustees, and Students
of
Brooklyn College
of the
City University of New York,
Brooklyn, New York 11210-2889**

**Prepared following an analysis of the institution's
Periodic Review Report**

**First Reviewer:
Dr. Linda L. Lamwers
Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost
West Chester University of Pennsylvania**

**Second Reviewer:
Dr. William L. Pollard
President
University of the District of Columbia**

August 2, 2004

8-4-04
2566

BROOKLYN COLLEGE

Introduction

Founded in 1930, Brooklyn College is a selective, comprehensive, state-and tuition-funded, non-residential institution located in one of the most diverse counties in the United States. As one of nine senior colleges within the City University of New York, it shares the university mission of access and excellence. Having a fall 2003 enrollment of approximately 11,000 undergraduates and 4,500 graduate students, it was rated third in the 2005 edition of Princeton Review's *American Best Value Colleges*. Since the 1999 Middle States team visit, the College has undergone significant changes including a new President and an almost totally new senior administrative team, a state budget crisis, elimination of remedial and developmental coursework, and tuition increases. Institutionally, there has been greater diversification of fiscal resources and increased attention to institutional research and the use of data for decision making.

As part of the Periodic Review process, in addition to the Periodic Review Report, the College provided the following information: current undergraduate and graduate catalogs, faculty and student handbooks, a copy of the Collective Bargaining Agreement and salary schedules, audited financial statements, the Institutional Profile, the College/President Performance Goals and Targets for three academic years (01-02, 02-03, 03-04) and planning documents—the strategic plan, an assessment plan, a technology plan, a diversity plan, and a governance plan.

Periodic Review Report

The Periodic Review Report and supplemental materials effectively provide an institutional context for Brooklyn College. The 61 page document is well written, and clearly addresses all the recommendations and suggestions from the prior Middle States visitation team. The PRR is also very helpful in providing a framework for understanding the relationship between Brooklyn College and the City University of New York.

The materials provided demonstrate the College's commitment to ongoing planning. As an example, the tabular presentation of the technology plan's goals and objectives aids understanding of the current status of activities. Also helpful is the inclusion of the CUNY College/President Performance Goals and Targets for three years. These goals and targets provide both a context and a good summary of progress.

Preparation of the PRR was an inclusive process, involving faculty, students, administration, and staff. These constituencies had appropriate representation on committees. The College is to be commended for the involvement of students on the Enrollment Management, Planning, and Personnel committees of the PRR.

The PRR was descriptive of the Brooklyn College's recent history and current situation. A small number of challenges were articulated. Consistent with its strategic

goal, Brooklyn College has the opportunity to become a greater partner with and be more responsive to the Borough and its citizens. With about one-third of undergraduate instruction taught by part time faculty, its location provides the opportunity for Brooklyn College to draw from New York City faculty who are both academics and practitioners. The institution is encouraged to determine the optimal mix of regular and adjunct faculty for different programs and to use adjuncts as one method of support for regular faculty scholarship and professional development. Because of its dependency on state funding and student tuition, continued diversification of resources and increases in entrepreneurial activities will be important.

Response to the Four Prior Recommendations

Recommendation 1: Improve faculty demographics through targeted recruitment and retention strategies, focusing on underrepresented groups.

Targets for faculty diversity hires were identified in the annual College/President Performance Goals and Targets. The PRR indicates the greatest success in hiring women who since 1999 represent almost 50 percent of new hires, decreasing the underutilization of women. Progress has also been strong in the recruitment of minority hires, which recently represent 30 percent of new hires. The College has approached targeted recruitment in a positive, inclusive, proactive manner. It is not clear from the Institutional Profile data how many of the non-tenured faculty are in tenure-track positions and which are from underrepresented groups. Over the next 5 years there is the expectation for a significant number of retirements. In light of this possibility and given the diversity of its student populations and the community it serves, the reviewers recommend that the College continue the focus on recruitment and retention of underrepresented groups. We also suggest that the College engage in the analysis of tenure and promotion rates for the various subgroups of faculty. Brooklyn College has several groups as the Diversity Council, the spring 2002 Task Force on Faculty Diversity, and the Center for Diversity and Multicultural Studies to assist in these efforts. The College is encouraged to find creative ways to fund incentives (e.g. supplemental salaries, moving costs) identified in the PRR as challenges to faculty recruitment.

While it may need to be updated, Brooklyn College's published Diversity Plan is easy to read and clear in its objectives and recommendations. Parts of the plan—faculty recruitment, for example—have been implemented. Publications photos (as in the student handbook) reflect the campus diversity. A more comprehensive approach within publications could highlight the campus commitment to diversity and the multicultural perspective that is suggested in the diversity plan. Given the community it serves and its strategic focus on being student-centered, Brooklyn College should continue its conscientious effort to find ways to celebrate diversity.

The annual report indicates that the College has set aside external funds to support faculty recruitment, retention and research. In discussing the Capital Facilities Plan for the West Campus, the challenge of providing competitive start up science

equipment funds was mentioned. The reviewers encourage exploration of grants to assist this effort.

Brooklyn College has made a commitment to professional development of faculty (which benefit all faculty, not only those from underrepresented groups). The New Faculty Orientation program includes a tour of the Borough of Brooklyn to help faculty understand their students and highlight the opportunities for being a responsive college partner, implementing service learning, and identifying areas of mutual interest. While the Academic Year Workshops for New Faculty provide guidance in the areas of evaluation, tenure and promotion, grants/research, student life, etc., the reviewers encourage evaluation to determine ways to ensure and increase participation. The annual "Transformation" seminar, annual Faculty Day, and peer mentoring of faculty new to grants activities all demonstrate commitment to faculty support. Further development of the Brooklyn College Experts Database is encouraged. The reviewers strongly suggest assessment of the various recruitment and retention efforts.

Recommendation 2: Develop a unified technology plan

In November 2002, the College produced an Information Technology Master Plan which is clearly linked to the College's 2000-05 Strategic Plan. It describes goals and activities for the next 1-2 years with the recognition that because of evolution, IT plans need more frequent review and updating. The detailed document indicates significant number of activities which are ongoing, others which are planned to begin in the near future as well as those which are desired.

The College has established a Teaching and Learning Technology Roundtable (TLRT), comprised of faculty, students and staff which according to the website "brings together all groups and individuals who are stakeholders in technology at the college" and "serves as a clearinghouse for information and a vehicle for communication among the various groups concerned with technology at the college." The TLTR discusses policy and process concerning the expenditure of the student technology fee.

The Technology Plan is inclusive and ambitious. Its implementation has been supported by the CUNY student technology fee equaling about \$1.4 million annually. Expenditures consistent with the Information Technology Master Plan have provided new labs, upgrades in existing labs, e-resources for the library and extended wireless connectivity. In addition to current expenditures, the College is also encouraged to consider use of funds to purchase systems such as The Learning Connection (TLC) Web training platform for staff development and to provide increased access to scholarly information in the form of digital media and full-text electronic databases.

The reviewers encourage the use of benchmarks to assess the efficacy of the technology plan. Examples of areas for examination include the number of faculty using BlackBoard and the training goals for faculty, staff, and students. With over 70 faculty workshops held in 2002-03 as well as intersession Blackboard Institutes, the reviewers would encourage assessment of their effectiveness.

In the Technology Plan, it is stated that "The College will develop a set of competencies for students and design a program for achieving them" as a future

activity. Given the centrality of student success, the reviewers strongly suggest focusing on an analysis of which skill sets students bring to Brooklyn College and on the identification by faculty (and potentially with external constituencies) of which skill sets are needed for students to become technologically competent. The TLRT could be charged with developing strategies through the Technology plan to address any gaps in student competencies.

Faculty mentoring faculty in online education, the development of online tutoring materials for key courses and the Title III grant to develop a virtual student services center highlight the institution's commitment to student success and the supporting role of technology.

Recommendation 3: Engage in a comprehensive planning process.

As was indicated in the introduction, Brooklyn College provided a number of planning documents as part of the PRR process. The driver for the specialized plans (e.g. technology) is the Strategic Plan and all other plans are clearly linked to the Strategic Plan. The Strategic Plan has been developed in a manner consistent with guidelines established by City University of New York and those established by the New York State Department of Education. The Committee composition points to an inclusive process involving faculty, staff, students and administration. The Strategic Plan has three major overarching goals which cut across all divisions: to maintain and enhance academic quality, to ensure a student-oriented campus, and to become a "model citizen" in the Borough of Brooklyn. These goals are cited in the other campus planning documents. Evidence of achievement of a number of goals is found in annual reports.

The College is commended for its development of annual Strategic Action Plan (SAP) goals and targets as well as its annual report to the campus community. The PRR states that individual departmental strategic planning aligns with the long-range plan. How this alignment is achieved is unclear; although the PRR indicates that departmental annual reports discuss how departments have contributed to the college goals.

Institutional research and assessment are now part of the responsibilities of the assistant vice president for budget and planning. The College is to be commended for establishing a college task force on data issues and information flow, focusing on data availability and quality.

For monitoring progress related to the Strategic Plan, the reviewers encourage further development of the strategic planning database that was included in the PRR report. Also encouraged is the continued linkage of planning and budgeting.

Recommendation 4: Devise and implement a campus-wide and comprehensive outcomes assessment plan.

Brooklyn College developed a very comprehensive Outcomes Assessment Plan and submitted it to Middle States Commission in fall 2001. The three major Strategic Plan goals are complemented by two other goals to form an assessment framework

addressing both student learning outcomes as well as institutional effectiveness. Reviewers found the website informative (including the Plan, Performance Indicators, Middle States documents). The website and other documents did not provide enough information for the reviewers to assess the current state of activities and action with regard to student learning outcomes assessment. The annual reports on the website included many process activities, and less information on how results from assessment activities were being used for program or institutional improvement.

Progress on assessment is being made. A structure has been established with the same individual serving as the Coordinator of Academic Assessment and the Director of the Center for Teaching and Learning, and the Director for Institutional Planning, Research, and Assessment serving as the overall Assessment Coordinator. The Brooklyn College team which attended AAC&U Asheville Institute on General Education developed a faculty and student survey of the core curriculum. The results indicated endorsement of the General Education goals developed by the team. Discipline based professional development workshops on assessing the majors have been offered for faculty. A review of the assessment plan is evident by the fact that there has been a decision to move from a model of incremental increase in departments' involvement in assessment to working with all units at the divisional level. This is reflected in the budget and planning website annual report on institutional effectiveness.

The reviewers commend Brooklyn College for its comprehensive approach to assessment and institutional effectiveness. We recommend continued institutional attention to the process of development and implementation of assessment plans. Attention should be paid to the utilization of assessment results/information for academic and program improvement. The College is encouraged to continue to institutionalize assessment activities into existing structures and processes. As suggestions, discussion of use of assessment results could be part of departments' annual reports, development of assessment competencies might be part of managers' professional development plans, and academic program reviews could focus on assessment activities.

Other Observations and conclusions

The reviewers found many exemplary activities and practices in Brooklyn College PRR documents. The reviewers commend Brooklyn College for its strategic focus on academic excellence, a student-oriented campus, and being a model citizen for the Borough of Brooklyn. The College deserves special recognition for its outreach efforts and its clear support of student success in preparing them for the diverse, pluralistic society of the 21st century. It is clear that the institution has an inclusive process for planning and has moved toward a culture of evidence.

A number of suggestions have been made in this document, particularly as they relate to the prior Middle States review. The reviewers make the following recommendations: Brooklyn College should continue its efforts to improve faculty demographics through targeted recruitment and retention strategies, focusing on

underrepresented groups. Secondly, Brooklyn College should continue to implement and institutionalize its comprehensive assessment plan.



Middle States Commission on Higher Education

3624 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104-2680 Tel: 215-662-5606 Fax: 215-662-5501
www.msache.org

July 26, 2004

Dr. Christoph M. Kimmich
President
CUNY - Brooklyn College
2900 Bedford Avenue
Brooklyn, NY 11210

Dear Dr. Kimmich:

Thank you for the submission of your Periodic Review Report. We hope that its preparation encouraged and supported the continuing process of review and assessment of goals for your institution.

Enclosed is the fiscal analysis of your Periodic Review Report materials. You should receive the external reviewers' analysis by August 2 or within a reasonable time. If you do not receive it, please call me at (267) 284-5027, or you may contact the reviewers directly.

Please prepare a single institutional response to both the financial and external reviewers' reports. We would appreciate your sending fifteen (15) copies to the Commission Office by September 1. The letter should be addressed to Ms. Jean Avnet Morse, Executive Director, and the transmittal envelope should be addressed to me.

Please feel free to call me or your CHE staff liaison if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Vivian L. Ellis".

Vivian L. Ellis
Evaluation Services Coordinator

7-29-04
2545

PERIODIC REVIEW REPORT

FISCAL ANALYSIS

2004

NAME OF INSTITUTION CUNY - BROOKLYN COLLEGE, NY

FINANCE ASSOCIATE Martin S. Dorph

Temple University, PA

Brooklyn College's financial condition is stable. The institution's financial condition reflects an array of strengths and potential weaknesses. Overall, Brooklyn College continues to demonstrate its ability to fulfill its mission within the resource constraints imposed upon it by its organizational and funding structure.

As a college within the City University of New York, Brooklyn College is dependent upon an allocation of State funding for a significant portion of its revenue. That funding has remained essentially level over the recent past. Therefore, Brooklyn College's ability to provide additional funding for improvements or changes to programs or services is limited to increases in enrollment, tuition, or development of outside funding sources.

Brooklyn College has responded reasonably well to the challenge. As indicated in its *Periodic Review Report*, the institution has increased its revenues from a number of areas:

- Headcount enrollment has increased from 15,057 in 1999 to 15,513 in 2003, an increase of 3.0%;
- New admissions (freshmen, transfers, and graduate students) have increased from 2,917 in 1999 to 3,960 in 2003, an increase of 35.8%;
- Tuition was increased by 25% in FY2004;
- A technology fee was instituted in FY 2004, generating approximately \$1.5 million per year;
- Fundraising efforts have been increased. The institution provided examples, but did not provide financial data showing the overall revenues and increases from this activity.

Over the next five years, Brooklyn College projects additional enrollment increases to a headcount of 17,558 students, an increase of 13.2% over 2003. It indicates that further tuition increases are likely, and expects to generate additional revenue from grants and contracts. The *Periodic Review Report* states that minimal operating budget increases are projected. However, it is unclear how that goal can be achieved in light of the increased demand for teaching and services that will follow from increased enrollment. Brooklyn College's future challenge will be to continue to grow its other revenues in order to meet the increased expenditure requirements fueled by its planned enrollment growth.

As a component of a larger system (City University of New York), Brooklyn College does not produce stand-alone audited financial statements. As such, there are no audit results or management letter findings to be cited in this review. Also, all long-term debt is managed centrally by the University, and is not a direct factor in Brooklyn College's annual budget and finances.

Trends in net assets or expendable reserves are not clearly identified because of the lack of audited financial statements. No budgetary statements were available to provide an analysis of expendable financial resources.