A transformative, distinctive, and affordable education to students from all backgrounds

SELF-STUDY REPORT
PREPARED FOR THE MIDDLE STATES COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

Draft of Nov. 27, 2018

REVIEW PERIOD 2009-2019
Table of Contents

Executive Summary

Introduction
I.1 Overview of Brooklyn College
   I.1.1 Trends in Enrollment
   I.1.2 Faculty and Staff
   I.1.3 Trends in Affordability and Student Success
I.2 Significant Changes and Challenges Since the 2009 Self-Study
   I.2.1 Leadership
   I.2.2 Academic Affairs Organizational Structure
   I.2.3 New Strategic Plan
   I.2.4 Significant Curricular Changes
   I.2.5 Facilities
I.3 Brooklyn College’s Recent MSCHE History
I.4 The 2016-2019 Self-Study Process
I.5 Organization of this Report

Chapter 1, Standard I: Mission and Goals
1.1 Summary of Evidence of Compliance with the Standard
1.2 Introduction
1.3 Mission
   1.3.1 Mission Development: Strategic Planning Process
   1.3.2 Alignment with CUNY
   1.3.3 Awareness of Mission Statement
1.4 Quality of a Brooklyn College Education
1.5 Diversity of the Brooklyn College Community
1.6 Affordability of a Brooklyn College Education
1.7 Integration with Community
1.8 Supporting the Mission
1.9 Recommendations Aligned with the College’s Strategic Plan

Chapter 2, Standard II: Ethics and Integrity
2.1 Summary of Evidence of Compliance with the Standard
2.2 Introduction
2.3 Ethical Conduct, Intellectual Freedom, Freedom of Expression, and Respect for Intellectual Property
2.4 Creating a Climate of Respect
2.5 General Policies that Govern Students, Faculty, and Staff
2.6 Policies Governing the Student Experience
2.7 Faculty Personnel Policies
   2.7.1 Promotion and Tenure/Certificate of Continuous Employment (CCE)
   2.7.2 Professional Development
   2.7.3 Faculty Complaints and Grievance Procedures
2.8 Staff Personnel Policies
   2.8.1 Staff Career Advancement/Professional Development
2.8.2 Staff Complaints and Grievances
2.9 Commitment to Diversity and Inclusion
2.10 Conclusions
2.11 Recommendations Aligned with the College’s Strategic Plan

Chapter 3, Standard III: Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience
3.1 Summary of Evidence of Compliance with the Standard
3.2 Introduction
3.3 Academic Program Offerings
3.4 Faculty
  3.4.1 Faculty Qualifications and Diversity
  3.4.2 Faculty Qualifications and Assessment
3.5 General Education
3.6 Graduate Education
3.7 Periodic Assessment of Programs
3.8 Recommendations Aligned with the College’s Strategic Plan

Chapter 4, Standard IV: Support of the Student Experience
4.1 Summary of Evidence of Compliance with the Standard
4.2 Introduction
4.3 Admissions, Retention and Graduation
  4.3.1 Momentum
  4.3.2 Retention and Graduation
4.4 Student Information and Records
4.5 Adequacy and Accessibility of Web-Based Information
4.6 Access to Face-to-Face Support
4.7 Adequacy of Co-Curricular and Extra-Curricular Activities
4.8 Adequacy of Staff in Student Support Areas
4.9 Conclusions
4.10 Recommendations Aligned with the College’s Strategic Plan

Chapter 5, Standard V: Educational Effectiveness and Assessment
5.1 Summary of Evidence of Compliance with the Standard
5.2 Introduction
5.3 Current Status of Assessment at Brooklyn College
  5.3.1 Initiatives Implemented to Foster a Culture of Assessment
5.4 Academic Assessment: Case Studies
5.5 Success of Students After Graduation
5.6 Sharing of Information
5.7 Conclusions
5.8 Recommendations Aligned with the College’s Strategic Plan

Chapter 6, Standard VI: Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement
6.1 Summary of Evidence of Compliance with the Standard
6.2 Introduction
6.3 Linkages among Institutional Objectives, Assessment, Planning and Resource Allocation
6.4 General Process of Administrative Oversight and Planning
6.5 The Financial Planning and Budgeting Process
   6.5.1 The Basic Operating Budget
6.6 Alternative Sources of Funding and Revenue
   6.6.1 Income Funds Reimbursable (IFR)
   6.6.2 Non-Tax Levy
   6.6.3 Auxiliary Enterprise Corporation (AEC)
   6.6.4 Brooklyn College Foundation (BCF)
   6.6.5 CUNY Research Foundation (RF)
6.7 Budget and Planning
6.8 The Office of Budget and Planning: Primary Challenges
   6.8.1 The Office of Budget and Planning: Addressing the Challenges
   6.8.2 Office of Information and Technology Services (ITS)
   6.8.3 College Facilities
   6.8.4 Communication and Dissemination of Information
6.9 The Use of Data Collection and Analysis to Improve the Delivery of Administrative Services
   6.9.1 Enhancing Student Collection Rates
   6.9.2 Improving the Purchasing and Procurement Department
6.10 The Use of Assessment Information to Achieve the Institutional Mission
6.11 Recommendations Aligned with the College’s Strategic Plan

Chapter 7, Standard VII: Governance, Leadership & Administration

7.1 Summary of Evidence of Compliance with the Standard
7.2 Introduction
7.3 Governance Structure
   7.3.1 Changes to Local Governance and Bylaws
7.4 Administration
   7.4.1 Implementation of a Five School Structure
   7.4.2 Technology to Support Administration
7.5 Assessment of Administrative Units
   7.5.1 Within Unit Assessment
   7.5.2 Assessment of the College President, College Leadership and Administration
7.6 Recommendations Aligned with the College’s Strategic Plan

List of Tables

Table I.1: Most Popular Undergraduate and Master’s Programs, Fall 2017
Table I.2: Ethnicity of Brooklyn College Students—Undergraduate and Graduate
Table I.3: Number of full-time and part-time staff at Brooklyn College, 2017-2018
Table I.4: Change in Faculty by Rank, 2013 - 2018
Table I.5: Change in Ethnic and Racial Composition of the Faculty Fall, 2013 - 2018
Table I.6: Ethnic and Racial Distribution of the Faculty, 2013 and 2018
Table 1.1: Standard I: Mission and Goals
Table 1.2: Alignment of CUNY Master Plan and Brooklyn College Mission Statement
Table 1.3: Comparison of tuition 2017-2018: Brooklyn College vs Benchmarks
Table 1.4: Why do students choose Brooklyn College: Perceptions of Students, Faculty, Staff and Alumni
Table 1.5: “In your opinion, how well integrated is Brooklyn College into the surrounding community?”
Table 2.1: Standard II: Ethics and Integrity
Table 2.2: Summary of Academic Integrity Allegations, 2013-2018
Table 2.3: “Please rate the diversity of Brooklyn College in the following areas…”
Table 2.4: Comparison of Ethnic Diversity of Faculty, Staff and Students
Table 3.1: Standard III: Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience
Table 3.2: New Academic Programs at Brooklyn College (since 2009) by School and Credential
Table 3.3: Full Time Brooklyn College Faculty by Rank and School
Table 3.4: Comparison of Ethnic Diversity of Faculty, Staff and Students
Table 3.5: Results of Tenure, Promotion, and CCE Review Process, 2012-2017
Table 3.6: What is Valued and What Should be Valued? – Faculty Responses
Table 3.7: Student Perception of Faculty
Table 3.8: CUNY General Education Requirements
Table 4.1: Standard IV: Support of the Student Experience
Table 4.2: Gateway Course Completion Rates
Table 4.3: Retention and Completion: Comparison across CUNY Senior Colleges
Table 4.4: “Courses that I need are offered frequently enough.” – Student responses
Table 4.5: Student Support Offices with URL
Table 4.6: “It is easy to find the information that I need on the Brooklyn College website.” – Student responses
Table 4.7: Co-Curricular Programs/Offices with URLs
Table 4.8: Intercollegiate and Intermural Athletic Opportunities
Table 5.1: Standard V: Educational Effectiveness Assessment
Table 5.2: Summary of Assessment Reports by Cabinet Area
Table 5.3: Program Reviews since 2014
Table 5.4: Learning Outcomes Assessment – Survey Responses
Table 5.5: Results of SPSS analysis
Table 6.1: Standard VI: Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement
Table 6.2: Tax Levy Funding (in thousands)
Table 7.1: Standard VII: Governance, Leadership and Administration

List of Figures
Figure I.1: Changes in Undergraduate and Graduate Enrollment, 2009-2017
Figure I.2: First-time Freshmen Versus Transfer Enrollment, 2009-2017
Figure 1.1: Student Race and Ethnicity, 2009-2017
Figure 3.1: Curriculum Development Process: Course and Program

Appendices
I.A: New degree programs
I.C: Credit Hour Plan and Progress Report
I.D: Brooklyn College’s Monitoring Report
I.E: Self-Study Working Group participants
I.F: Approved Self-Study Design
I.G: MSCHE Survey Reports
1.A: 2011 Mission Statement
1.B: Fall 2016 report *Brooklyn College – Analysis of Student Admissions*
2.A: Student Handbook
3.A: Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Workshop Materials
3.B: History of Pathways at Brooklyn College
3.C: Oral Communication and Technological Competency Courses
3.D: General Education Assessment Plan
3.E: Annual Assessment Templates for Academic and Administrative Units
4.A: Seek Program Effectiveness
4.B: Student Survey Results
4.C: Student Orientation and Assessments
5.A: Narrative of Pedagogy and Curriculum Improvements
5.B: Status of Assessment Reports by Unit
5.C: AAC and IAC Meeting Minutes for the 2017-18 academic year
5.D: Program Review Schedule
5.E: Assessment templates and forms
5.F: Initial Assessment of Post-Graduate Incomes
6.A: Detailed funding report
6 B: Purchasing and Procurement Survey 2017
7.A: Set of six Governance Plan versions
7.B: Policy Council bylaw changes
7.C: “Benefits of a School Structure at Brooklyn College”
7.D: “Primary Responsibilities of the Deans at Brooklyn College” and “School Configurations for Discussion”
7.E: Positive impacts and challenges in using CUNYfirst
Executive Summary

With a new President at the helm, Brooklyn College is intentionally transforming itself to fundamentally address the challenges that confront urban, public, higher educational institutions today. The College’s history of excellence inspires our community to become a “world-class, distinctive engine of intellectual discourse and social mobility”\(^1\) as we prepare our students to shape and improve the rapidly changing world they will inherit. These aspirations form the College’s newly-adopted, 2018 vision statement, the focal point that guides our mission and planning.

Our Self-Study reports Brooklyn College’s preparation for our decennial accreditation review by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) within the context of these ambitions. Our review not only coincided with the inauguration of our new president, Michelle J. Anderson, but also with the development of the College’s 2018-2023 Strategic Plan. The exploration required for each of these rigorous institutional assessments and planning processes has helped inform the other, providing information and insights that expand our knowledge about our College and sharpen our image of its future.

Starting in 2016, the Self-Study’s Steering Committee and eight working groups investigated the College’s compliance with the Middle States Commission on Higher Education’s Seven Standards of Accreditation and Requirements of Affiliation as described in the MSCHE’s Higher Education’s Standards of Accreditation and Requirements of Affiliation, 13th edition. The Self-Study reveals that the College demonstrates a clear and strong commitment to each of the Standards and Requirements. Brooklyn College has benefitted greatly from the Self-Study process and is honored to provide the Commission with our 2019 Self-Study Report in preparation for our review.

The Self-Study Process

The Self-Study was led by the Steering Committee, co-chaired by Dr. Jeremy Porter, Professor of Sociology, and by Dr. Jo-Ellen Asbury, the Associate Provost for Institutional Planning and Assessment. The Steering Committee is composed of faculty and administrators who oversaw the development of the specific research questions for each of the Standards of Accreditation. The research design was approved by the Commission. The Steering Committee worked in collaboration with eight working groups that it established to investigate the research questions specified for each of the standards. The eighth group verified the College’s compliance with the Requirements of Affiliation. Evidence of compliance, transparency, diversity and inclusion, and information accessibility are some of the common themes that cross the research questions. The Steering Committee provided information, feedback, and guidance to the working groups. The working groups included faculty and administrators with expertise and interest in particular areas related to each standard. The Self-Study Draft Report draft is currently being circulated to the entire Brooklyn College community for feedback that will inform the final document.

\(^1\) The Brooklyn College Vision Statement, The Strategic Plan, 2018-2013, August 1, 2018, p. 4.
Overview of the Self-Study Report

The primary goal of the Self-Study was to demonstrate the College’s compliance with each of the Commission’s standards and to show and ensure that it has processes and systems in place to assure continuous improvement with regard to the criteria that defines each standard. The working groups collected considerable data about each standard. Analyses of the data demonstrated compliance and were used to make recommendations for improvements. As the Self-Study Report indicates, the recommendations are aligned with the College’s new strategic plan goals. The reports developed by the working groups were submitted to the Steering Committee and form the basis of the Self-Study report.

An overview of the findings and recommendations for each of the seven standards follows.

Standard I Mission

The College revised its mission statement in 2018 through its strategic planning process. The new statement is similar to the one that preceded it: it addresses the quality of education at the College; the diversity of our community; the affordability of our programs, and our engagement with the larger community. New is an emphasis on intellectual freedom and on specifying the education of first generation, immigrant students. The mission informs all aspects of planning on campus. The working group also found that not all members of the community were knowledgeable about the mission. The group recommended that the mission be featured more prominently on campus so that all students could be more fully oriented to it. In addition to knowledge about the mission, the working group investigated the extent to which the College lives the key elements of its mission. It found that the mission propels the campus’ work in all of its dimensions. As enrollments shift and the demography of the borough of Brooklyn changes, it was recommended that the campus monitor our students’ diversity to ensure that the College is positioned to remain representative of our locale.

Standard II Ethics and Integrity

The working group noted the strength and scope of policies in place at the College and the University assure integrity and ethical behavior. The College was found to be in compliance with the criteria of the standard. A primary area of investigation was the transparency and accessibility of policies and information related to the standard. The way in which the College operationalizes its fundamental values of diversity and inclusion was also explored. Pushing off from the success of recent implicit bias training for faculty search committee members last year, the committee recommended extending the same development opportunity to all faculty and staff. Including specific policies related to grievance procedures into the Faculty and Student Handbooks was also recommended as was the development of a staff handbook.
Standard III: Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience

The working group found that the strength of the student learning experience is demonstrated by the high quality of the education the College provides its students. The quality of its programs is affirmed by the extent of the external recognition the college receives, the valuation of external accrediting bodies, the scope and coherence of programming, the level of curricular assessment, the high level of its faculty preparation and full-time section coverage, clear academic programming, and considerable support services, among other metrics. Recommendations include additional support for faculty research and mentoring and a comprehensive evaluation of graduate programing.

Standard IV

The working group explored the student experience from recruitment to graduation and found the college to be in compliance with the requirements of the standard. It found the processes to be clearly defined and aligned with the mission. Students receive appropriate services and the institutional outcome data demonstrates the extent of their success. The working group recommended a thorough assessment of the Brooklyn College website’s navigability for students. Improvements in advisement were also recommended. The college has a limited number of professional advisors, and the working group recommended the expansion of this unit, especially to serve sophomores. The working group noted that more research on sophomore attrition was needed to develop comprehensive strategies for the improved retention of the group. Enhancements to scheduling and a review of transfer credit policies, particularly related to prior learning assessment, were also proposed for consideration.

Standard V

The working group focused on investigating the progress the college has made since 2016 in developing a culture of assessment on campus. It found that the college has made great strides over this period and that it has put in place strategies to enhance the quality of assessment. Recommendations that emerged from the Self-Study include changes to the program review timeline and scope; the addition of more faculty to the Academic Assessment Committee, and the implementation of new assessment strategies that leverage the College’s new school structure and strengths in assessment. These recommendations aim to support a sustained practice of assessment throughout the institution through modeling, monitoring, and closing the loop on improvements.

Standard VI

The use of assessment and evaluation to drive decision-making processes was explored primarily by focusing on the offices of (1) Budget and Planning, (2) Information Technology Services, and (3) Facilities, Planning, and Operations. Across these units, individual unit objectives are consistent with internal goals, in alignment with the overarching goals of the College, and in compliance with CUNY policy and guidelines. The studies the working group undertook also show that assessment and data-driven decision making and planning occur in multiple ways across a broad range of units. The working group found that the use of data to drive assessment is inconsistent across the campus and recommended developing an approach to disseminating
relevant data analyses for each unit or division that is tied closely to assessment and planning cycles. Developing mechanisms to help prioritize data requests was also recommended.

**Standard VII**

An examination of the College’s organizational structure and staffing, an assessment of its governance documents, and an analysis of assessment processes was the focus of the working group’s efforts. The investigation verified that Brooklyn College is transparent in its governance and administrative structures and that these structures facilitate the ability of Brooklyn College to carry out its mission and goals effectively in order to serve its students and all other stakeholders. It was recommended that the College continue to focus on developing a culture of transparency, service, and trust and that it document standard operational procedures in order to enhance best practices. It was also recommended that governance documents be revised to incorporate the responsibilities and authority of the deans. The working group found that it is also important for each department to continue to file specific affirmative action plans in order to increase opportunities to hire minority and women faculty where they are underrepresented.

An Introduction to the Self-Study follows this summary. It provides an overview of the College, outlines the structure of the Self-Study Report, and describes significant trends and challenges.
INTRODUCTION

Founded in 1930, Brooklyn College has been accredited by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) since 1933. This Self-Study Report demonstrates compliance with MSCHE’s seven standards, probes selected research questions related to each standard, and specifies recommendations for the College’s continued improvement.

Our Self-Study Report tells the story of an institution with an historical identity synonymous with the traditions of the liberal arts, engaged in transformation as it solidifies its position in the rapidly-shifting landscape of global higher education. Since the inauguration of Michelle J. Anderson as Brooklyn College’s 10th president in August 2016, the College has examined its history and analyzed its current circumstances in order to chart a future with intention. An inclusive strategic planning process, undertaken in 2017 and conducted over an 18-month period, unified stakeholders and provided the community a detailed roadmap for navigating the course of institutional improvement. This Self-Study Report process has further deepened the College’s collective understanding of itself and framed a wider lens to help vision its future.

In this introduction to the Self-Study Report, we present an overview of Brooklyn College, survey trends, specify key developments, and describe the Self-Study process.

I.1 Overview of Brooklyn College

Brooklyn College is one of 25 higher educational institutions of the City University of New York (CUNY), the largest urban University system in the nation. CUNY serves over 274,000 degree-seeking students. The CUNY system emphasizes shared resources and ease of transfer between its constituent campuses. As a premier liberal arts institution among CUNY’s 11 senior Colleges, and ranked by the University as among its five most selective colleges offering both bachelor’s and master’s degrees, Brooklyn College works closely with the University’s central administration, its peer institutions, the system’s seven community Colleges, and the Graduate Center, which houses most of CUNY’s doctoral programs. Many Brooklyn College faculty also teach at the Graduate Center, where they have the opportunity to collaborate with colleagues from across the University and to mentor and engage in research with doctoral students.

A vibrant, academic community, Brooklyn College has been shaped by centuries of immigration and the promise of social mobility expressed in its mission. It was the first public, coeducational College in New York City. Located in the borough of its namesake, the College mirrors the riches of that borough’s extraordinary diversity. As of fall 2018, 18,125 students are enrolled in the College’s undergraduate, graduate, master’s, and certificate programs.

Brooklyn College sits on a tree-lined, 35-acre campus, nationally acclaimed for its exceptional beauty. The College has deep roots in the surrounding community, as evidenced by an active alumni association, a host of neighborhood partnerships, and specialized academic and service programming.
The College takes pride in serving its locale: 75% of our students reside in Brooklyn. Our students hail from 138 countries and speak more than 90 languages. Over a quarter of our students speak a language other than English at home. Our 83 undergraduate and 72 graduate programs have been designed to reflect students’ interests, open-up new vistas of knowledge and meaning, and prepare them for the future.

Brooklyn College has been called, “the poor man’s Harvard.” Indeed, in a Chronicle of Higher Education survey of public Colleges, Brooklyn College ranked eighth in the nation for students’ socio-economic mobility, that is, the College’s ability to lift low-income students into the middle class. This ranking underscores the impact of our students’ attainment: our graduates are prepared for both a broad spectrum of careers and graduate schools. Recent survey data show that approximately 92% of our recent graduates are employed or pursuing further education.

Our emphasis on academic quality through assessment and improvement is attested to by our program- and school-level accreditations. These include: the master’s program in speech-language pathology, accredited by the Council on Academic Accreditation in Audiology and Speech Language Pathology of the American Speech-Language Hearing Association; the master’s program in school counseling, accredited by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs; The Didactic Program in Dietetics, accredited by the Accreditation Council for Education in Nutrition and Dietetics. In addition, the School of Education is accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education and in the process of seeking accreditation from the Association for Advancing Quality in Educator Preparation. Finally, the Murray Koppelman School for Business is currently a candidate for accreditation from the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB). All of Brooklyn College’s academic programs are registered by the New York State Department of Education.

National rankings in the past two years alone underscore the high quality of the educational experience across Brooklyn College.

- U.S. News & World Report ranked Brooklyn College as having the #1 Most Ethnically Diverse College among regional campuses in the north.
- Chronicle for Higher Education ranked Brooklyn College in #8 Best College for Students’ Socio-Economic Mobility among all public College in the nation.
- U.S. News & World Report ranked Brooklyn College as the #12 Best Undergraduate Teaching among regional Colleges in the north.
- Best Colleges ranks Brooklyn College the #14 Most Beautiful College Campus.
- U.S. News & World Report ranked Brooklyn College as #19 Top Public College in north.
- U.S. News & World Report ranked Brooklyn College as the #74 Best Regional College in the north.
- Money Magazine ranked Brooklyn College in the Top 20% of Best Colleges for your Money.
- Forbes ranks Brooklyn College #70 Best Value College in the nation.
- Best Value Schools ranks Brooklyn College among the Top 30 Most Beautiful Campuses, Top 30 Best Small Colleges for Aspiring Filmmakers, Top 50 Best Colleges for Teaching Degrees, and Top 100 Most Affordable Colleges in America.
Students are drawn to Brooklyn College because of its academic excellence, affordability, and the scope of its offerings. Once they study here, students report a high level of satisfaction with the education they receive.²

Reflecting a trend across higher education, the academic programs at Brooklyn College with obvious career paths have become particularly popular with students. As Table I.1 shows, our largest undergraduate degree programs are Psychology (BA and BS), Computer Science (BS), Accounting (BS), and Biology (BS), which together account for about 25% of undergraduate enrollments. Our largest master’s programs are all in professional study areas, including Early Childhood Teachers (MSED), Teaching Students with Disabilities (MSED), School Counseling (MSED), Business Administration Global Finance (MS), and Business Administration General Business (MS).

Table I.1
Most Popular Undergraduate and Master’s Programs, Fall 2017

| Undergraduate | | Graduate | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Program | Degree | Majors | % | Program | Degree | Majors | % |
| Psychology | BA | 978 | 8.2% | Early Childhood Teachers | MSED | 169 | 8.7% |
| Computer Science | BS | 571 | 4.8% | Teaching Student w/Disabilities | MSED | 128 | 6.6% |
| Accounting | BS | 530 | 4.5% | School Counseling | MSED | 98 | 5.1% |
| Psychology | BS | 529 | 4.5% | Business Administration Global Finance | MS | 86 | 4.4% |
| Biology | BS | 420 | 3.5% | Business Administration General Business | MS | 83 | 4.3% |

Source:

In addition to our remarkably diverse student body and the breadth and quality of our academic programs, Brooklyn College boasts an extraordinarily dedicated faculty of 524 members³ who distinguish themselves through innovative teaching, research, creativity and service. They are recipients of numerous honors, grants, fellowships, and prizes. Many have earned the highest distinctions in their fields, including (with examples hyperlinked) the Pulitzer Prize, Academy Award, Emmy Award, Obie Award, Peabody Award, Grammy Award, Rome Prize, American Book Award, National Science Foundation Award, NAACP Image Award, and Presidential Medal

---

² See the Spring 2016 Student Experience Survey, p x.
of Freedom. They have won fellowships and grants (with examples hyperlinked) from the NEA, the NIH, the NSF, the NIMH, the Guggenheim Foundation, the Ford Foundation, the Fulbright Program, and the MacArthur (“genius”) Program. Over the last decade, they have contributed nearly 12,000 scholarly and creative works to their fields.

Of note, Brooklyn College and its excellent faculty have helped develop future luminaries in their fields. An extraordinary list of distinguished alumni (with examples hyperlinked) include winners of the Nobel Prize in Medicine, Pulitzer Prize, Man Booker Prize, Academy Award, Tony Award, American Academy of Poets Award, Obie Award, Grammy Award, PEN/Laura Pels Award, Whiting Award, Nebula Award, Peabody Award, Edward R. Murrow Award, O. Henry Award, National Book Award, MacArthur (“genius”) Award, and a rare (and funny) EGOT winner. Alumni also include two U.S. Senators and a number of Congressmembers, including Shirley Chisholm. These honorable graduates further distinguish the College.

Both undergraduate and graduate students, as our full-time faculty coverage data demonstrate, have considerable opportunity to work closely with faculty in the classroom, as well as through student clubs, community service, civic engagement, and research. It is the strength of this bond that undergirds student success at the College.

I.1.1 Trends in Enrollment

Over the past ten years, total enrollment at Brooklyn College has grown by 5.7%, from 17,094 in fall 2009 to 18,125 in fall 2018. As figure I.1 shows, the College has experienced both overall enrollment growth—an increase of 1,031 students—and shifts in the composition of the student body. While undergraduate enrollments have risen sharply since 2013, graduate enrollments have declined since 2012. Graduate enrollment dipped from 24% of total enrollment to 17% during the period.

![Figure I.1](image-url)

Changes in Undergraduate and Graduate Enrollment, 2009 - 2018

As the first-year class has grown at Brooklyn College, the difference between the number of entering first-year students and entering transfer students has narrowed, as Figure I.2 indicates.
These changes in enrollment patterns have implications for revenue, curriculum, and services. As discussed throughout this Self-Study Report, the College has responded to these changes by investing in strategies to improve student success, facilitate transfer and access, and update the curricula.

The Fall 2017 enrollment snapshot provides other important information about the student profile: 73% of our undergraduates study full-time, and 76% are under 25. Females comprise 60% of the student body, and 45% of our students are first-generation college students.

Table I.2 outlines the extensive ethnic diversity of our students, which is a source of considerable pride on the campus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing/Unknown</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The age profile of our graduate students differs in some way from our undergraduates. The majority are older, between 25 and 40, and 80% of them study part-time.
I.1.2 Faculty and Staff

The College has $X$ full-time and $Y$ part-time employees. Table I.3 shows their distribution.

Table I.3
Number of full-time and part-time staff at Brooklyn College, 2017-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full-time Employees</th>
<th>Part-time Employees</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Lab Technicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Assistants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Teaching Adjuncts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Education Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Civil Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: IPEDS Human Resources, 2017-2018…verify date

A significant change in staffing at Brooklyn College over the past ten years has been the decline in the number of administrative staff. In spring 2015, there were 749 administrative, non-teaching, fulltime employees on the payroll. Due to budget challenges, the College cancelled 12 staff searches that year and instituted a strategic assessment plan for future staff searches. In fall 2018, there were 722 similar positions on payroll, including five new administrative staff positions added for the newly opened Barry R. Feirstein Graduate School of Cinema.

The change in administrative staff at Brooklyn College reflects a reduction of over 40 positions over the past three years. The College has carefully streamlined its administrative operations to address budget realities and to maximize fulltime faculty coverage.
Excluding temporary and visiting faculty, the Brooklyn College faculty census in fall 2018 shows 502 fulltime faculty, a number that has been relatively stable since 2013. The faculty is distributed among the ranks as Table I.4 illustrates.

Table I.4
Change in Faculty by Rank, 2013 - 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2018</th>
<th>%Δ</th>
<th>Δ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor/Dist Professor</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>-3.4%</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>+20.0%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>-21.7%</td>
<td>-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer/Instructor</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-35.9%</td>
<td>-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Prof/Dist Lect</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>+25.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>-4.6%</td>
<td>-24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of the Associate Provost for Faculty and Administration
FT Faculty History Race Rank Ethnicity Over Time, Fall 2018

As the chart indicates, over the past five years, we see an overall increase in more senior level faculty. Attention to rank distribution is slated to become an increasingly important part of departmental planning; a distribution of faculty across professorial ranks bolsters the work of departments and supports institutional needs for continuity and change. We are seeing evidence of an aging faculty, with 23% of our fulltime ranks above the age of 68 and numerous others approaching retirement.

As faculty lines open, the College plans to diversify the fulltime faculty to reflect more fully the diversity of the student body, and to ensure that students and faculty from underrepresented groups are more fully supported in the College community. Table I.5 shows the ethnic and racial composition of the College’s full-time faculty and its change over the last five years.

Table I.5
Change in Ethnic and Racial Composition of the Faculty, 2013 - 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity/Race</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2018</th>
<th>%Δ</th>
<th>Δ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>-8.9%</td>
<td>-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>+19.0%</td>
<td>+11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>+12.1%</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-11.4%</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+33.3%</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-50.0%</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>-4.6%</td>
<td>-24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of the Associate Provost for Faculty and Administration
FT Faculty History Race Rank Ethnicity Over Time, Fall 2018

Substitute and visiting faculty are not included in these data tabulations; this explains the difference between the 502 ranked faculty census in fall 2018 and the IPEDS 2017-2018 reporting of 524.
Since 2013, the number of white faculty has declined while the numbers of Asian and Hispanic faculty have increased by 19% and 12%, respectively. The number of Black/African American faculty has unfortunately declined by 11% during that same period. While these changes include diversity gains in the overall racial and ethnic composition of the faculty, as Table I.6 illustrates, these gains have been slow, and they exclude Black/African American faculty.

Table I.6
Ethnic and Racial Distribution of the Faculty, 2013 and 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity/Race</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>75.1%</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of the Associate Provost for Faculty and Administration
FT Faculty History Race Rank Ethnicity Over Time, Fall 2018

To address these realities, the Brooklyn College Strategic Plan specifies activities the College is undertaking to increase and retain faculty from underrepresented groups, especially among Blacks/African-Americans.

Fulltime staff better reflect the diversity of our student body. Diversity among staff has been relatively stable since 2009; staff is 41% white, 34% Black/African-American, 14% Hispanic, and 8% Asian. Our part-time staff has diversified slowly and steadily, with a 14% decline in white part-time staff and a roughly 5% increase each in Black/African American, Asian, and Hispanic staff.

I.1.3 Trends in Affordability and Student Success

Brooklyn College remains unusually affordable, a key element of its access mission. Tuition is decidedly low relative to peer institutions. National rankings, cited in Section I.1 above, demonstrate that the College is viewed as a top value college, with low tuition and high academic return. When affordability is coupled with the College’s success in retaining and graduating first-generation students, we preview the College’s effectiveness in realizing its mission.

Moreover, Brooklyn College is on an upward trajectory in improving academic momentum and its retention and graduation rates. In 2017, for instance, its six-year graduation rate rose to 58.1%, a 7% increase over the previous year, and the second highest rate among CUNY senior Colleges. We have documented similar gains in academic momentum for both first-year students and transfer students. Retention in the second year is challenging; we have begun working to address that challenge as described in Chapter V.

I.2 Significant Changes and Challenges Since the 2009 Self-Study

I.2.1 Leadership
Since our last MSCHE Self-Study Report, the senior administration of the College has changed markedly. President Karen Gould stepped down after seven years of service and Michelle J. Anderson, previously Dean of the CUNY School of Law, was named Brooklyn’s 10th president beginning August 2016. President Anderson has brought a focus to the College on strategic planning, integrated planning and assessment, and team-building. Her emphasis on diversity and inclusion, transparency, research, and evidence-based decision-making have inspired stakeholders and provided the College with tools to advance cross-divisional work. These developments are propelling the College forward in assessment and planning, and guiding its transformation as a liberal arts College with an increasing number of career and professionally-focused programs. The new Strategic Plan outlines the College’s purpose, values, vision, and the step-by-step template to realize its goals.

President Anderson has invigorated senior leadership through a combination of internal promotions and external hiring. Ronald C. Jackson, formerly Dean of Students, became the Vice President for Student Affairs in 2017. Lillian O’Reilly, who served previously in numerous other roles, was promoted to the Vice President for Enrollment Management and Retention in 2017. Alan Gilbert, who held the position of Associate Vice President for Finance and Administration, was promoted to Senior Vice President for Finance and Administration in 2017. Finally, Chief of Staff to the President Nicole Haas is in the process of assuming the additional responsibilities of the campus Executive Director of Government and External Affairs.

New cabinet-level colleagues have joined the College’s senior administration in three areas. Tony Thomas was appointed Chief Diversity Officer and Special Assistant to the President in fall 2017. (He has since become General Counsel to the College.) Todd Galitz joined the College as the Vice President for Institutional Advancement in spring 2018. Finally, Anne Lopes became Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs in fall 2018.

The President’s senior leadership team is unified by a commitment to the College’s mission. It is working together to deepen the culture of assessment and to drive the College’s new Strategic Plan forward. New approaches to integrated planning and ongoing collaborations are in place for both day-to-day work and special initiatives; this organizational approach will enhance our institutional effectiveness.

I.2.2 Academic Affairs Organizational Structure

Before 2011, some 34 department Chairs at Brooklyn College reported directly to the Provost. In addition to the Provost’s many other direct reports, such a flat reporting structure had become unwieldy. As a result, Brooklyn College developed a new five-school structure in fall 2011. The School of Humanities and Social Sciences, the School of Natural and Behavioral Sciences, the School of Business, and the School of Visual, Media and Performing Arts were each created at that time, joining the already existing School of Education.

The development of four new schools in Academic Affairs necessitated the hiring of new deans, each of whom leads a school and reports directly to the Provost. Academic departments were
separated into the five-school structure, and departmental chairs now report to their respective Deans.

The five-school structure has remained an area of concern for faculty for some time, primarily with regard to the relatively undefined role of the “Dean.” With a new provost in place, however, the faculty and administration are working together to clarify the decanal role and use it to propel progress on the College’s strategic goals. In an early step, Provost Lopes tasked the Deans to work with their respective chairs to articulate the mission and identity of each of their schools. Faculty and administration agree that articulating a robust and distinctive identify for each school is a precondition to developing a school’s fundraising case for its priority programs and needs. It is also a mechanism of self-assessment that will help the schools engage in both short- and long-term planning.

I.2.3 New Strategic Plan

The 2011-2016 Brooklyn College Strategic Plan expired in fall 2016 when President Anderson assumed the presidency. President Anderson began her tenure with a Listening Tour to facilitate her understanding of issues and priorities, with input from campus constituents and strategic stakeholders. She reported back in numerous sessions to the Brooklyn College community on the results of her Listening Tour. The feedback she received served as the foundation for the development of the new strategic plan.

The formal strategic planning process, completed during the 2017-2018 academic year, was a collaborative and inclusive one. The 2018-2023 Brooklyn College Strategic Plan includes five major goals:

(1) Enhance Our Academic Excellence

(2) Increase Undergraduate, Master’s, and Doctoral Students’ Success

(3) Educate Students for Fulfilling Work and Leadership in Their Communities

(4) Develop a Nimble, Responsive and Efficient Structure to Serve Our Students and Carry Out Our Mission, and

(5) Leverage Brooklyn College’s Reputation for Academic Excellence and Upward Mobility

A living document, with clearly articulated strategic actions to realize its goals, five years of sequenced benchmarks to track and assess progress, and identified outcomes to demonstrate attainment of our goals, the Brooklyn College Strategic Plan is aligned with the CUNY Master Plan, the CUNY Strategic Framework: Connected CUNY, and the University’s annual performance management process (PMP) through the College’s own integrated planning.
The implementation of the Brooklyn College Strategic Plan began in fall 2018. Progress and challenges are discussed regularly by individual units and assessed quarterly by the president’s cabinet. Adjustments are made as indicated based on assessment.

I.2.4 Significant Curricular Changes

In 2013 CUNY implemented Pathways, a new general education curriculum intended for all of its undergraduate colleges and designed to facilitate seamless transfer among them. Pathways limited general education to 42 credits and organized requirements by thematic areas rather than liberal arts and sciences disciplines. Both the credit limitations and the rejection of liberal arts and sciences categories occasioned a lengthy process of debate at the College as the traditional core curriculum was reconsidered. These discussions were amplified by the faculty’s questioning of the University’s authority in curricular matters. In the end, litigation settled the question of authority in favor of the University.

As a result, the Brooklyn College faculty voted to adopt Pathways in spring 2017. The faculty is developing more courses and processes to support its new general education curriculum and to ensure the proper advisement of students.

In addition to the new general education curriculum, the faculty has developed 29 new degree programs and 12 new certificate, advanced certificate and diploma programs over the past ten years. A complete list of new degree programs is in Appendix I.A.

I.2.5 Facilities

Since 2009 the College has made improvements both large and small in facilities on its campus. After decades of deferred maintenance, repair and maintenance has become an institutional priority. Numerous projects are underway or have been recently completed to update and improve lecture halls and other aspects of the physical plant.

Within the School of Visual, Media and Performing Arts, the Barry R. Feirstein Graduate School of Cinema opened in fall 2015. It is the first public film school in New York and the only one in the United States built on a working film lot with a world-class facility.

Also in the School of Visual, Media and Performing Arts, Brooklyn College opened the Leonard and Claire Tow Center for the Performing Arts in fall 2018. The Tow Center includes rehearsal and performance space, set design and constructions workshops, a double-height theater seating 200, a grand lobby and arcade, as well as classrooms, meeting and reception rooms.

The College is engaging in a series of planned capital renovations to its large lecture halls, many science labs, and largest theater. Additionally, the College is engaging in a Request for Expressions of Interest (RFEI) process to solicit a private partner to help the College build a new facility for the Murray Koppelman School of Business. Through the generosity of Brooklyn College Foundation Trustee Murray Koppelman, the College has been able to acquire adjacent land to the campus. A long-term plan to build the School upon it requires a public-private partnership to fund the construction.
I.3 Brooklyn College’s Recent MSCHF History

Brooklyn College submitted a Periodic Review Report (PRR) in 2014 (See Appendix I.B) as part of the regular accreditation cycle. The review of that report required an additional Monitoring Report submitted in April, 2016. As MSCHF stated:

To accept the Periodic Review Report and to reaffirm accreditation. To request a monitoring report, due April 1, 2016, documenting further progress on the implementation of a documented, organized, and sustained assessment process to evaluate and improve the total range of programs and services, achievement of institutional mission, goals and plans, and compliance with accreditation standards with the support and collaboration of faculty and administration in assessing student learning and responding to assessment results (Standards 7 and 14). The next evaluation visit is scheduled for 2018-2019.

The Brooklyn College community believes that the only way an institution can accomplish its goals is through vigorous and routine assessment. Since the College submitted its Monitoring Report, it has made considerable progress on institutionalizing a culture of assessment.

Several years ago the College strengthened its assessment capacity by hiring an Associate Provost for Institutional Planning and Assessment as well as a new Assessment Manager. The College’s new Strategic Plan highlights the significance of consistent reflection and adjustment, integrating assessment activities into our priorities so that the institution can learn and improve continuously.

Assessment has taken root across the College. Our processes are described throughout the report and summarized in Chapter V. The College’s commitment to assessment is demonstrated by the use of evidence and data-based decision-making in all units across the College. Assessment is systematic and comprehensive in both degree programs and administrative units. It is built into the personnel evaluation process and formal assessment plans, although the degree to which assessment is used explicitly for program improvement still varies.

The University builds assessment into its performance metrics. To chart and reinforce our progress on these metrics, we are developing a Strategic Plan Report Card. Our assessment website will become a record of best practices and provide assessment results for the community. Assessment at Brooklyn College is detailed more thoroughly in Chapter VI as well as Chapter V of this Self-Study Report.

The reviewers of the 2014 PRR also mentioned inconsistencies in our method of assigning credit hours that needed to be addressed. We have made substantial progress in this area as well. Please see Appendix I.C for documentation of our progress in addressing the credit hour issue.

Brooklyn College’s Monitoring Report (see Appendix I.D) was submitted in April 2016, as requested, and it was approved with no additional follow-up required.
I.4 The 2016-2019 Self-Study Process

This Self-Study Report has been a collaborative, intensive, multi-year effort involving the campus community through various committees, academic and administrative department meetings, public comments and updates, web updates, and communications distributed to the campus community both electronically and in print format. Draft copies of this Self-Study have been placed in the Library and are available online for comment from faculty, staff, students and administrators.

The Self-Study Report Steering Committee was led by Jo-Ellen Asbury, Associate Provost for Institutional Planning and Assessment and Jeremy Porter, Professor of Sociology. Additional members include:

Herve Queneau
Professor & Department Chair, Business Management
Vanessa King
Promotion, Tenure & Reappointment Coordinator
Patrick Kavanagh
Director of Graduate Studies
Andrew Meyer
Associate Professor, Department of History
Jane Cramer
Government Information Specialist, Library
Michael Bergen
Director, Speech-Language Hearing Center
Beth Evans
Associate Professor, Library
Lucas Rubin
Assistant Dean for Institutional and Academic Programs
Louise Hainline
Professor, Department of Psychology
Catherine McEntee
Lecturer, Department of Biology
Alan Gilbert
Senior Vice President for Finance and Administration
James Eaton
Administrative Executive Officer, Academic Affairs
Michael Ayers
Senior Director of Institution Planning, Research and Assessment
John Paul
Professor, Department of Accounting
William Tramontano
Provost & Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs
   (Through June 30, 2018)
Anne Lopes
Provost & Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs
   (Starting August 13, 2018)
April Bedford
Dean, School of Education
Maria Conelli
Dean, School of Visual, Media and Performing Arts
Willie Hopkins
Dean, School of Business
Ken Gould
Interim Dean, School of Humanities and Social Sciences
Tammy Lewis
Interim Associate Provost for Faculty and Administration
   (Starting July 30, 2018)
Mary Mallery
Associate Dean/Chief Librarian and Executive Director of Academic Info Technology
Matthew Moore
Associate Provost for Faculty and Administration
   (through August 31, 2018) (Returned to Faculty)
Kleanthis Psarris
Dean, School of Natural and Behavioral Sciences

Eight Working Groups were formed, one for each of the seven standards, and an eighth to work on the Verification of Compliance report. The co-chairs of each Working Group were asked to recruit members for their respective groups based upon their knowledge and experiences at Brooklyn College. Appendix I.E includes a complete list of those who served. Working groups designed
research questions to focus their work. These questions were incorporated into the Design Document, which was approved by our MSCHE Vice Presidential Liaison at the time, Dr. Tito Guerrero, with only two additions to the proposed timeline. See Appendix I.F for the approved Self-Study Design. Brooklyn College specified the following outcomes for the Self-Study process:

1. To be reaccredited by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education.

2. To gather information that will result in a more complete understanding of our status relative to the mission, vision, and goals of Brooklyn College, and suggest strategies for the future that are in alignment with those goals.

3. To establish a manageable set of recommendations that will serve as the foundation for strategic action priorities in the coming years.

With a focus on their respective research questions, the Working Groups gathered and analyzed information with these three outcomes in mind.

Once the Design Document was approved, Working Groups were encouraged to contact the appropriate campus offices and personnel to gather information that would address their research questions. A number of steps were taken to avoid duplication of efforts and “survey fatigue.” For example, the groups were asked not to create and administer individual surveys. Co-chairs were reminded to consult the Office of Institutional Research and Data Analysis website first to determine if needed information already existed before reaching out to offices across campus. Leaders of the groups also shared information at Steering Committee meetings to reduce duplication of effort and to enable the teams to place information properly across the Standards.

The Working Groups were also asked to review their individual research questions and to develop any survey questions that they would like to administer to students, faculty, staff or alumni. With support from the Office of Institutional Research and Data Analysis, one survey--the “MSCHE Surveys”--was created for each stakeholder group.

These surveys were largely parallel, allowing comparison of responses across stakeholder groups. Questions addressed proximity of residence to the Brooklyn College campus, what attracted them to Brooklyn College (as a student, faculty, or staff member), views about College goals and priorities, and how well the College prepared alumni for professional pursuits. In the end, 1,140 current students (6.4%), 313 faculty (21.4%), 503 staff (18.0%), and _______ alumni (xx%) responded to the surveys. No incentives to complete the survey were provided. Complete reports for each of the surveys can be found in Appendix I.G.

I.5 Organization of this Report

Following this Introduction, a chapter is devoted to each of the seven MSCHE Standards. Each identifies the standard, includes an introductory table that specifies the standard’s criteria and key corresponding evidence that demonstrates the College’s compliance, as detailed in the Standards for Accreditation and Requirements of Affiliation. The chapter then discusses the evidence that supports the College’s attainment of each Standard. Specific recommendations for improvement
are also identified based on analyses of the evidence. These recommendations are aligned with the goals of 2018-2023 Brooklyn College Strategic Plan.
CHAPTER 1

STANDARD I: MISSION AND GOALS

The institution’s mission defines its purpose within the context of higher education, the students it serves, and what it intends to accomplish. The institution’s stated goals are clearly linked to its mission and specify how the institution fulfills its mission.

1.1 Summary of Evidence of Compliance with the Standard

Table 1.1 below provides links to summary evidence that demonstrates Brooklyn College’s compliance with Standard I: Mission and Goals.

Table 1.1:
Standard I: Mission and Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>EVIDENCE OF COMPLIANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. are developed through appropriate collaborative participation by all who facilitate or are otherwise responsible for institutional development and improvement;</td>
<td>“We are proud of our history of intellectual freedom and academic excellence, as well as our location in a borough known for innovation, culture, and the arts. We have a special commitment to educate immigrants and first-generation college students from the diverse communities that make up our city and state.” (Excerpted from Mission Statement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. address external as well as internal contexts and constituencies;</td>
<td>CUNY Governance; approved by Policy Council Fall 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. are approved and supported by the governing body;</td>
<td>Brooklyn College Governance Plan, Integrated Planning Documents 2018-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. guide faculty, administration, staff, and governing structures in making decisions related to planning, resource allocation, program and curricular development, and the definition of institutional and educational outcomes;</td>
<td>“Through outstanding research and academic programs in the arts, business, education, humanities, and sciences, we graduate well-rounded individuals who think critically and creatively to solve problems.” (Excerpted from the Brooklyn College Mission Statement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. include support of scholarly inquiry and creative activity, at levels and of the type appropriate to the institution;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


1. The Mission Statement was revised in 2018; prior version had been in place since 2010. The Mission Statement will be reviewed again when the current Strategic Plan expires in 2023. Progress on goals is reviewed yearly.

2. Connected CUNY, the CUNY strategic framework, serves as the basis for Brooklyn College goals for students and for the institution. These goals include: college readiness, access and completion, career success and knowledge creation.

3. SLOs are stated for each academic department and Academic Educational Services unit. Strategic Plan, Add link to integrated planning documents, Academic Assessment website, http://www.brooklyn.cuny.edu/web/about/offices/assessment.php

4. Most recent review and revision, 2018 in conjunction with Strategic Planning process.

1.2 Introduction

This chapter explores the Brooklyn College mission statement, which articulates our campus’ distinct identity within the CUNY system. It traces the development of the statement as it emerged from the College’s recent strategic planning process. It also shows how the current mission and vision animate the College’s new strategic plan and are aligned with the University’s Strategic Framework and with its Performance Management Process (PMP). The PMP is a University tool for annual goal setting and assessment. It establishes broad goals and metrics for the colleges based on the University’s Strategic Framework. It also provides the University with information for the annual review of the institution and the evaluation of the President’s leadership and administration. The extent of progress on the accomplishment of these goals helps each campus monitor its progress as a part of its assessment of effectiveness. The mission speaks to the institution’s core: it helps define institutional and educational outcomes. Our mission acts as the Prime Mover, unifying and inspiring all while driving the work of the College forward.

To address our compliance with this standard, work focused on four components of the statement: (1) the quality of a Brooklyn College education, (2) the diversity of our community, (3) the affordability of a Brooklyn College education, and (4) engagement in a larger geographic and social community, with a focus on positive contributions to those communities.

The chapter also addresses the following research questions. The responses to the questions are integrated into our discussion below.

1. How do we demonstrate our compliance with Standard I?
2. Following on President Anderson’s Listening Tour of fall 2016, do the current statements of Brooklyn College mission and goals align with stakeholder perceptions of the identity of Brooklyn College?
3. Does the current mission statement adequately convey institutional priorities to prospective faculty, staff and students?
4. Does the current mission statement align with goals and outcomes, both internally and at the University (CUNY) level?

1.3 Mission

Brooklyn College provides a transformative, distinctive, and affordable education to students from all backgrounds. We are proud of our history of intellectual freedom and academic excellence, as well as our location in a borough known for innovation, culture, and the arts. We have a special commitment to educate immigrants and first-generation college students from the diverse communities that make up our city and state. Our striving spirit reflects our motto: “Nothing without great effort.” Through outstanding research and academic programs in the arts, business, education, humanities, and sciences, we graduate well-rounded individuals who think critically and creatively to solve problems. They become leaders who transform their fields and professions and serve our increasingly global community. Brooklyn College, Mission Statement, August 1, 2018

Our new mission statement emerged from the College’s recent strategic planning process. It is very similar to our prior mission statement, which was revised during the previous strategic planning process. The main continuities between the two include the quality of our education, the diversity of our community, the affordability of the education, and engagement in the larger community. The main differences reflect some of the local changes that have occurred since 2009: a change in the general education program away from the former Common Core and our re-organization into schools. The new statement also echoes the current historical moment in its emphasis on the importance of intellectual freedom and by drawing attention to two specific groups—immigrants and first-generation students. Both groups are prominently represented within the College’s extensive diversity. In addition, the value of effort appears in the new statement and is foregrounded. These revisions update the mission—make it realistic and achievable—while improving its ability to speak to all stakeholders in today’s Brooklyn College community.

1.3.1 Mission Development: Strategic Planning Process

When President Anderson arrived in August, 2016, she began a comprehensive Listening Tour that enriched our understanding of Brooklyn College’s identity. That process included over 50 meetings and open forums with more than 170 staff members, 150 faculty, 130 students, 100 alumni, 40 donors, 20 community leaders, and seven Brooklyn elected officials. The Listening Tour deepened our understanding of the identity and culture of Brooklyn College, the key challenges it faces, and the College’s hopes for the future. It also laid the foundation for the strategic planning process from which the revised mission statement emerged.

---

5 See Appendix 1.A
In spring 2017, the president convened the Strategic Planning Working Committee. The committee was charged to develop the goals for the new strategic plan by using the information that had surfaced during the Listening Tour. The committee included 20 faculty members, 19 administrators and staff members, and 10 students. Professor Tammy Lewis was appointed to coordinate an iterative, inclusive, and collaborative community-wide planning process.

The strategic planning process itself was also informed by the Listening Tour. It was built upon two principles of critical importance to the community: transparency and accountability. These values were operationalized by facilitating and expanding the scope of multi-directional communication and by providing repeated opportunities for dialogue among all stakeholders. The process, explained in detail in the plan’s introduction, was designed to address an undercurrent of concern about exclusion. In short, over the course of the 2017-2018 academic year, multiple town halls, work groups, discussions and feedback sessions with governance committees, faculty, students, chairs, deans, administrative units, and internal and external stakeholders were held. The plan was revised five times based on four town halls with more than 300 attendees, a focus group, a visioning session, more than 50 meetings with stakeholder groups, individual faculty contributions from every department on campus, and more than 500 online suggestions from students, staff, faculty, and alumni.

The resulting effort is noteworthy because of the extent to which it repeatedly engaged the entire community in reflection about itself. Moreover, the process yielded a strategic plan in which all members of the community can find themselves represented with both agency and consequence. These characteristics of the plan shaped it into a very detailed roadmap and portend its successful implementation at Brooklyn College.

1.3.2 Alignment with CUNY

As part of CUNY, our mission aligns with the University’s broader mission and organizational plans. In fall, 2016 CUNY released The Connected University: The CUNY Master Plan 2016-2020 followed by the strategic framework Connected CUNY in early 2017. The Master Plan highlights four foci for the University: 1) Opportunity and Access, 2) Student Success, 3) Academic Excellence, and 4) Efficient Management. These are captured in Table 1.2, below, along with notations showing how the Brooklyn College Mission Statement aligns with the CUNY Master Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CUNY Master Plan (2016)</th>
<th>Aligned Text from the Brooklyn College Mission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity and Access</td>
<td>Brooklyn College provides a transformative, distinctive, and affordable education to students from all backgrounds. We have a special commitment to educate immigrants and first-generation college students from the diverse communities that make up our city and state.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.2
Alignment of CUNY Master Plan and Brooklyn College Mission Statement
Student Success

... we graduate well-rounded individuals who think critically and creatively to solve problems. They become leaders who transform their fields and professions and serve our increasingly global community.

Academic Excellence

Through outstanding research and academic programs in the arts, business, education, humanities, and sciences...

Efficient Management

Addressed in the Strategic Plan 2018-2023

Goal 4: Develop a Nimble, Responsive, and Efficient Structure to Serve Our Students and Carry Out Our Mission

All elements with the exception of efficient management are addressed in the mission statement. Efficient management is addressed in our Strategic Plan. It is one of the five main goals and is a key element in the College’s decision-making processes. The College’s managerial efficiencies are extremely well regarded by the University as evidenced by our history of prudent budget management, relatively high and stable full-time faculty capacity, and ability to improve student success despite budget cuts as discussed in Chapters 4, 5 and 6 of this Self-Study Report.

1.3.3 Awareness of Mission Statement

The College strategic planning process overlapped with the campus’ Middle States Self-Study. Findings and activities of each informed the other. Discussion of the new mission was widespread as evidenced by the campus’ intensive strategic planning process that included presidential emphasis on the mission. The working group engaged in the Self-Study simultaneously investigated the extent to which the 2010 mission statement was known to the campus. The investigation found that the majority of faculty and staff who responded to the MSCHE survey on the mission (faculty, 48.2%; staff, 45.6%) had a general recollection of what the Mission Statement said, while the majority of current and former students who responded (current students, 55.1%; alumni, 52.6%) stated they had never read the Mission Statement.

Though the survey did not address why the students and alumni were not familiar with the Mission Statement, anecdotal evidence suggests that difficulty locating the statement might be one factor. Based on this, attention has been given to the mission statement’s placement on our website. It is now featured more prominently on our Fast Facts page and students are now explicitly exposed to it during orientation. The more prominently the Mission Statement is featured, the more aware of that mission all members of the Brooklyn College community will be. Additional activities are underway to ensure that the mission is.

1.4 Quality of a Brooklyn College Education

Brooklyn College has long taken pride in the quality of our faculty members, the rigor of our curriculum, and the overall quality of a Brooklyn College education. Detail is provided in Chapter III of this report, where we discuss our compliance with Standard III: Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience.
As an essential factor in establishing high academic quality standards, our institutional mission undergirds the academic programs in multiple ways. It guides governance structures, decision-making related to planning, resource allocations, and the definition of institutional and educational outcomes. School, departmental and program-specific mission statements are aligned with the College’s. Academic mission statements are approved by departmental faculty and feedback is provided by the Assessment Manager and the College-wide Assessment Council. The statements guide planning, goal-setting, and assessment activities on departmental and school levels and serve the same function for departments and units in non-academic areas of the College. The Institutional Assessment Committee provides feedback and guidance to non-academic offices.

Mission statements of the schools, academic programs and administrative areas resonate the institutional mission. The following serve as examples. The Murray Koppelman School of Business, for instance, starts its mission statement by highlighting the diversity of its learners and the high quality of educational offerings the school provides its student. The School of Education emphasizes preparation for work in our locale, while the School of Natural and Behavioral Sciences underscores the advancement of knowledge and the contributions of graduates to society. In their own mission statements, departments, academic majors, and graduate programs specify how the institutional mission lives among their offerings. Examples include the following. The School Psychology, Counseling and Leadership Program advocates high quality education for all students in the city and beyond; the library offers integrated information support for research and instruction; the Center for Academic Success and Advisement helps students achieve graduation requirements; the Enrollment Services Center is committed to student success, and The Office of the Budget and Planning facilitates the academic and programmatic aspirations of the College. The academic program review template reinforces the need for departmental specification of its own mission and the importance of its alignment with the College’s mission.

1.5 Diversity of the Brooklyn College Community

Since 2009, the composition of our highly diverse student population has shifted slightly. Figure 1.1 below provides information about changes in the distribution of our overall student population by race and ethnicity since 2009.

Figure 1.1
Student Race and Ethnicity, 2009 - 2017
The proportion of white students has declined as the numbers of Hispanic and Asian students have increased. The number of Black students has decreased by over 3% during the period. The extent to which these changes mirror fluctuations in the racial and ethnic composition of the campus' surrounding neighborhoods, the impact of new recruitment strategies, or changes in the demographic characteristics of Brooklyn’s public high school population has not yet been investigated. We recommend that the campus track and monitor these shifts to ensure that its diversity is fully representative of the borough it seeks to serve, an intersectional value tied to our diversity mission.

At Brooklyn College, our understanding of diversity is multi-faceted and goes beyond both headcounts and proportional distributions. A number of initiatives across campus have been designed to foster an inclusive environment. A notable example is We Stand Against Hate, a College initiative that reflects our ongoing commitment to elevating dialogue, enhancing understanding, promoting compassion, and celebrating the voices that make up our diverse campus community. Lectures, workshops, concerts, programs, and events to enhance our understanding and compassion for diversity are showcased.

### 1.6 Affordability of a Brooklyn College Education

To assess our affordability, we compared Brooklyn College’s tuition to competitor institutions.\(^6\) As Table 1.3 shows, Brooklyn College was the most affordable of the comparison group.

#### Table 1.3
Comparison of tuition 2018-2019: Brooklyn College vs. Benchmarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CUNY Brooklyn College</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public In-State</td>
<td>$6,730 per year</td>
<td>$10,770 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Out-of-State</td>
<td>$295 per credit</td>
<td>$455 per credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Student Fees</td>
<td>$600 per credit</td>
<td>$830 per credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$431 per year</td>
<td>$431 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUNY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public In-State</td>
<td>$6,870 per year</td>
<td>$11,090 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Out-of-State</td>
<td>$286 per credit</td>
<td>$462 per credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Student Fees</td>
<td>$988-1,023 per credit</td>
<td>$944 per credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2,755-3,229 per year</td>
<td>$1,917-2,615 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>St. John’s University</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private All Students</td>
<td>$40,680 per year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,356 per credit</td>
<td>$1,230 per credit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^6\) See Fall 2016 report *Brooklyn College – Analysis of Student Admissions* produced by the Office of Institutional Research and Data Analysis which can be viewed in Appendix 1B. Many of our ‘competitors’ are other CUNY institutions, whose tuition matches our own. We have not included them in our comparison for that reason. In this analysis, we include a number of SUNY institutions, two private institutions, whose tuition greatly outpaces ours, and Long Island University – Brooklyn, another private institution, given its geographic proximity to Brooklyn College.
Our tuition is contained for multiple reasons. The CUNY Board of Trustees carefully considers any petition for a tuition increase as does the State of New York, which established the tuition rate for the City University. These controls have kept tuition well below the national average.

The Excelsior program initiated in New York State in fall 2017 has also contributed to making a College education affordable for NY state residents. The program provides assistance to students who attend a CUNY or SUNY institution, whose family income is at or below $125,000 and who complete 30 credits per calendar year. This makes Brooklyn College, and all CUNY/SUNY schools, an even more attractive option for middle-class students whose family income is too high to qualify for most forms of need-based financial aid from the federal government or the New York State.

The campus’ recent Middle States Surveys show that affordability is a key feature of the institution. Faculty, students, staff and alumni were asked why students choose Brooklyn College. Respondents could select up to three reasons. As Table 1.4 below shows, affordability was the most common response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Alumni</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(n = 1099)</td>
<td>(n = 314)</td>
<td>(n = 397)</td>
<td>(n = 1050)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The cost of attending is affordable</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>94.3%</td>
<td>89.3%</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The location was convenient</td>
<td>67.8%</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wanted a specific program or major offered by Brooklyn College</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn College has a good reputation in the community</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My family or a friend recommended the College</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The faculty have a good academic reputation</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student body is diverse</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MSCHE Surveys, 2018
We believe that the actual tuition rate, the tuition containment mechanisms, and the community’s perception support the claim that Brooklyn College lives its mission of affordability and that it is well understood across all levels of the institution.

1.7 Integration with Community

Brooklyn College has forged uncommonly strong links to the surrounding community since its inception. The relationship is best evidenced in curriculum and special programs that leverage faculty expertise and student learning to provide on-going services in a broad number of areas. Among the many noteworthy programs is the Diana Rogovin Davidow Speech-Language Hearing Center, which opened its doors off campus in 1931 and moved to its current space on campus in 1937. The Center has provided services to thousands of clients in the community. A state-of-the-art facility, the center provides diagnostic and rehabilitative services for children and adults with speech, language, voice, and hearing impairments. It serves as the clinical education site for master's degree students in Brooklyn College's Speech-Language Pathology Program and for doctoral audiology students of the CUNY Au.D. Program. Both of these programs are accredited by the American Speech-Language Hearing Association’s Council on Academic Accreditation.

The Department of Accounting’s Volunteer Income Tax Assistance Center is also a pillar of community service. Established nearly half a century ago, this free program is offered to low- to moderate-income individuals with disabilities and to elderly members of the community who need tax assistance and cannot afford the services of a paid preparer. The Urban Soils Lab, a more recent undertaking, provides an affordable soil testing service as part of Brooklyn College's commitment to community service. Members of the community pay a small fee and drop off their sample for analysis. The School of Education has rich partnerships with the NYC Department of Education schools. The Tow Center Arts and Music events also welcome the community. Another important community engagement project is the Community Garden, which foster partnerships with gardeners from the college (students, staff, and faculty), from the neighborhood surrounding the college, and from other Brooklyn gardens and organizations involved in urban gardening. There are numerous community engagement programs on the campus along with a wide array of regular events the bring the community onto the campus and the campus into the community. Our faculty are the champions of these undertakings.

A recent and significant project that ties the community aspect of our mission with the diversity aspect of our mission is the Brooklyn College Listening Project. It is an oral history and community interview initiative, where students interview family, neighbors, friends and strangers about their lives, their experiences and their perspectives on the world. Since its founding in 2014, over 600 students across courses have conducted interviews with their families, neighbors, friends and strangers. The project houses over 350 audio recordings of interviews in an on-line digital archive.

The Middle States Surveys asked students, faculty, staff and alumni their perceptions regarding the integration of the College into the surrounding community. Table 1.5 shows the results.
Table 1.5
“In your opinion, how well integrated is Brooklyn College into the surrounding community?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Students (n = 1095)</th>
<th>Faculty (n = 314)</th>
<th>Staff (n = 394)</th>
<th>Alumni (n = 1044)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Well</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Well</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Poorly</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Poorly</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Don’t Know</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MSCHE Surveys, 2018

The majority of students (64%), staff (62%) and alumni (52%) thought that the College was very well integrated or somewhat well integrated, while only (41%) of faculty thought that was the case. Anecdotal evidence suggests that faculty hold high standards for community integration. Their consistent work on initiatives in this area suggests a strong-shared vision and identification with this aspect of the mission.

1.8 Supporting the Mission

Finally, the College’s budget is clearly linked to supporting the College’s mission as described in Chapter 6. In addition, the University provides funding for special initiatives related to furthering the mission, such as the Academic Momentum Initiative, and it supplies annual budget allocations for Coordinated Undergraduate Education (CUE). At Brooklyn College, CUE funding supports initiatives in the offices of Academic Success Services, the honors programs, tutoring and mentoring, the Center for Teaching among many other services and programs that support high academic program quality. The University also provides annual funding for specialized programs that support diversity such as the Black and Latino Male Initiative and the Leadership Diversity Initiative among many other programs.

In conclusion, we believe that Brooklyn College is in compliance with Standard I: Mission and Goals. The steps taken in our Self-Study included an analysis of the current mission statement, and analysis of our alignment with the larger University plan. Our newly-revised mission statement speaks to what we have always been as an institution, and where we are headed in the future.

1.9 Recommendations Aligned with the College’s Strategic Plan

Based on our analysis of Standard I: Mission and Goals, we recommend the following:

- A fuller discussion of the mission should occur at all student, staff and faculty orientations; there should be concrete information shared about how it guides decision-making at the College. (Goal 4)
- The mission statement needs to be made more visible in all facilities on campus, in promotional materials, and on major access points on the web. (Goal 4)
The campus should monitor shifts in enrollment to ensure that its diversity is fully representative of the borough. (Goal)
CHAPTER 2
STANDARD II: ETHICS AND INTEGRITY

*Ethics and Integrity are central, indispensable, and defining hallmarks of effective higher education institutions. In all activities, whether internal or external, an institution must be faithful to its mission, honor its contracts and commitments, adhere to its policies, and represent itself truthfully.*

2.1 Summary of Evidence of Compliance with the Standard

Table 2.1 provides links to summary information that demonstrates the College’s compliance with Standard II: Ethics and Integrity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>EVIDENCE OF COMPLIANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. a commitment to academic freedom, intellectual freedom, freedom of expression, and respect for intellectual property rights;</td>
<td>CUNY Academic Freedom College Mission Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frederic Ewen Lecture on Civil Liberties and Academic Freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st Amendment Teach-In with Ruthann Robson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. a climate that fosters respect among students, faculty, staff, and administration from a range of diverse backgrounds, ideas, and perspectives;</td>
<td>CUNY Policy on Policy on Equal Opportunity and Non-Discrimination The CUNY Intellectual Property Policy governs how Brooklyn College defines ownership, commercialization and distribution of intellectual property created or developed by faculty, staff, and students while using University resources. We Stand Against Hate Regular Administrative and Student Leadership Meetings Regular Labor Management Meeting Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Faculty Handbook&lt;sup&gt;7&lt;/sup&gt; links to the policy, which includes details about applicability, management, and procedures for dispute resolution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. a grievance policy that is documented and disseminated to address complaints or grievances raised by students, faculty, or staff.</td>
<td>Policies CUNY Grievance Process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>7</sup> See p. 56.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The institution’s policies and procedures are fair and impartial, and assure that grievances are addressed promptly, appropriately, and equitably;</th>
<th>Other union contracts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. the avoidance of conflict of interest or the appearance of such conflict in all activities and among all constituents;</td>
<td>CUNY Conflict of Interest, Multiple Positions Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. fair and impartial practices in the hiring, evaluation, promotion, discipline, and separation of employees;</td>
<td>HR Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicts of interest at Brooklyn College are governed by the CUNY Conflict of Interest Policy: “all activities shall be conducted in accordance with the highest standards of integrity and ethics.” The policy defines which College officials are considered “Covered Individuals” and sets forth the rules of conduct on hiring faculty/staff, supervising family members, contract transactions and conflict of interest in research.</td>
<td>Various union contracts?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. honesty and truthfulness in public relations announcements, advertisements, recruiting and admissions materials and practices, as well as in internal communications;</td>
<td>Admissions, Media Access Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. as appropriate to its mission, services or programs in place: a. to promote affordability and accessibility; b. to enable students to understand funding sources and options, value receive for cost, and methods to make informed decisions about incurring debt;</td>
<td>Tuition and Fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See also pp. xx – xx of the Self-Study Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. compliance with all applicable federal, state, and Commission reporting policies, regulations, and requirements to include reporting regarding: a. the full disclosure of information on institution-wide assessments, graduation, retention, certification and licensure or licensing board pass rates; b. the institution’s compliance with the Commission’s Requirements of Affiliation; c. substantive changes affecting institutional mission, goals, programs, operations, sites, and other material issues which must be disclosed in a timely and accurate fashion; d. the institution’s compliance with the Commission’s policies; and</td>
<td>Financial Aid Information, Fast Facts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[internal link to V.O.C]</td>
<td>Most recent Substantive Change submitted and approved, 2017. Approved for totally online graduate certificate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 Introduction

This chapter includes information on CUNY and Brooklyn College policies that guide our day-to-day practices and also reviews the accessibility of those policies. We found that while, in general, we have the needed policies, demonstrating that we follow them is a greater challenge. The chapter also includes discussion of the research questions below, which have guided our exploration of the policies.

1. How do we demonstrate compliance with MSCHE Standard II?
2. Do we have clear policies and procedures in place regarding the student experience at Brooklyn College? Can students locate and access them as needed? Do we follow them consistently?
3. Are the policies and procedures regarding faculty and staff governance clear and accessible? Do we follow them consistently?
4. How do we demonstrate ethical relations with students, faculty, staff and the Brooklyn Community?
5. Given our diverse student population, do we have a campus environment that promotes inclusiveness?

Finally, we address issues of diversity and inclusion, which are central to our mission.

2.3 Ethical Conduct, Intellectual Freedom, Freedom of Expression, and Respect for Intellectual Property

Brooklyn College is unwavering in its commitments to academic freedom, intellectual freedom, freedom of expression, and respect for intellectual property rights. Our mission statement affirms it: “We are proud of our history of intellectual freedom and academic excellence.” Academic and intellectual freedom form the cornerstone of the College and the ability to pursue them advances excellence in teaching, learning and research. CUNY upholds academic freedom by codifying it in policy to which the campus zealously adheres. Compliance is monitored by faculty governance at both the campus and University levels.

Freedom of expression is also a fundamental value to the Brooklyn College community and to the University. In recent years, the campus community like many others has grappled with issues related to free speech and inclusion. At Brooklyn, President Anderson launched the We Stand Against Hate campaign in fall 2016. It has a broad purpose: elevate our discourse around controversial issues as well as foster inclusiveness and peace on campus. The campaign includes lectures, workshops, teach-ins, concerts, and events under its banner. Most recently, the College organized a teach-in on the intersection of the First Amendment and civil rights, and how the tensions between them impact public College communities. The event was prompted by two instances of faculty free speech that members of the community found discriminatory and hurtful.
The teach-in—one of several College responses—historicized the events and related decision-making and situated both within legal discourse and politics.

While many participants found the teach-in helpful, some students seek more opportunities to express their feelings directly in more timely public forums. What we had immediately tried, a traditional Speak Out, was not successful. Our meetings with student leadership to assess and improve our response indicated that the College’s executive leadership needs more systematic opportunities to meet directly with students. In response, the president has instituted regular meetings between her cabinet and student leadership and monthly town halls to improve communication and provide regular opportunities to discuss these and other issues of concern for the community.

In addition, Brooklyn College supports the right of students, faculty and staff to participate in demonstrations and leafletting, which provides an immediate avenue for response. These actions foster a climate of academic freedom and freedom of speech. They are guided by the Rules and Regulations for the Maintenance of Public Order and by policy in the The Student Handbook, which state that demonstrations are to be held “with sensitivity to the civil rights of others.” The policy itself outlines the penalties for students, faculty and staff who violate the rules of conduct. Faculty and staff can access links to this policy via the Human Resource Services website or the Policies page on the Brooklyn College website.

### 2.4 Creating a Climate of Respect

An underlying purpose of forums and events like those described above is to engender a climate of respect among all students, faculty, staff and administrators, especially at a time in US history when campus hate crimes are on the rise and incivility and inflammatory rhetoric rule public discourse. In addition to the forums, the University will provide training to all faculty and staff on sexual harassment in the next academic year. The College, as part of its work on diversity and faculty hiring, has begun working systematically on implicit bias training for faculty and search committees. In addition, it is recommended that the College expand opportunities for this training to all faculty and staff. It is also recommended that the College add faculty development opportunities for managing conflicts and contentious debate. We believe the combination of these events and trainings will further a climate of respect as it helps the campus balance freedom of expression and inclusion.

The COACH survey, the NESSE and the Staff survey provide more insight into campus climate with regard to respect and academic freedom.

Supporting the climate are the ethical guidelines of the University and College. Faculty, staff and students are required to follow the ethics guidelines set forth by New York State that are made

---

8 See pp. 61 & 65-66 of the Student Handbook also available in Appendix 2.A.
9 See also: [https://www.chronicle.com/article/Hate-Crimes-on-Campuses-Are/245093?cid=at&utm_source=at&utm_medium=en&elqTrackId=d41b2b26f95e4d73b875ffeeadd9e6a50&elq=56876ff89f946fd9d2b1b2b9dfff038&elqaid=21400&elqat=1&elqCampaignId=10226](https://www.chronicle.com/article/Hate-Crimes-on-Campuses-Are/245093?cid=at&utm_source=at&utm_medium=en&elqTrackId=d41b2b26f95e4d73b875ffeeadd9e6a50&elq=56876ff89f946fd9d2b1b2b9dfff038&elqaid=21400&elqat=1&elqCampaignId=10226) and [https://www.chronicle.com/blogs/ticker/heres-a-rundown-of-the-latest-campus-climate-incidents-since-trumps-election/115553](https://www.chronicle.com/blogs/ticker/heres-a-rundown-of-the-latest-campus-climate-incidents-since-trumps-election/115553).
available on the CUNY Office of Legal Affairs’ Ethics website. These policies cover everything from academic integrity to research misconduct to a variety of policies protecting the rights of students to policies articulating employee rights. These ethical policies and guidelines are available with direct links from the Policies page on the Brooklyn College website. The Office of Legal Counsel oversees ethical training for faculty and staff. It investigates allegations of non-compliance. While we have the mechanisms in place to ensure we meet the standards for ethics and integrity, we need the standards themselves to be more accessible to the College community. And we need stronger evidence showing that we adhere to the policies.

The Office of Legal Counsel oversees labor relations, including grievances and contract issues. Legal Counsel oversees compliance with state and federal regulations, including financial disclosure; the use of facilities by external groups, and all other legal matters. The Chief Diversity Officer (CDO) oversees affirmative action in relation to hiring. The CDO also oversees the College’s Title IX officer who investigates complaints related to sexual harassment and provides awareness and training about the legislation to the community.

All CUNY policies are reviewed and assessed individually and as needed. For instance, in June 2011, the CUNY Board of Trustees adopted a revised Policy on Academic Integrity, which amended the 2004 policy “to reflect evolving legal requirements, practical considerations and technological advances.”

2.5 General Policies that Govern Students, Faculty, and Staff

One of our guiding research questions for this standard asked if our policies and procedures are clear and accessible. The Self-Study process revealed that clear policies do exist. However, they are not all readily available to students, staff, and faculty equally. In some instances, a policy about which students should be aware, such as selected research compliance policies, are not mentioned in the Student Handbook. Although all information on policies can be found on the Brooklyn College and CUNY websites, it is not easy to locate all of them given the sheer volume of information.

For instance, The CUNY Policy Regarding the Disposition of Allegation of Research Misconduct promotes an environment for responsible research and similar educational activities. It applies to all research conducted by students, faculty and staff and provides the guidelines for reporting misconduct. While the Faculty Handbook provides a brief outline of the policy with a link to the CUNY Policy website, it is absent from the Student Handbook. The same is true of policies from the Office of Research Compliance. The ORC works with oversight committees and officers to promote the ethical and responsible conduct of research and to ensure compliance with regulatory requirements relating to research involving human subjects, animals, and research misconduct. The Faculty Handbook provides an overview on this topic; the Student Handbook does not cover it. Future editions of the Student Handbook should introduce these policies to students.

Many policies, such as Brooklyn College’s policy statement on computer and internet use, is more readily available in the Student Handbook, the Faculty Handbook, and on the Brooklyn College website. This policy in particular prohibits use of computer resources in specific circumstances. Clear mechanisms for reporting non-compliance and possible penalties are listed.
2.6 Policies Governing the Student Experience

In this section, we discuss policies that govern those issues most central to the student experience, from their admission through graduation. The provision of complete information to students helps ensure our institution’s integrity; it is also a hallmark of our effectiveness as the examples below illustrate.

The current policies and procedures for admission are posted on the Brooklyn College Admissions website. Students applying to Brooklyn College are expected to provide documents that have not been altered or fraudulent. The CUNY Policy on the Submission of Fraudulent Documents and the Omission of Information in Support of Application Admission details the procedures for discipline, if discovery of fraudulent documents is made pre-enrollment, post-enrollment, or after graduation. There is also a provision in the policy on how a student can file an appeal. The relevant link to this information can be found on the Brooklyn College website and in the Student Handbook.

Prospective and enrolled students can find financial aid information on the Financial Aid and Bursar’s webpages and in the Financing Your Education section of the Student Handbook. A clear outline of the cost of attendance, eligibility for government-based financial aid, types of aid, the process on how to obtain that aid and financial aid advisement is presented. The costs section delineates all the fees, payment deadlines, payment options, refund drop policy, and special fees for certain services or requests. The information is updated regularly. This clear and complete information helps students succeed in managing their aid successfully. A review of the NCES data for cohort default rate for 2014 (most recent data) shows the average default rate for New York State at 8.6%; it is 5.6% for Brooklyn College. The default rate for public four-year Colleges is 7%. These indicators point to Brooklyn College providing information on aid that is accessible and that leads to their success in managing our students managing their loan debt.

The Student Handbook’s section on the CUNY’s Academic Integrity Policy outlines definitions for dishonesty grouped under the following: Cheating, Plagiarism, Obtaining Unfair Advantage, Falsification of Record and Documents. It is posted on the Policies page of the College website.

Faculty members are trained to understand the policy and all College handbooks and websites contain this information. Procedures including academic or disciplinary sanctions are clearly outlined. Since 2011, the College has had an Academic Integrity Officer who acts as liaison between faculty, students, and the five-person Faculty Council Committee on Academic Integrity. The Academic Integrity Officer ensures cases are properly documented at each step of the process and that students are notified of the report with information on the procedures for filing an appeal.

Guidance on “purchased” student papers comes from New York State Education Law. The Student Handbook excerpts the law and informs students about the scope and meaning of the policy. Systematic and detailed information would assist students. We recommend that the College address this in the short term.

To assess the effectiveness of the policies on academic integrity, the working group studied trends in allegations of academic integrity violations. Table 2.2 provides a summary of the findings.
Table 2.2
Summary of Academic Integrity Allegations, 2013-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegations</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overturned</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Appeals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overturned</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary Referrals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegations in General Education Courses</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total in General Education courses (year)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% in General Education Courses</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% (year)</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of Academic Integrity

There has been a relatively stable number of allegations over the past five years with a high of 117 in the 2013-14 academic year and a low of 69 in the 2016-17 academic year. The number of allegations in general education courses has ranged from a low of 20% (14 of 69) of the allegations in the 2016-17 academic year to a high of 41% (36 of 88) of the allegations in the 2014-15 academic year. The data regarding student appeals indicates that the Faculty Council Committee on Academic Integrity is more inclined to overturn allegations of policy violations whereas the departmental grade appeal committees are disinclined to overturn the penalties imposed by instructors. These differences underscore the importance of having a system of checks and balances. They also point to the need for additional training for both departmental and College-wide committees to review interpretations of standards and ensure commonality.

Brooklyn College has comprehensive policies, processes, and services (including Center for Student Disability Services, Office of Human Resources, and Diversity Office) to provide students with disabilities an inclusive learning experience and campus environment. The Student Handbook directs students to the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs to receive guidance about issues outside the academic sphere. The Student Affairs Website provides more details by listing the steps students should take when considering filing a non-academic grievance. A link to the Student Complaints about Faculty Conduct in Academic Settings can be found by visiting the Policies Page on the Brooklyn College Website. The document refers students to the Chief Student Affairs Officer and then outlines the procedure for filing such a complaint. The Student Handbook summarizes the process.

Our findings show that Brooklyn College has a comprehensive set of policies and procedures that govern all aspects of the student experience. The Student Handbook, available on our website,
provides much of the necessary information on student rights, student disciplinary process, academic integrity and academic freedoms. The College website also has copies of most of the policy documents or links to off campus websites that have the relevant information.

An area for improvement in addition to those described above is the accessibility of the handbook itself. It is difficult to locate and should be more prominently placed on the Student Affairs’ websites. According to the MSCHE Student Survey, 56.4% of our students visit the College website once a week or more frequently. It would therefore be beneficial to have the handbook available and accessible via a mode students are likely to use.

2.7 Faculty Personnel Policies

Since Brooklyn College belongs to the larger system that is the City University of New York (CUNY), the governance structure and thus governing faculty documents are two-tiered. These documents define policies and the way we structure our governing bodies. The bylaws of the CUNY Board of Trustees and the Manual of General Policy, which can be found on the CUNY website policy page, are CUNY-wide documents. Another key governance document is the PSC-CUNY Contract, the bargaining agreement between the University and the faculty union. Primary governing documents are the Brooklyn College Governance Plan, Brooklyn College Faculty Council Bylaws and Bylaws of Brooklyn College Policy Council. A College and University webpage is linked to the president’s website. The Faculty Handbook also links to the main governance documents.

Faculty hiring practices are undergoing a systematic review to ensure that they utilize best practices in hiring for a diverse faculty. Current practices are widely perceived by faculty as fair. Guidelines on search procedures and charges to search committees emphasize the importance of a transparent and open process. The practices in place, which involve departmentally-based search committees, dean’s review and provost’s review will be augmented with other practices that will help ensure the diversity of the hiring pool and increase the diversity of search committees. An additional improvement underway will be written guidelines for conducting faculty searches to be developed by the academic affairs team with consultation from Human Resources, the Labor Designee, and the campus Affirmative Action Officer.

Faculty performance is evaluated through peer classroom observation, student evaluation, and an annual conference with the department chair. For untenured faculty teaching observations are conducted each semester. Adjunct faculty are observed during their first ten semesters. The Faculty Handbook discusses how often each of these evaluative processes are completed and the governance documents that inform these processes. Student evaluation results are accessible online, with certain responses available only to the faculty and chairperson. Peer classroom observation documentation varies in style by department while the annual conference is completed on a standard Brooklyn College form. A review of differences in the observation instrument across departments will occur in spring 2019; a faculty working group will conduct a comprehensive assessment of rigor in the process and will make recommendations for improvements to the larger faculty and provost.

---

10 See Chapters 2-3.
The College recognizes the importance of periodic review of all aspects of its processes. When personnel files are sent to the Office of the Associate Provost for Faculty and Administration (APFA) for reappointment, promotion, tenure purposes, each should include classroom observations, student evaluations, and documentation of the annual conference among other supporting materials. The Office of the Associate Provost for Faculty and Administration (APFA) began reviewing promotion and tenure files in fall 2011. The following semester, spring 2012, the office started reviewing annual reappointment files. Based on the reviews, the office decided to conduct a systematic analysis.

An examination of a sample of 31 personnel files of assistant professors being reviewed for annual reappointment during fall 2013 showed that 55% of files were missing at least one peer teaching observation and 35% had at least one missing annual conference report. To address this, the office took multiple actions. The faculty Personnel Files Inventory Checklist was updated in May 2014; departments were asked to use it as a guide throughout the pre-tenure years, not just in preparation of the personnel files for tenure review. The College also established a “Personnel File Management Workshop,” which was first offered in June 2017 (17 attendees), again in April 2018 (21 attendees), and planned again for the spring 2019 semester. Department chairs and staff responsible for maintaining the personnel files are invited to these workshops. In addition, it is now the practice of the APFA’s office to review every file for completeness and to ask departments to provide missing documents. While this review is subsequent to the department-level action, the regular review provides quality control. The study performed in fall 2013 is scheduled to be repeated in fall 2019 as part of the office’s assessment plan.

2.7.1 Promotion and Tenure/Certificate of Continuous Employment (CCE)

The promotion and tenure procedures were adjusted in 2011 to reflect the College’s change to a school structure. The two levels divisional promotion and tenure committees were replaced by the school promotion and tenure committees. The College Review Committee, which made recommendations directly to the President of the College, was eliminated. The Faculty Handbook provides a summary of these two actions with reference to the relevant governance documents. Full-time professorial faculty appointed to a seventh year are automatically considered for tenure. The Faculty Handbook describes the steps toward tenure, beginning with the candidate creating a portfolio of scholarly and/or creative works that is sent to four external evaluators. Internal review starts at the department appointments committee, followed by the school promotion and tenure committee, and then the College-wide promotion and tenure committee. All recommendations are then forwarded to the President. On all levels of the process, candidates are notified of the decision to recommend or not recommend. For full-time lecturers under consideration for CCE, the process is the same, except that it starts after reappointment to a fifth year. Since research is not required, external evaluations are not requested. The process for promotion to associate and full professor mirrors the process for tenure with two exceptions. First, the promotion process only begins after the candidate notifies the College of his/her intent to be considered for promotion. Second, the first level of review varies, where a department promotion committee replaces the appointments committee in the case of tenure. Although the composition of each committee is described, there is no mention in the Faculty Handbook of the relevant policy documents.

11 See pp. 27-30.
2.7.2 Professional Development

Members of the Brooklyn College faculty are expected to engage in research, scholarship and creative work. The Faculty Handbook provides a listing and brief description of some of the grants and other types of funding and academic leaves available. The Faculty Handbook offers a list of on-campus professional development programs and services that faculty can utilize. Services include workshops on grant writing, technology in the classroom, teaching, promotion and tenure, and portfolio building. Faculty also are directed to visit the Faculty Professional Development web page where the information is more comprehensive. By making these resources and information available to faculty, the College is providing the support necessary to meet the requirements of these documents.

2.7.3 Faculty Complaints and Grievances Procedures

The rules for how Brooklyn College handles faculty complaints and grievances come from Article 20 of the PSC-CUNY Contract. The article itself defines the difference between a complaint and a grievance as well as the timeframe a faculty has to file an action, the steps of each process, and the meaning of resolution. This information is only available to faculty via a review of the Contract. The Faculty Handbook and the Brooklyn College website have no information on this topic.

2.8 Staff Personnel Policies

There is no Brooklyn College staff handbook, in hard copy or on the website. The Human Resource Services website has a page that provides links to the different unions’ websites and contracts. Whereas faculty have a clear two-tiered governance structure, Brooklyn College staff are governed by CUNY-wide polices set forth in the bylaws of the CUNY Board of Trustees, the Manual of General Policy, and the collective bargaining agreements between the unions who represent the different categories of staff and the City University of New York. An exception is the staff classified as College Laboratory Technicians (CLTs). Aspects of their work life are covered under the Brooklyn College Governance Plan.

2.8.1 Staff Career Advancement/Professional Development

College laboratory technicians have a promotion process that is comparable to that of faculty while staff members who are in higher education officer (HEO) titles are non-promotable. Staff members are eligible for free tuition under CUNY’s Tuition Waiver Policy can take undergraduate and graduate classes for professional development purposes. The number of credits that staff members are eligible to take per semester depends on the collective bargaining agreement that represents them. Information can be found on the Human Resources website under Benefits Plan Overview. Eligible staff members also have access to funds by way of additional provisions in the various collective bargaining agreements. Funds can be used for educational training, research and travel. Through CUNY’s Professional Development and Learning Management Office, staff members can also participate in classes and workshops designed to enhance the knowledge and skills necessary to work and manage the diverse work environment that is Brooklyn College.
2.8.2 Staff Complaints and Grievances

Policies on staff complaints and grievances are processed based on provisions in the collective bargaining agreements between CUNY and the unions. As with faculty, those staff who fall under the umbrella of the PSC-CUNY have an outline of what constitutes a complaint and how it differs from a grievance as well as the timeframe to file an action, steps of each process and the meaning of a resolution. The provisions of the collective bargaining agreements for all other staff only provide rules for grievance procedures. This information is not provided anywhere on the Brooklyn College website and can only be found by reviewing the relevant contracts.

2.9 Commitment to Diversity and Inclusion

Inclusion of all and the celebration of our diversity continues to be a central part of Brooklyn College’s identify. Therefore, we considered it essential to assess how we are doing in this area, to speak to our own standard of ethics and integrity.

The CUNY Policy on Equal Opportunity and Non-Discrimination states that CUNY “is committed to a policy of equal employment and equal access in its educational programs and activities. Diversity, inclusion, and an environment free from discrimination are central to the mission of the University.” This policy describes the various types of prohibited discriminatory conducts as well as the processes to report discrimination and/or retaliation, conduct a preliminary review of employee, student, or visitor concerns, file a complaint, resolve a complaint informally, investigate a complain, withdraw a complaint, and formally resolve a complaint. The policy also indicates how to deal with false and malicious accusations and anonymous complaints and outlines the responsibilities of the President of the College, managers, and the University committee at large. The CUNY policy clearly establishes a foundation for its inclusive, bias-free environment.

To help determine whether or not we are actually living this part of our mission, we included items on the Middle States survey that asked respondents to rate how satisfied they were with the diversity of Brooklyn College. Faculty, staff and students responded to this question; their responses are reported in Table 2.3.

Table 2.3
“Please rate the diversity of Brooklyn College in the following areas…”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Views of FACULTY diversity</th>
<th>Students (n = 1044)</th>
<th>Faculty (n = 296)</th>
<th>Staff (n = 363)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the diversity of this area</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat diverse, but not as much as it should be</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited diversity</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No diversity at all</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Across all groups, the majority of respondents reported being ‘satisfied’ with the level of diversity of the faculty, staff and students on campus. This was particularly true regarding the diversity among students on campus. Respondents were somewhat less satisfied with the diversity among faculty and staff/administration; the diversity among faculty and staff does not reflect the diversity of the student population as Table 2.4 shows. Relative to the student population of Brooklyn College, African American and Hispanics are underrepresented in the faculty and staff. There are also some disparities by gender and by job category. For example, Black/African American and Hispanic are relatively over-represented among administrative assistants, accounting for approximately 46% of all administrative assistants.

Table 2.4:
Comparison of Ethnic Diversity of Faculty, Staff and Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>6.70%</td>
<td>22.70%</td>
<td>24.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>11.30%</td>
<td>9.40%</td>
<td>16.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>5.90%</td>
<td>10.70%</td>
<td>20.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Is.</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>71.00%</td>
<td>53.70%</td>
<td>32.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race unknown</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While we acknowledge that we are not perfect in this area, initiatives are underway to address the disparities.

2.10 Conclusions

In sum, Brooklyn College has comprehensive policies and procedures that govern all aspects of the work and career of faculty. A major challenge is the accessibility of some of this information. The Faculty Handbook simplifies the language while providing a single location to find information. However, only 19.1% of our surveyed faculty strongly agreed that this information is easy to locate, a reflection of the difficulty in locating the handbook and Brooklyn College Policy page on our website. Brooklyn College staff members have no single location where information on all governing policies and procedures can be found. Finding the necessary policies requires a search of the Brooklyn College and CUNY websites; it is not always clear which policies apply. The lack of a staff handbook makes understanding policies difficult since the policies tend to be written in legal terms. Information on career/professional development is easier to find through the Human Resource Services website. The same observation was made when it came to policies on staff compensation and benefits. According to the MSCHE Staff Survey 81.1% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this assessment.

2.11 Recommendations Aligned with the College’s Strategic Plan

Based on our analysis of Standard II: Ethics and Integrity, we recommend the following:

- Expand Implicit Bias training opportunities to all faculty and staff and strengthen our efforts to provide students, faculty, and staff with an inclusive campus environment (Goal 5.B.d).
- Provide development opportunities for departmental and college-wide grade appeals committees to discuss criteria and standards (Goal 1)
- Make the Student Handbook and Faculty Handbook easily accessible on the Brooklyn College website. Consider adding grievance procedures to the Faculty Handbook and website. (Goal 4.A.a).
- Create a Staff Handbook comparable to the Faculty Handbook, and make it easily accessible on the Brooklyn College website. Consider the addition of grievance procedures (Goals 4.A.a).
- Make the CUNY guidelines and procedures on ethical conduct easily accessible on the Brooklyn College website. Goal 4.A.a).
CHAPTER 3

STANDARD III: DESIGN AND DELIVERY OF THE STUDENT LEARNING EXPERIENCE

An institution provides students with learning experiences that are characterized by rigor and coherence at all program, certificate, and degree levels, regardless of instructional modality. All learning experiences, regardless of modality, program pace/schedule, level, and setting are consistent with higher education expectations.

3.1 Summary of Evidence of Compliance with the Standard

Table 3.1 provides links to summary information that shows the College’s compliance with the Standard.

Table 3.1
Standard III: Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>EVIDENCE OF COMPLIANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. certificate, undergraduate, graduate, and/or professional programs leading to a degree or other recognized higher education credential, of a length appropriate to the objectives of the degree or other credential, designed to foster a coherent student learning experience and to promote synthesis of learning:</td>
<td>Undergraduate Programs Graduate Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. student learning experiences that are designed, delivered, and assessed by faculty (full-time or part-time) and/or other appropriate professionals who are:</td>
<td>Our Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. rigorous and effective in teaching, assessment of student learning, scholarly inquiry, and service, as appropriate to the institution’s mission, goals, and policies;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. qualified for the positions they hold and the work they do;</td>
<td>Our Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. sufficient in number;</td>
<td>Faculty/Student Ratio:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. provided with and utilize sufficient opportunities, resources, and support for professional growth and innovation;</td>
<td>Faculty Professional Development Roberta S. Matthews Center for Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. reviewed regularly and equitably based on written, disseminated, clear, and fair criteria, expectations, policies, and procedures;</td>
<td>Professional Evaluation of the Faculty Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure/CCE PSC-CUNY Agreement (see Article 18, “Professional Evaluation,” and Article 9, “Appointment and Reappointment”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. academic programs of study that are clearly and accurately described in official publications of the institution in a way that students are able to understand and follow</td>
<td>Undergraduate Bulletin Graduate Bulletin Academic Departments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
degree and program requirements and expected time to completion;

4. sufficient learning opportunities and resources to support both the institution’s programs of study and students’ academic progress;

5. at institutions that offer undergraduate education, a general education program, free standing or integrated into academic disciplines, that:
   a. offers a sufficient scope to draw students into new areas of intellectual experience, expanding their cultural and global awareness and cultural sensitivity, and preparing them to make well-reasoned judgments outside as well as within their academic field;

   Pathways General Education Curriculum at Brooklyn College
   CUNY Pathways

   b. offers a curriculum designed so that students acquire and demonstrate essential skills including at least oral and written communication, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis and reasoning, technological competency, and information literacy. Consistent with mission, the general education program also includes the study of values, ethics and diverse perspectives; and

   Pathways General Education Curriculum at Brooklyn College

   c. in non-US institutions that do not include general education, provides evidence that students can demonstrate general education skills;

   N/A

6. in institutions that offer graduate and professional education, opportunities for the development of research, scholarship, and independent thinking, provided by faculty and/or other professionals with credentials appropriate to graduate-level curricula;

   Graduate Programs

7. adequate and appropriate institutional review and approval on any student learning opportunities designed, delivered, or assessed by third-party providers; and

   N/A

8. periodic assessment of the effectiveness of programs providing student learning opportunities.

   All units (academic and administrative and educational support) are required to submit annual assessment reports, to report on the achievement of states outcomes.

3.2 Introduction

In this chapter, we will elaborate on Table 3.1 and address the following Self-Study research questions.
1. How do we demonstrate our compliance with Standard III?
2. Are courses and programs regularly offered in all divisions and at all levels of the College of sufficient number and rigor to meet criteria 1 and 4 of Standard III?
3. Are the existing protocols for the recruitment, review, and promotion of faculty and staff sufficient for the fulfillment of criteria 2 and 6 of Standard III?
4. Are the resources and mechanisms available for the advisement and information of the students about the curriculum sufficient to meet criteria 3 of Standard III?
5. Does the general education curriculum currently in place at Brooklyn College fulfill criteria 5 of Standard III?
6. Are the mechanisms in place for the review of the curriculum sufficient to meet criteria 7 and 8 of Standard III?

3.3 Academic Program Offerings

Brooklyn College offers eighty-three undergraduate programs, seventy-two graduate programs, and 20 certificates and diplomas in business, education, the humanities, social sciences, performing arts, sciences, pre-professional, and professional studies. Since our last self-study as Table 3.2 shows, the faculty developed 23 new degree, diploma and certificate programs, including: 5 bachelor’s degrees, 1 certificate program, and 6 master’s programs, 9 advanced certificates, and 2 advanced diplomas.

Table 3.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>Certificate</th>
<th>Bachelor's</th>
<th>Master's</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adv. Cert, Cert, Adv. Dipl.</td>
<td>BA, BBA, BS</td>
<td>MA, MAT, MFA, MS, MSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koppelman School of Business</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Humanities and Social Sciences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Natural and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Visual, Media and Performing Arts</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total = 23 (all schools)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All programs are registered with the New York State Education Department. The college confers the following degrees: Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Business Administration, Bachelor of Fine Arts, Bachelor of Music, Bachelor of Science, Master of Arts, Master of Arts in Teaching, Master of Fine Arts, Master of Music, Master of Science, and Master of Science in Education. Bachelor’s degree programs are designed to be completed in 120.

Faculty develops all curriculum as Figure 3.1 illustrates. The curriculum is coherent in design and assessed in both developmental stages through the departmental curriculum committee, the appropriate curriculum committee of the Faculty Council, the Faculty Council, and University
program approval processes. The latter includes review by the University Office of Academic Affairs, the Board of Trustees Committee on Academic Policy, Programs, and Research and the approval of the Board of Trustees.

Figure 3.1
Curriculum Development Process: Course and Program

Through regular assessment, including decennial program review, programs are reviewed for continued coherence. In the spring 2019, Academic Affairs will assess the adequacy of the current ten-year review schedule and consider whether or not the review function should move from the examination of a department’s offerings to an individual program. As part of our Strategic Plan’s Goal 1, Academic Affairs will also shortly undertake a comprehensive review of our undergraduate programming toward enhancing our academic excellence. Attention will focus on enhancing assessment, the currency of programs, and continuous improvements.

Students have opportunities in virtually every program of study to synthesize knowledge at the course level and at the program level as demonstrated by the curriculum in Sociology, Urban Sustainability. The methods for synthesis vary widely on the program level based on best practices. In Sociology, for example, a traditional senior thesis capstone integrates knowledge and skills. The Urban Sustainability provides a more experiential approach. Students from the three
tracks—sociology, business management, and earth and environmental sciences—work on a project for a client and produce a report and oral presentation for the client.

The curriculum is organized and managed across thirty-five academic departments within the College’s five schools: (1) the Murray Koppelman School of Business, (2) the School of Education, (3) the School of Humanities and Social Sciences, (4) the School of Natural and Behavioral Sciences, and (5) the School of Visual, Media and Performing Arts. External professional accreditation is a priority, and a number of Brooklyn College programs have achieved it:

- Chemistry B.S.: the American Chemical Society
- Speech-Language Pathology MS: Council on Academic Accreditation in Audiology and Speech Language Pathology of the American Speech-Language Hearing Association
- Education: School Counseling MS: Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs
- Health and Nutrition Sciences BS—The Didactic Program in Dietetics: Accreditation Council for Education in Nutrition and Dietetics.

In addition, the School of Education is accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education and in the process of seeking accreditation from the Association for Advancing Quality in Educator Preparation. The Murray Koppelman School for Business is currently a candidate for accreditation from the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business AACSB.

3.4 Faculty

The college is served by 524 full-time 802 part-time faculty members, as reported in our 2017-2018 IPEDS survey. Table 3.3 shows the distribution by rank and school. As reported in the 2017-2018 AAUP Survey, 97.0% of faculty at the Professor rank are tenured, 95.5% at the Associate Professor rank are tenured and 19% at the Assistant Professor rank are tenured. 50.4% of our undergraduate FTE/credit hours were taught by fulltime faculty in fall 2017, and 46.7 of our graduate credit hours were taught by part time faculty.12

Table 3.3
Full Time Brooklyn College Faculty by Rank and School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Humanities and Social Sciences</th>
<th>Natural and Behavioral Sciences</th>
<th>Visual, Media, and Performing Arts</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 Office of Institutional Research and Data Analysis, October 20, 2018.
Table 3.3 also shows that 93% of full-time faculty are in tenure track positions, a ratio that makes Brooklyn College an outlier nationally, where the trend has been toward non-tenure lectureships. Moreover, more than half of the lecturer-rank positions among the full-time faculty are in the School of Natural and Behavioral Sciences, which routinely employs instructors of that rank to lead laboratory and fieldwork. College-wide, just over 39% of the faculty are full-time, which again places the College outside of national trends, where on average 30% of faculty are full-time. The ratios of full-time to part-time faculty and tenure-track to non-tenure-track faculty reflect positively on the maintenance of high teaching standards at Brooklyn College because as the subsequent discussion outline the full-time and tenure-track faculty are subject to more rigorous protocols for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. They also have more time for teaching, mentoring, faculty-student research, and pedagogical development activities.

### 3.4.1 Faculty Qualifications and Diversity

Faculty are recruited in accordance with the by-laws of the City University of New York and must have credentials (generally a Ph.D. or an M.A. degree from an accredited University) consistent with the academic rank to which they are appointed. Recent research indicates the importance of increasing the demographic match between students and faculty in order to promote student achievement. Brooklyn College faculty is less diverse than faculty at peer institutions; we have numerous departments where various groups are underrepresented. During the 2017-2018 academic year, the Office of Diversity and Equity implemented several initiatives to increase faculty diversity across the College.

Table 3.4 below shows the extent of ethnic diversity differences among students, staff and faculty.

#### Table 3.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>6.70%</td>
<td>22.70%</td>
<td>24.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>11.30%</td>
<td>9.40%</td>
<td>16.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>5.90%</td>
<td>10.70%</td>
<td>20.60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

13 This paragraph will be reviewed and updated once the correct data are added to the table above.

14 Need the data here to demonstrate this. See, for instance, Seth Gershenson, Stephen Holt, and Nicholas Papageorge, “Who Believes in Me? The Effect of Student-Teacher Demographic Match on Teacher Expectations,” Economics of Education Review, 2016.
Beginning in 2017-2018, each academic department conducting a faculty search was required to develop a department-specific affirmative action recruitment plan. The Office of Diversity and Equity also revised the search committee charge meeting to include information about implicit bias using real world examples of how implicit bias can impact faculty hiring. This initiative yielded several important results including more diverse faculty applicant pools, which led to increased diversity among new faculty hires. The new faculty entering in fall 2018 included five female Asian/Pacific Islander faculty, two male Black/African-American faculty members, and ten white female faculty members. These strategies will remain in place.

### 3.4.2 Faculty Qualifications and Assessment

Faculty performance is assessed through several forms of rigorous review that are documented in the faculty member’s file. The parameters for review are established by the University and PSC CUNY contract. Full-time faculty appointments must be re-authorized annually until conferral of tenure or, for full-time lecturers, a Certificate of Continuous Employment (CCE). Reappointment decisions are made using information gathered through student evaluations, peer observation of classroom instruction, and annual conferences between each faculty member and his or her department chair, in which performance in the areas of teaching, service, and scholarship are assessed and future expectations articulated.

A file is maintained for each faculty member that contains all records of student evaluations, peer observations, and annual conferences with department chairs. Also included are copies of all published and ongoing scholarship and creative works by the faculty members, as well as a record of all service, mentoring, and other professional activities. These files are reviewed and updated regularly and consulted for all personnel actions taken during a faculty member’s service. As part of its New Faculty Orientation Program, the Office of the Associate Provost for Faculty and Administration hosts a workshop on the Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure process.

During the spring semester of the sixth year of service, full-time faculty members come under review for tenure or a CCE. Lecturers reviewed for a CCE are not evaluated based on their

---

15 Based on all students enrolled.
16 See Chapter 4 of the Faculty Handbook.
17 See Section 2.7 for a discussion of this use.
18 A copy of these materials are in Appendix 3.A.
research, thus their review is conducted based on their updated personnel file. During tenure review for faculty members of professorial rank, copies of all published work are sent to four external evaluators (acknowledged experts in the research field of the faculty member under review), and letters are solicited appraising the scholarly quality of the work. These letters are added to the confidential personnel file of the faculty member and are made available for tenure assessment.

During tenure review, a faculty member’s complete personnel file is reviewed by several committees in succession. First, the Appointments Committee of a faculty member’s department reviews the file and votes on the candidate’s fitness for tenure. The file is then reviewed by the School’s Promotion and Tenure Review Committee, comprising representatives of each department in the candidate’s School. After the School committee votes, the file is then reviewed, and voted on by the College-wide Promotion and Tenure Committee, comprising all chairpersons at the College. After reviewing the deliberations of these three committees, the President makes a recommendation concerning the candidate’s tenure to the Board of Trustees.

For promotion from the rank of assistant professor to associate professor, and likewise from associate professor to professor, the file of a faculty member is similarly submitted for review by the same three committees in succession. Promotion to associate professor may be undertaken in the same action as the review for tenure; that consideration requires that the candidate’s scholarly and creative work be evaluated by four external reviewers. During consideration for promotion, a faculty member must submit all scholarly and creative works produced since the achievement of their most recent rank for external evaluation. Promotion is contingent upon providing evidence of persistent effectiveness in teaching and service as well as significant scholarly and/or creative achievement in one’s field. 19

Compliance with promotion and tenure protocols is well-documented in the procedural records maintained by the College. Moreover, there is some evidence, in the forms of statistical and survey data, that they have been effective in maintaining high standards of rigor and competence among the faculty.

Table 3.5 shows that between 2012 and 2017, the College completed a total of 323 reviews for promotion, tenure, and CCE accreditation. Of these, 296 resulted in the approval of rank or certification, 27 were denied. This yields an admittedly high success rate of 92%. But, the n = 323 does not include faculty in the tenure stream, only those who remain at Brooklyn College long enough to come up for tenure and/or promotion. The high success rate reflected in the data in Table 3.5 are a testament to the fact that those unlikely to succeed at these points of summative evaluation have already separated from the College via non-reappointment.

Table 3.5

Results of Tenure, Promotion, and CCE Review Process

19 See pp 6-8 of the Brooklyn College Governance Plan for details on the process and also http://policy.cuny.edu/policyimport/manual_of_general_policy/article_v_faculty_staff_and_administration/policy_5.01_academic_personnel_practice/document.pdf of the University Manual of General Policy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period of Review</th>
<th>Total Number of Reviews for Promotion, Tenure, and CCE</th>
<th>Number of Approvals</th>
<th>Number of Denials</th>
<th>Percentage Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012-2017</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>91.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Associate Provost for Faculty and Administration, 2017-2018

The process is cautious and deliberate, including fail-safes such as a “third-year review” instituted to minimize the instance of unqualified candidates being reviewed for tenure and ensure full feedback on performance to those on the tenure track. The fact that 8% of candidates who sought promotion or tenure failed to gain approval demonstrates that the process is conducted diligently and in accordance with consistent standards. It is perhaps also a reflection of the rigorous hiring process, that few faculty who are unlikely to succeed, are brought on board.

When being considered for promotion and tenure, faculty are evaluated based on their scholarship, teaching, and service. Table 3.6 shows that when faculty were surveyed about their perceptions with regard to what should be most valued, research, teaching or service, most thought that teaching should be most valued (72.5%). However, when asked which is most valued, they rated teaching and research about equally.

### Table 3.6

What is Valued and What Should be Valued? – Faculty Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What Is Valued</th>
<th>What Should Be Valued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MSCHE Surveys

Most faculty rated research high in importance; they also indicated that research and creative works are not adequately supported by the College as Table 3.6 shows. This area requires significant planning and appropriate resourcing. Academic Affairs has begun to address this during fall 2018. A search is currently underway for a local Research and Compliance Manager. The Provost is also recruiting a Faculty Fellow for Research who can help support faculty engaged in grant sponsored research and provide other mentoring and advice to faculty seeking appropriate
peer reviewed outlets for their research. Planning is also underway to host local grant and scholarly writing boot camps in the spring 2019.

Students’ perceptions of their faculty members are favorable, based upon responses to the Student Experience Surveys compiled by CUNY’s Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. Students were asked about their level of satisfaction with the preparedness of their faculty members and their satisfaction with their faculty member’s ability to communicate clearly.

Student satisfaction with advisement from their major department is relatively high: 62.7% of students either strongly or moderately agree that they get the advisement they need from their major department. There is variance at the school-level with only 19.9% of students in the School of Natural and Behavioral Sciences strongly agreeing that they get the advisement they need from the major department, whereas 35.1% of students in the School of Education strongly agree. This survey also highlights the fact that the students perceive the faculty very positively in the following categories: the faculty: are fair (86.7%), well-prepared (87%), accessible (85.7%), approachable (87.2%), and knowledgeable (92.4%) as Table 3.8 shows.

Table 3.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty are….</th>
<th>Percent Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-Prepared</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approachable</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledgeable</td>
<td>92.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CUNY Experience Survey

The findings of the CUNY 2016 Student Experience Survey are consistent with the results from the “Middle States Student Survey Report,” which indicates that the students have a high degree of confidence in the faculty as both instructors and advisers.

The College maintains several resources at the disposal of faculty in support of their professional activities. Funds are dispersed through the deans’ offices in support of faculty travel, participation in conferences, and related research projects. Other funds are made available through the PSC/CUNY grant program and through the City University’s Professional Development and Learning Management Office. The success of these efforts can be seen in the record of faculty accomplishments maintained in the form of regularly updated faculty profiles on the College’s website. The College offers a broad range of instructional development opportunities. The Center for Teaching is an area of the College, which is slated for further investments and development. Its focus is on the provision of a broad range of pedagogical development opportunities. Other opportunities for development related to technology use and instructional design are available through the Library’s Academic Instructional Technology unit. Faculty are introduced to these opportunities. Information about these resources can be accessed through the faculty handbook and through the Associate Provost for Faculty and Administration. It is a topic at new faculty
orientation, and the Associate Provost’s website provides extensive information, which is regularly augmented with email communications about new opportunities and scheduling.

An area recommended for improvement is the mentoring of junior faculty and associate professors. The 2015 COACHE survey findings confirm that between 20-30% of the faculty have not received mentoring from one or the other source. In addition, associate professors, women and faculty of color report mentoring needs. Plans are underway to develop comprehensive mentoring programming through departments, schools and across Academic Affairs during the spring 2019.

### 3.5 General Education

A program of general education aims to provide a rigorous and structured foundation for the bachelor’s degree. It ought to expose students to the full-breadth of possible intellectual experiences, while providing them with those skills that they will need upon graduation. Brooklyn College has a long history of responding to the needs of its students in this regard. In 1980, the Faculty Council voted to move away from a set of loosely defined distribution requirements. Instead, it voted to adopt a Core Curriculum, a set of ten specific courses that all students were required to take. These courses aimed to expose students to the full-range of intellectual opportunities at the College. It was comprised of two tiers of courses that were to taken in sequence, over the student’s first two to three years.

In 2013 the University instituted a new system-wide general education curriculum called Pathways. The centerpiece of this initiative is a 30-credit general education Common Core. Each CUNY College also requires bachelor’s-degree students to take another 6 to 12 credits of general education through the College Option. The College Option was designed as a means for each of the campuses to distinguish the General Education curriculum by placing their campus’ imprint on Pathways. General Education credits carry over seamlessly if a student transfers to another CUNY College. Pathways has also aligned gateway courses for a number of popular majors. Its development was based on extensive University research about obstacles to transfer among Colleges that included extensive credit loses for students.

Pathways was not well received at Brooklyn College. The campus reception reflected the tensions that can surface between a system and an individual campus related to the proper role of the system and the campus with regard to governance. Pathways was ultimately adopted by Faculty Council at its March 21, 2017 Meeting.

In many respects, the structure and substance of the College’s Pathway’ requirements remain the same as the previous General Education curriculum. Pathways is a 42-credit (14-course) program that is divided into three parts: (1) a Required Common Core (12 credits/4 courses), (2) a Flexible Common Core (18 credits/6 courses), and (3) a College Option (12 credits/4 courses). The curriculum was built around specified CUNY-wide expectations for student learning. Additional Middle States expectations—technological competency and oral communication—were included in the Brooklyn’s design.

---

20 COACHE Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey, Provost’s Report, Brooklyn College 2015, pp.
21 A full description of the history of Pathways at Brooklyn College is located in Appendix 3 B.
22 See Appendix 3.C for a listing of courses that include outcomes related to Oral Communication and Technological Competency.
Table 3.8
CUNY General Education Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REQUIRED COMMON CORE (12 credits/4 courses)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Composition (2 courses)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematical and Quantitative Reasoning (1 course)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life and Physical Sciences (1 course)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FLEXIBLE COMMON CORE (18 credits/6 courses)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World Cultures and Global Issues (1 course)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Experience in its Diversity (1 course)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Expression (1 course)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual and Society (1 course)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific World (1 course)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One additional course from one of the above areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| COLLEGE OPTION (12 credits) |  |

At Brooklyn College, the Pathways Curriculum is implemented as follows. The Required Common Core includes four specific courses that all students must take. First, there is a two-course sequence in English Composition: ENGL 1010 and 1012. Second, students are required to take one of the following two courses under the heading of “Math/Quantitative Reasoning:” either MATH 1311 or CISC 1001; STEM students may substitute a STEM variant course for one of the two. Third, under the heading of “Life and Physical Sciences,” students are required to take one of three courses in Biology (BIOL 1010), Chemistry (CHEM 1007) or Anthropology (ANTH 1200). A variant for STEM students is offered to fulfill the requirement. The latter two courses of this Required Core respond to the expectation of Middle States that students acquire and demonstrate essential skills in scientific and quantitative reasoning.

The Flexible Common Core includes several courses under each of five headings: World Cultures and Global Issues, U.S. Experience in its Diversity, Creative Expression, Individual and Society, and Scientific World. Beginning in fall 2017, all students are required to take two courses under the heading Creative Expression (ARTD 1010 and MUSC 1300 or MUSC 1400). In addition, students are required to take one of the courses specifically named under each of the other four headings. The courses of this Flexible Core respond to the expectation of Middle States that students explore the study of values, ethics, and diverse perspectives.

The College Option component of this program currently includes courses under each of three headings, each of which specifies student learning outcomes: (1) Exploring Arts & Literature (2) Exploring Global Connections, and (3) Exploring Science. Students are required to take a total of four of these courses; but no more than two courses can be taken from the list that appears under
any one of these three headings. The College Option is still in development, and the College is preparing for a new set of offerings to be implemented starting fall 2019.

The College has developed a process to determine which courses might qualify as approved STEM variants and which courses might qualify for inclusion under one of the three headings that comprise the College Option. Departments submit candidate courses for inclusion to the Faculty Council Committee on General Education. If this Committee determines that the candidate courses qualify, then they are submitted to Faculty Council for approval by the Faculty Council Committee on Curriculum and Degree Requirements. The Committee on General Education also reviews and monitors the implementation of the general education curriculum. A faculty coordinator for General Education has been appointed to facilitate and oversee the implementation of General Education at the College.

In addition to the General Education requirements, students must satisfy two Academic Foundations Requirements for the bachelor’s degree. These are: (1) a library research requirement, which is usually satisfied as a part of the coursework for ENGL 1010 and 1012, and (2) a one course Writing Intensive requirement.

These aforementioned requirements of the College’s General Education program are specifically for those students who begin their undergraduate careers at Brooklyn College. Adjustments to these requirements are in place for the other student populations, such as transfer students. The findings from the “Middle States Student Survey Report” indicate that 56.4% of undergraduate students think that general education courses prepared them very or somewhat well to be successful in their major courses. General Education assessment will examine student satisfaction with the college’s new Pathways program going forward.

3.6 Graduate Education

The College offers 72 graduate programs. As part of our Strategic Plan (Goal 1.A.a), the College will shortly undertake a comprehensive review of our graduate programming toward enhancing our academic excellence. Attention will focus on assessment, the scope of programming, the organizational structure for the graduate programs, the currency of programs, and managing and closing the loop on assessment for improvements.

Our graduate programs are fully described in the annual bulletin, on the graduate program inventory and linked to the admissions webpages. The College provides a rich array of opportunities for graduate student research with faculty and professionals to support the graduate curricular. In addition to program-based research, faculty-led centers and institutes provide many research opportunities that support the graduate curricula. Centers with non-faculty leadership, such as the Science and Resilience Institute at Jamaica Bay are led by highly trained professionals. Students conducting research also receive support and guidance as indicated from specialized disciplinary Library staff and from the Office of Research Compliance.

3.7 Periodic Assessment of Programs

---

23 JEA…see if alumni survey can add to this…, even though they would be responding to the old curriculum…
24 See the General Education Assessment Plan in Appendix 3.D
25 See Section I.1 for details about our graduate programs, and I.1.1 for details about students.
The College has established both an Institutional Assessment Committee and an Academic Assessment Council led by the Associate Provost for Institutional Planning and Assessment. Both groups guide our assessment efforts and facilitate the ongoing cultivation of a culture of assessment.\(^{26}\) The Academic Assessment Council consists of faculty and administrative representatives from each of the five schools; these individuals oversee and advocate for the assessment initiatives in the Academic Affairs division.

A faculty member chairs the committee. The Council will work with the General Education Coordinator and the General Education Committee to review the new general education program. The Council aspires to serve as the “outside reviewers” of student artifacts from general education courses. Faculty members receive a course release to serve on the Academic Assessment Council. A review of the membership of the Council shows insufficient faculty membership. We recommend that faculty from each of the schools be recruited for participation. It is important that the work of the Council be faculty driven.

The Institutional Assessment Committee was formed in response to the Monitoring Report, which called for an assessment body for the non-academic units. The committee is composed of representatives from Student Affairs, Government and Community Relations, Admissions, the Registrar’s Office, Financial Aid, and Institutional Assessment. This committee has developed an “assessment boot camp” for the non-instructional departments on campus to help them develop a comprehensive assessment system. This body works in parallel, to the extent possible, with the Academic Assessment Council.

The academic departments complete a program review by external evaluators every ten years. Prior to the external review, the departments spend a semester completing a self-study.\(^{27}\) Upon completion of the Self-Study, the departments identify external evaluators who conduct a site visit. The external evaluators make recommendations for the department to which the department is asked to respond. The Office of the Associate Provost for Institutional Planning and Assessment sets the schedule for the ten-year reviews. It is recommended that further collaboration between the Associate Provost and deans occur with regard to assessment. The deans have recently been charged by the Provost with monitoring assessment across the departments of their respective schools. This includes program review. They will need to work closely with the Office of the Associate Provost to benefit from that office’s expertise on assessment. Currently, departments are asked to send program review reports to the deans. Going forward, the deans will assist departments with action plan development to address the review. This will include marshalling resources and making decisions collaboratively about priorities for the department and school. This work will form part of the provost’s annual review of each the schools going forward.

Each year the academic departments draft Annual Assessment Reports. The templates for both the academic and administrative units are located in Appendix 3.E. These reports address student learning outcomes, how the outcomes were assessed, the cycle in which each of the student learning outcomes will be assessed, the data the department identified, the artifacts they collected, and how the data will be used to close the assessment loop and create an assessment plan moving forward. Student learning outcomes are established by degree program and the department

\(^{26}\) Additional information on both groups is provided in Section V of the Self-Study Report.

\(^{27}\) A copy of the 2017 revised guidelines is located in Appendix 3.F.
determines the cycle in which to assess each of the learning outcomes. Academic departments are developing curriculum maps that indicate which outcome is addressed by each of the courses offered in the department. The departments are also identifying how their offerings align with the College’s Mission and the unique contributions they provide in service of that Mission.

In concluding this survey of the College’s execution of the “design and delivery of the student learning experience [spanning curricular offerings, faculty, communications with and advisement of students, the general education program, academic support services and programs, centers and institutes, and the periodic assessment of programs],” it is appropriate to refer to two questions asked on both the “Middle States Faculty Survey Report,” and the “Middle States Student Survey Report”: 1) What are the most important skills for Brooklyn College students to gain during their time here? 2) What do you think Brooklyn College’s highest priority goals should be over the next five years? Students and faculty both agree that the most important skills for students to develop are effective written communication, critical thinking skills, and effective oral communication. They likewise concur in feeling that the highest priority goals for the College over the next five years should be improving the quality of a Brooklyn College education, keeping the College affordable, and hiring and retaining a distinguished faculty.

These answers speak to both successes and challenges in the structuring of the student learning experience at Brooklyn College. On the one hand, the fact that students and faculty stress the need to “improve the quality of a Brooklyn College education” signifies that more must be done to equip students with essential skills and meet their learning needs. On the other hand, the call to “keep the College affordable” indicates that students already derive significant value from their experience here. This index of success is corroborated by the fact that during the past four administrations, when the CUNY Student Experience Survey asked students if they would choose to attend their current College if they had a chance to start over, Brooklyn College outperformed both the senior College average and the CUNY average. The College strives to improve the student learning experience to fulfill its educational mission.

3.8 Recommendations Aligned with the College’s Strategic Plan

Based on our analysis of Standard III: Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience, we recommend the following:

- Bolster support for faculty research. Develop funding to support faculty research and conference travel and align funding levels with those of peer institutions (Goal 1B.c).
- Establish specialized mentoring programs for junior faculty, associate professors, and faculty of color (Goal 8).
- Increase faculty participation on the Academic Assessment council by recruiting one faculty member from each school (Goal 8).
- Conduct full assessment of the graduate programs, which includes an evaluation of their resourcing and administrative structures, and develop an action plan that includes a timeline to address findings (Goal 1).
CHAPTER 4

STANDARD IV: SUPPORT OF THE STUDENT EXPERIENCE

Across all educational experiences, settings, levels, and instructional modalities, the institution recruits and admits students whose interests, abilities, experiences, and goals are congruent with its mission and educational offerings. The institution commits to student retention, persistence, completion, and success through a coherent and effective support system sustained by qualified professionals, which enhances the quality of the learning environment, contributes to the educational experience, and fosters student success.

4.1 Summary of Evidence of Compliance with the Standard

Table 4.1 below provides links to summary evidence that demonstrates Brooklyn College’s compliance with Standard IV: Support for the Student Experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>EVIDENCE OF COMPLIANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. clearly stated, ethical policies and processes to admit, retain, and facilitate the success of students whose interests, abilities, experiences, and goals provide a reasonable expectation for success and are compatible with institutional mission, including:  
  a. accurate and comprehensive information regarding expenses, financial aid, scholarships, grants, loans, repayment, and refunds;  
  b. a process by which students who are not adequately prepared for study at the level for which they have been admitted are identified, placed, and supported in attaining appropriate educational goals;  
  c. orientation, advisement, and counseling programs to enhance retention and guide students throughout their educational experience;  
  d. processes designed to enhance the successful achievement of students’ educational goals including certificate and degree completion, transfer to other institutions, and post-completion placement. | Admissions criteria-undergraduate and graduate Student Success Office  
Bursar  
Admissions  
Percy Ellis Sutton SEEK Program  
Learning Center  
Orientation  
Center for Academic Advisement and Student Success  
First College Year  
Counseling  
Career Services  
Offices within division of Student Affairs |
| 2. policies and procedures regarding evaluation and acceptance of transfer credits, and credits awarded through experiential learning, prior non-academic learning, competency-based | Transfer Students  
Transfer Evaluations Office for Undergraduates |
### 4.2 Introduction

In this section, we detail how Brooklyn College supports all aspects of the student experience from admission through graduation. Processes for recruitment and admission are clearly defined and align with our mission. Students receive appropriate support services and programming, which are delivered to enhance their success as supported by institutional outcomes data. The chapter discusses these supports. Throughout this section, we provide evidence of our compliance with Standard IV as well and information addressing the following research questions.

1. How do we demonstrate our compliance with Standard IV?
2. Is College policy and guidance information adequate and accessible?
3. Is academic student support adequate for our various constituencies? With particular regard to transfer students, freshmen and graduate students.
4. Is support for co-curricular and extracurricular activities adequate?
5. Are our current levels of staff and resources adequate to support student success?

### 4.3 Admissions, Retention and Graduation

Brooklyn College recruits and admits students who are well-suited to the College, and who are likely to succeed and graduate. Students apply using a CUNY-wide process. The application procedures for all programs is clear and detailed information for distinct populations—such as veterans, international students, and reentry students—is clearly linked to admissions information. Financial aid information is accurate and comprehensive as described in Section 2.2 of this Self-Study Report.

As a senior College in the CUNY system, students must demonstrate proficiency in basic skills—math, writing, and reading—in order to gain entry to a senior College. The College also sets other specific criteria that is clear and well aligned with a prospective students likelihood of academic success at Brooklyn.
The College offers admission to Percy Ellis Sutton Search for Education, Elevation, and Knowledge to first time college students and transfer students who do not qualify for admittance through regular admissions criteria. Founded in 1965, SEEK is the higher education opportunity program at the senior CUNY colleges, established to provide comprehensive academic, financial, and social supports to assist capable students who might not be able to attend college due to their educational and financial circumstances. Students are admitted without regard to age, sex, sexual orientation, race, disability or creed. The CUNY Central Office of Special Programs provides periodic assessment of SEEK Program effectiveness via the SEEK Learning Outcomes Surveys for both freshman and seniors.28

Brooklyn College’s student success data indicate the extent to which we admit students who can succeed at the College.

We measure student success by looking at four indicators.

1. Academic progress toward the degree. To what extent are students earning a sufficient number of credits toward their degrees at the appropriate time in their academic careers.
2. Retention term-to-term, year to year.
4. Post Graduate Outcomes. Graduate school and career.29

4.3.1 Momentum

To further bolster student success, during the 2017-2018 year, CUNY initiated an Academic Momentum Campaign, designed to increase 4-year graduation rates to at least 65% at bachelor’s institutions, beginning with students entering in fall 2019. The campaign encourages students to enroll in 30 credits per year, thereby making satisfactory progress toward degree completion in four years.

Currently, the average time to completion at Brooklyn College across majors is 4.6 years. Brooklyn faculty and staff spent the spring 2018 semester engaged in planning and assessment to better enable those entering in 2019 to meet that outcome. In 2017 before the start of the CUNY-wide campaign advisors began to encourage all full-time students to enroll in 15-credits per semester. They were prompted to do this because of the significance of credit accumulation for degree completion as discussed in the research literature.

The campaign introduced additional strategies, including degree mapping for all majors, meta-major development, and improvements in gateway course completion. Implementation has been swift. Academic programs and advisors have almost completed accurate degree maps for all majors and planning is underway for the development of meta-majors, which can help students build pathways toward their degree completion based on their interests.

---

28 See Appendix 4.A. Annual reporting and other SEEK data can be found as the CUNY Central Office of Special Programs.
Brooklyn College has also begun to look closely at student progress in gateway English and Math courses. Table 4.4 compares the Brooklyn College Math and English Composition pass rates to the CUNY average.

Table 4.2
Gateway Course Completion Rates (2017-2018??)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MATH</th>
<th>READING/WRITING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CUNY Goal</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current CUNY rate</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Brooklyn College rate</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source:

These data show that Brooklyn is not far from the CUNY goal in English Composition and ahead of the current CUNY average rate. The English Department is developing special programming to continue improvements toward the CUNY goal. Completion rates in gateway Math courses, however, are well below the CUNY average. One reason is that the gateway course requirement at Brooklyn College is Precalculus. The other campuses offer College Algebra. Toward that end, the Math Department plans to develop a College Algebra course for non-STEM majors. In addition, faculty members in Math and staff from the Center for Academic Advisement and Student Success are collaborating to better identify students having trouble in the course early in the semester. The College has allocated funds to support this component of the campus’ Academic Momentum initiative. These funds added extra tutoring services for gateway Math students and supported early warning work starting in spring 2018. Assessments of these interventions are currently underway.

The Math Department also plans to adopt other strategies, including the hiring of a math educator for a newly established position of Faculty Coordinator for the gateway math courses, and the adoption of standard syllabi for the gateway options. Other research-based strategies have been proposed and will be considered for College funding next year.

Overall a look at credit accumulation shows that the College has made considerable progress on student academic momentum over the last year. In 2016, 48.9 of first-time fulltime freshmen in bachelor’s programs completed 30-credits in the first-year. By 2017 nearly 60% (59.8%) attained the 30-credit target. While it is too early to know the extent of the impact of the strategies we put in place during the 2016-17 academic year, it appears that the program is already having an impact on credit accumulation. We do know that the creation of degree maps for all academic programs appears to be helping professional advisors, faculty advisors and students. It is recommended that degree maps be developed for part-time and transfer students as well. These maps are expected to serve as a resource in the advisement process by increasing clarity and transparency and unearthing any hidden prerequisites in the degree programs.

4.3.2 Retention and Graduation

30 Both CUNY goals are for FT Freshmen entering in F2019.
With regard to retention and graduation, the most recent data we have is based on the fall 2017 entering cohort. The data show an 82% retention rate for first-time full-time freshmen and a 58% six-year graduation rate; both compare favorably to the rates across CUNY’s senior colleges as indicated in Table 4.3 below.

Table 4.3
Retention and Completion: Comparison across CUNY Senior Colleges, 2017-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FT 1st to 2nd year retention</th>
<th>PT 1st to 2nd year retention</th>
<th>4-year grad rate</th>
<th>6-year grad rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baruch College</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn College</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City College of New York</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Staten Island</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter College</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Jay College</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehman College</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medgar Evers College</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York City College of Technology</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens College</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York College</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: IPEDS, 2017-2018

Table 4.3 also shows that retention in the second year is a concern. The College is currently engaged on investigating the causes beyond the generalized sophomore slump.31 The Office of Student Success and the Advisement Center are working with the Office of Institutional Research and Data Analysis to explore this further. In the interim, they have implemented some stop-gap retention strategies for sophomores. One such strategy is The Sophomore Academy, which has been piloted since 2015. It is meant to act as a bridge between the intrusive first-year advisement practices and departmental/faculty advisement once the student has declared a major. Students may opt to take advantage of the program’s offerings, but participation is not required. Assessment is on-going.

There are challenges to developing sophomore advisement programming. One challenge is the number of full-time professional advisors. Outside of those advisors dedicated to special undergraduate populations, such as the Honor’s Programs and SEEK, the college employs eight professional advisors. Given enrollments, the ratio of students per advisor is at a minimum 1:1500. Assessment of the pilot and further research into the causes of the sophomore attrition at Brooklyn College, will allow the College to develop comprehensive plans to address the problem and to reallocate funds from the Coordinated Undergraduate Education budget to improve sophomore retention.

We are also not satisfied with the four-year graduation rate, even though it ranks third among the 11 senior colleges listed above. Our research into understanding the factors the impact degree timely completion is ongoing. An impediment that we have identified is the ability of students to register for the classes that they need in their degree plan. Table 4.4 below shows the extent of the problem based on the MSCHE Student Survey.

Table 4.4
“Courses that I need are offered frequently enough.” – Student Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Students (n = 939)</th>
<th>First-Time Freshman (n = 147)</th>
<th>Entering Transfer Students</th>
<th>Continuing UNG Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MSCHE Survey 2018

The data show that while entering first-year students did not seem to experience challenges in registering for the courses they needed, upper class students (transfer students bringing credits in, or continuing undergraduate students) appear to have had a different experience. More than 50% of continuing undergraduate students and more than 37% of the transfer students disagreed with the statement: Courses that I need are offered frequently enough.” The issue of course availability for transfer students appeared particularly acute. 41.9% of students surveyed indicated that they were unable to register for their first choice courses or to find other classes that they wanted to take.32

Discussion is underway between enrollment management and academic administrators to determine how to best address this issue. New predictive approaches to scheduling are needed. In addition, routine, timely procedures for opening new section during the registration cycle need to be instituted. In fall 2018, additional funds were allocated to allow for new section openings late in the cycle. The College increased seat count from 56,365 in fall 2017 to 57,855 in fall 2018, a gain of 1490 seats.33 This gain was based on adding 114 sections to the schedule. The impact of this supplemental allocation was considerable on course availability as evidenced by increased enrollment. Further assessment is ongoing.34

Work on improving retention and graduation is continuous and involves all aspects of the college. The initiatives we have put in place, such as the Academic Momentum Initiative, demonstrate our commitments to retention, completion, persistence and success, as does the programming that is described below.

32 See Appendix 4.B, p. for the survey findings.
33 Office of the vice President for Enrollment Management, Course Availability, November 19, 2018.
34 A fuller discussion of the funding allocation decision-making process can be found in Chapter 6.
4.4 Student Information and Records

The College safeguards student records and complies with all CUNY policies and guidelines with regard to access to non-public information as protected by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). Access to student records is highly regulated and occurs on a need to know basis only. The process and permissions is overseen by the College’s Registrar. Information security is a priority and passwords to systems must be changed every 180 days. These technological security requirements are established by the Office of Information Technology and are described in Chapter 2.

4.5 Adequacy and Accessibility of Web-Based Information

The experience of the Working Group IV members indicated that students are not always able to locate the information they need when seeking a specific type of service to support their academic success. In order to assess the accessibility and adequacy of Student Support Information, the Working Group reviewed web-based material and interviewed personnel from offices that are student facing and provide academic support services. These offices are identified in Table 4.5 below.

Table 4.5
Student Support Offices with URLs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OFFICE</th>
<th>URL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athletics, Recreation and Intermural</td>
<td><a href="http://www.brooklyn.cuny.edu/web/athletics.php">http://www.brooklyn.cuny.edu/web/athletics.php</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black and Latino Male Initiative</td>
<td><a href="http://www.brooklyn.cuny.edu/web/about/offices/studentaffairs/offices/blmi.php">http://www.brooklyn.cuny.edu/web/about/offices/studentaffairs/offices/blmi.php</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bursar</td>
<td><a href="http://www.brooklyn.cuny.edu/web/about/offices/bursar.php">http://www.brooklyn.cuny.edu/web/about/offices/bursar.php</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAASS -- Center for Academic Advisement and Student Success</td>
<td><a href="http://www.brooklyn.cuny.edu/web/about/offices/caass.php">http://www.brooklyn.cuny.edu/web/about/offices/caass.php</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Student Disabilities Services</td>
<td><a href="http://www.brooklyn.cuny.edu/web/about/offices/studentaffairs/offices/disability.php">http://www.brooklyn.cuny.edu/web/about/offices/studentaffairs/offices/disability.php</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUNY Edge</td>
<td><a href="http://www.brooklyn.cuny.edu/web/about/offices/cuny-edge.php">http://www.brooklyn.cuny.edu/web/about/offices/cuny-edge.php</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Services</td>
<td><a href="http://www.brooklyn.cuny.edu/web/about/administration/enrollment/esc.php">http://www.brooklyn.cuny.edu/web/about/administration/enrollment/esc.php</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCY -- First College Year</td>
<td><a href="http://www.brooklyn.cuny.edu/web/academics/special-programs/first.php">http://www.brooklyn.cuny.edu/web/academics/special-programs/first.php</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td><a href="http://www.brooklyn.cuny.edu/web/about/offices/financial.php">http://www.brooklyn.cuny.edu/web/about/offices/financial.php</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our students are avid users of online services. For that reasons, web-based information is particularly important for supporting the student experience. The MSCHE Student Survey asked students about their satisfaction with the accessibility of information on the College website. Overall, more than 80% of students expressed satisfaction as indicated in Table 4.6 below. Continuing undergraduate and graduate students, however, expressed higher levels of dissatisfaction than entering students.

Table 4.6
“It is easy to find the information that I need on the Brooklyn College website.”
– Student Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(n=140)</th>
<th>(n=106)</th>
<th>(n=434)</th>
<th>(n=90)</th>
<th>(n=14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MSCHE Surveys 2018

This suggests that the information needs of continuing students are not being met as well as are the needs of entering students, even if BC Web Central—the College’s portal—serves as a convenient source of information and online services for students. Continuing students are not fresh from orientation and starting in the second year most do not see a professional academic advisor. These students require just-in-time reminders about information related to support service resources. Students also develop new needs as they advance in their academic programs, and often students are not sure about what office can provide services to address their needs. For all of these reasons they require clear and robust web-based service information. The Working Group review also revealed some inconsistencies across institutional websites focused on student advising. For example, while CAASS has a well-maintained and up-to-date webpages, academic departmental pages varied in terms of completeness and timeliness of information regarding advisement.

A number of issues also were identified on the University web pages. These issues can negatively impact the student experience. The CUNY Portal, a crucial access point in admissions and later in a student’s Brooklyn College career, is not mobile-friendly. Given that many students rely on mobile devices, this creates a considerable disconnect and hardship. While it is difficult to accurately measure the direct impact that this has on enrollment, it is worth further investigation.

35 ITS, Report on Student Online Use of Services, 2017.
DegreeWorks is a University-wide technological system that enables students to track progress in their declared degree programs. While advertised as being accessible 24/7, persistent downtime has been noted. This limits accessibility and negatively impacts the student experience.

4.6 Access to Face-to-Face Support

Academic Advisement at Brooklyn College is provided by the Center for Academic Advisement and Student Success (CAASS) and by the academic departments. For students who have not yet declared a major, all advising is provided by CAASS. CAASS also continues to advise students in some capacity throughout their Brooklyn College career, even if they have successfully connected with an advisor in their intended major. This stretches our thin advisement resources and is less than optimal with regard to student advisement needs in the major. National standards (NACADA - National Academic Advising Association) recommend an advisor to student ratio of 1:300 for medium-sized, and 1:600 for large institutions. With a staff of 8 advisors, the ratio for Brooklyn College is 1:1500 CAASS advisors. This argues for an increased focus on our current advisement resources and procedures and addition advisement support.

Guidance to students by faculty is specified in the faculty contract. Results from the Departmental Student Advising Survey administered in November, 2016 determined, that of the departments that responded, 85.7% rely on their full-time faculty to advise students. How departments appoint faculty advisors varies ranging from Chairs and Deputy Chairs only to all full-time faculty. Thus, the average ratio of majors/faculty advisor ranges from 12:1 to 300:1. The College’s guidelines affirm the expectation of faculty advisement. Nonetheless, departmental and program-specific advisement varies widely across departments due to enrollment, staffing, and program-specific considerations. The identification of departmental advisors on the website is inconsistent: some departments list advisors without contact information, others are more vague. The establishment of a Faculty Council Advising Committee in 2015 shows faculty recognition about the significance of advisement. The committee has conducted an assessment of B.A.-M.D. Recommendations are currently under review for adoption by the college’s new provost. Working jointly with the provost, the committee has begun to review advisement in our largest academic programs starting this year. The provost plans to work closely with the committee, other faculty, deans and chairs in spring 2019 to develop specific guidelines for yearly advisement planning and delivery for all academic programs. Assessment will be integrated into annual school and departmental evaluations, with implementation slated for the 2019-2020 academic year.

Other college-wide services examined that support student success include the Library and Academic Technology Center, the Magner Career Center, Information and Technology Services (ITS) and the LGBTQ Center. Based on the MSCHE survey and additional assessment data, all are effective in supporting the student experience.

Library & Academic IT (AIT) serves the College community through its print and electronic collections, spaces, services and expertise. Results of the Middle States Student Survey indicated

---

36 “Student guidance” is among the nine elements considered when academic performance of a faculty member is evaluated. See the PSC-CUNY Agreement, Article 18, Professional Evaluation. CUNY faculty are contractually obligated to make themselves available to students.

37 Faculty Handbook, p. 44.
that 89% of students had utilized the library, and that they are largely satisfied with the services they receive. Recent budget cuts have limited the Library’s ability to provide subject matter expertise in some areas. Most notably the absence of a Science Librarian and an Emerging Technology Librarian have limited the Library’s ability to meet student (and Faculty) needs for research support.

**Information Technology Services** and Academic Information Technologies (AIT)/Library [https://tinyurl.com/y9xet6af](https://tinyurl.com/y9xet6af) are responsible for technology on campus including email, website, Blackboard, privacy of student data, informational kiosks, extensive offerings of student technology workshops across various computer platforms. Wi-Fi access and smart classroom technology has expanded considerably in recent years. Supports exist to assist students with web-based and email difficulty: [https://tinyurl.com/y9xet6af](https://tinyurl.com/y9xet6af) Both ITS and AIT maintain computer labs. Students report that “…computer labs are adequate and accessible,” and “…computer technology available to me at Brooklyn College is sufficient for my needs as a student.”

**Magner Career Center** provides students the knowledge, skills, values and opportunities that are essential to fulfilling their career aspirations. Through partnerships with employers, alumni, faculty and staff, students are prepared to succeed in today’s competitive global economy. The center further provides an array of services, including career planning, internship matching, alumni mentoring, professional resume/interview preparation, and they offer a variety of workshops for students. The most recent graduate survey (2015-16) of 720 individuals, in response to the question “How well did the Magner Career Center prepare you for your current occupation?” finds that over 90% of respondents reported “adequately,” “well,” or “very well.”

**The LGBTQ Center** was established in response to student need. Created in 2014, the center seeks to bring together the talents of students, faculty and staff to create programming about issues that affect the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer and/or Questioning, Intersex, and Asexual (LGBTQIA) community.

Transfer students are a group that require specific sets of services to support their experience. The MSCHE Student Survey revealed no obvious disparity between the experiences of transfer and non-transfer students. They demonstrate comparable, albeit slightly lower, levels of satisfaction with regard to web resources and advisement in the major.

The Transfer Student Services Center (TSSC) provides undergraduate transfer students with a seamless transition to Brooklyn College by collaborating with various departments, including the Office of Undergraduate Admissions, the Center for Academic Advisement and Student Success (CAASS), Peer Mentoring (TransferNation), the Office of the Registrar, the Office of Financial Aid, and the Magner Career Center. The TSSC is responsible for processing all transfer credits, including AP, IB, CLEP, and College courses taken while still in high school. The center also serves as a liaison to all academic departments to assist faculty with the process of evaluating transfer credits. Upon acceptance to Brooklyn College, transfer students receive a Transfer Credit Report, listing all courses from prior Colleges and their Brooklyn College equivalents.

38 Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory (2015).
39 New freshmen, receive a Transfer Credit Report once enrolled.
Anecdotal evidence suggests that transfer credit evaluation does not always happen quickly enough to satisfy the potential transfer student. In addition, the College’s policies and mechanisms for prior learning assessment are quite limited. While Brooklyn accepts some CLEP exam credits, it does not have robust prior learning assessment systems and guidelines that are capable of meeting the needs of today’s adult learners. Given the decline in numbers predicted for the high school population and the needs of recent immigrants and first generation adults for higher education, the development of rigorous and robust student-friendly prior learning assessment policies should be considered.

Information regarding Articulation Agreements between Brooklyn College and partner institutions can be found: [https://tinyurl.com/yc23t7o6](https://tinyurl.com/yc23t7o6). An early fall 2018 review of articulation agreements by Academic Affairs and Enrollment Management indicated that not all are up-to-date. Responsibilities for leading the review and up-date process had not been clearly reassigned when Academic Affairs was reorganized. The Special Assistant to the Provost has now been charged with this responsibility and is currently working with faculty and staff across institutions in priority transfer areas to update articulation agreements.

A special program that supports the expansion of transfer student research opportunities is The Mellon Undergraduate Research for Transfer Students Program (within the Center for the Study of Brooklyn. It facilitates their ability to conduct serious and rigorous independent research, giving them the support and training they need to succeed, and helping them develop mentor relationships with faculty. The latter is particularly important since transfer students often have difficulty identifying mentors early in their experience at a new college.

### 4.7 Adequacy of Co-Curricular and Extra-Curricular Activities

Students appear to be satisfied with the availability of activities. They are adequate for levels of student interest and engagement based on the MSCHE Student Survey. A variety of extra-curricular student programming exists, including athletics, recreation/intramurals and student clubs.

Table 4.7 provides a snapshot of extra-curricular programs. Table 4.8 lists intercollegiate and intermural athletic opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civic Engagement</th>
<th>The Office of Civic Engagement and Social Responsibility strives to create and provide opportunities for students to contribute positively to the quality of life in both the campus and larger communities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clubs</td>
<td>Student choose to participate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>This URL provided a brief overview of intercollegiate and intermural sports available on campus, as well as a link to the cites for specific teams.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As the name suggests, at this URL students can find information about recreational facilities include a swimming pool; fitness center, basketball, handball and volleyball courts, running track, tennis courts and more.

One of the many examples of respect and support for diversity at Brooklyn College, the LGBTQ center provides a place of support for LGBTQ students.

The College offers a full orientation to all students. The first Year College coordinates First Year Orientation for all in-coming first year students. The orientation is academic in focus. Students develop a working, introductory knowledge of campus resources and degree requirements. They also are also advised and may complete registration. There are opportunities for meeting other students provided. Transfer students are invited to a Transfer Student Welcome Reception that takes place during the first week of classes. They learn about campus resources and opportunities. The focus of the orientation is the opportunity to meet with college faculty, staff, current students and alumni. Student surveys highlight their interest in meeting faculty and in learning tips that help guide their experience at the college.

The table below lists the rich array of team and individual athletic opportunities available to our students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women’s Sports</th>
<th>Men’s Sports</th>
<th>Rec &amp; Intramurals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>Fitness Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerleading</td>
<td>Cheerleading</td>
<td>Swimming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Country</td>
<td>Cross Country</td>
<td>Tennis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>Racquetball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>Swimming &amp; Diving</td>
<td>Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming &amp; Diving</td>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: BC Website

### 4.8 Adequacy of Staff in Student Support Areas

Though existing survey results reflect generally high levels of student satisfaction for a variety of student services, the working group conducted interviews with specific offices. It learned that the budgetary considerations described in the Self-Study Report have limited staff replacements have increased workload for staff in some offices.

1. Financial Aid and Bursar - in 2017 there were reportedly seven counselors available to process more than 22,000 FAFSA applications.

See Appendix 4.C for details about Orientation and assessments.
2. TSSC - reports a relatively small number of staff (4 FT, 4PT) members to administer services to transfer students
3. Office of Scholarships – the Associate Director recently retired creating an unfilled vacancy in a critical position.

The offices named above provide essential financial support to students. Brooklyn College offers more than 600 scholarships, awards, and prizes each year to undergraduate and graduate students, with well over $1 million available to support their education [https://tinyurl.com/zfv3pay](https://tinyurl.com/zfv3pay). Approximately 81% of full-time students received financial aid; for additional detail: [https://tinyurl.com/y7o6j96c](https://tinyurl.com/y7o6j96c). If these essential financial services are not provided at adequate levels, students are not able to complete their enrollment. It is recommended that the College monitor staffing in these areas to ensure adequate staffing from the student’s perspective and from the vantage point of staff workload.

### 4.9 Conclusions

Brooklyn College commits to student retention, completion, and success through a support system of student-centered offices and qualified professionals. A majority of policy and guidance information is accessible and adequate. Evidence suggests that academic student support services are adequate to fulfill student needs. Co-curricular and extracurricular activities were deemed to be sufficient. Existing survey tools reflect generally high levels of student satisfaction for a variety of student services. Interviews with specific offices revealed increased workload due to vacant positions not being filled.

### 4.10 Recommendations Regarding Standard IV and Strategic Plan Alignment

Based on our analysis of Standard IV: Support of the Student Experience, we recommend the following:

- A thorough assessment of the Brooklyn College website’s navigability for students is needed. Student participation in the assessment of their needs is critical. (4.E.e)
- Increase the number of professional advisors to better meet needs; improve the handoff from professional advisement to major advisement; ensure that information about major advisement is available for all programs on the web. Review and consider implementation of the recommendations of the Faculty Council-approved report of the Committee on Student Advisement 2016 and 2017 ([https://tinyurl.com/ybacnyga](https://tinyurl.com/ybacnyga), [https://tinyurl.com/y7cljcvd](https://tinyurl.com/y7cljcvd)) (Goal 2.A.e)
- Investigate the causes of sophomore attrition and develop and implement an action plan.
- Establish improved predictive scheduling models to ensure course availability.
- Improve the review time for the review of transfer credits and consider robust and rigorous Prior Learning Assessment guidelines and procedures.
CHAPTER 5

STANDARD V: EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AND ASSESSMENT

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

5.1 Summary of Evidence of Compliance with the Standard

Table 5.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>EVIDENCE OF COMPLIANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. clearly stated educational goals at the institution and degree/program levels, which are interrelated with one another, with relevant educational experiences, and with the institution’s mission;</td>
<td>Connected CUNY; the CUNY framework, serves as the basis for Brooklyn College goals for students and for the institution. These goals include: college readiness, access and completion, career success and knowledge creation. Brooklyn College Strategic Plan Integrated Annual Plan Program and administrative unit goals/objectives/outcomes are located on annual Assessment Plans and Reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. organized and systematic assessments, conducted by faculty and/or appropriate professionals, evaluating the extent of student achievement of institutional and degree/program goals. Institutions should:</td>
<td>See discussion of annual Assessment Plans and Reports. Assessment document repository Each academic program is expected to identify which program outcomes will be assessed in a given academic year, and how they will be assessed. Methods are determined by the program faculty, with consultation – from assessment professionals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. define meaningful curricular goals with defensible standards for evaluating whether students are achieving those goals;</td>
<td>At the end of each academic year, programs are expected to report on which assessment initiatives they were able to complete, what the information collected suggested, and what decisions have been made for next steps. The templates that faculty are staff are asked to use was revised in 2016-2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. articulate how they prepare students in a manner consistent with their mission for successful careers, meaningful lives, and, where appropriate, further education. They should collect and provide data on the extent to which they are meeting these goals;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. support and sustain assessment of student achievement and communicate the results of this assessment to stakeholders;</td>
<td>Brooklyn College supports the Office of the Associate Provost for Institutional Planning and Assessment. In addition to the Associate Provost, staff include an Academic Assessment Manager. The Office works closely with the Academic Assessment Council and the Institutional Assessment Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. consideration and use of assessment results for the improvement of educational effectiveness. Consistent with the</td>
<td>Once assessments are complete, program faculty meet to discuss the implications of the results.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### institution’s mission, such uses include some combination of the following:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>assisting students in improving their learning;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>improving pedagogy and curriculum;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>reviewing and revising academic programs and support services;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>planning, conducting, and supporting a range of professional development activities;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>planning and budgeting for the provision of academic programs and services;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>informing appropriate constituents about the institution and its programs;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>improving key indicators of student success, such as retention, graduation, transfer, and placement rates;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>implementing other processes and procedures designed to improve educational programs and services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please see the narrative in Appendix S.A for examples of how this has occurred across campus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each academic department is expected to complete a program review every ten years. Program review is monitored by the Associate Provost and Deans collaborate on action plans and oversee their implementation. Support Service units are required to submit annual assessment reports, to report on the achievement of states outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit-level Assessment Plans and Reports include information on assessment planning, implementation, and interpretation and use of the assessment information. Staff: Assessment Day Faculty: Assessment Award</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Planning, Educational Policy and Budget Committee, Budget and Planning Committee, CUE Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment results are shared with program faculty/unit staff to inform decisions going forward.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUNY Academic Momentum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention and graduation rates are reviewed regularly by academic and administrative staff, and strategies discussed to improve upon current practice.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUNY Academic Momentum Program CUE funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 4. | if applicable, adequate and appropriate institutional review and approval of assessment services designed, delivered, or assessed by third-party providers; and |
| 5. | periodic assessment of the effectiveness of assessment processes utilized by the institution for the improvement of educational effectiveness. |
|   | N/A |
|   | All units (academic and AES) are required to submit annual assessment reports to report on the achievement of states outcomes. |

#### 5.2 Introduction

This chapter demonstrates how Brooklyn College meets Standard V. It describes the extensive progress the College has made on educational effectiveness assessment since 2016 when the college submitted a Monitoring Report to the MSCHE. That report focused on documenting the College’s progress on implementing an organized and sustained assessment process to assess student learning and respond to assessment results. The report was submitted in 2016 and accepted
without additional follow-up. The chapter also addresses the following research questions, the responses to each we have integrated into our discussion below.

1. How clear are educational goals at the institutional, degree and program levels? How interrelated are they to one another, with relevant educational experiences, and with the institution’s mission?
2. How effective is Brooklyn College in facilitating a comprehensive and sustainable process of assessment resulting in clearly stated learning outcomes within all majors and programs (both undergraduate and graduate), general education, and educational support programs?
3. How effective is Brooklyn College in using the results of assessment to impact change in curriculum and pedagogy?
4. What evidence do we have of Brooklyn College student success after graduation?
5. How well does Brooklyn College communicate assessment results to internal and external constituents?

5.3 Current Status of Assessment at Brooklyn College

The College has diligently worked to develop and sustain a culture of assessment and continuous improvement. To provide executive leadership for this effort, the College created the Office of the Associate Provost for Institutional Planning and Assessment. The Associate Provost was hired along with her key staff—the Assessment Manager and an administrative assistant—in 2016. The Associate Provost works collaboratively with the Director of Institutional Planning Research and Assessment to oversee, monitor, and evaluate the implementation of assessment activities across the college.

Two committees review assessment activities: (1) The Academic Assessment Council (AAC), and (2) The Institutional Assessment Committee (IAC). The AAC was created in 2014. It is comprised of one faculty member, who receives 3-credits of reassigned time, and one administrator from each of the schools. The faculty member chairs the Council. The AAC also includes the Associate Provost for Institutional Planning and Assessment (APIPA), the Academic Assessment Manager (AAM), and the Senior Director for Institutional Research and Data Analysis. The Chair works closely with the Associate Provost. The work of the Council is supported by an Assessment Coordinator in each academic unit. Ideally the ACC should function as a peer review group. To increase faculty participation in the college-wide review process, the addition of more faculty to the Council is recommended.

The IAC was established in fall 2016 in response to recommendations outlined in the 2016 Monitoring Report. That group is comprised of at least one representative from each division represented on the President’s Cabinet. The IAC is chaired by the Associate Provost who along with the Senior Director for Institutional Research and Data Analysis provides consistency and communication across the divisions. 41

Assessment initiatives that have been undertaken from fall 2016 to the present are described below.

---

41 Minutes from the meetings of both the AAC and the IAC for the 2017-2018 academic year are located in Appendix 5.C.
Reports from the academic departments, interdisciplinary programs, and administrative units show an overall improvement in engagement in the assessment process across the campus. Table 5.2 provides a top-level summary of the submission of annual assessment reports, organized by areas of responsibility within the President’s Cabinet.

Table 5.2 – Summary of Assessment Reports by Cabinet Area

More detailed information can be viewed in Appendix 5.B, which contains a summary table of the status of assessment reports by unit, as well as narrative information detailing successes and challenges within units. While there is progress to be made, the College has made significant strides since the 2014 PRR and the 2016 Monitoring Report.

In 2017-2018, xx% of academic units submitted annual assessment reports, up from xx% in 2016-2017. XX% of administrative units submitted reports in 2017-2018. This represents an X% increase over the previous year. In a review of the components of the assessment reports for both academic and AES areas, we found that units demonstrated strengths in the planning stages of the cycle: that is, when stating the mission, outcomes and the specific assessment strategies that had been planned. However, reports on the implementation of the plans were less specific and clear. This led to the ACC’s and IAC’s review of the many different assessment templates that were in use across the College. The review demonstrated that clear and specific questions yielded improved responses. Therefore, a new template and a scoring rubric were developed for the academic units based upon best practice models. The same template and rubric were adapted for use by the administrative units. Because there was concern about the sustainability of the assessment process, the templates were designed to document the planning and reporting phases of the assessment cycle on the same form. Standard feedback forms were also designed for committee use using the same principle of long-term assessment sustainability. The new templates have led to X and Y improvements in reporting.

In addition to annual assessment reports, the academic units complete program reviews, following a scheduled cycle that was in place before the 2014 Periodic Review Report. The 2007 guidelines for program review were updated to facilitate the review process. A copy of the current program review schedule is in Appendix 5.D. Table 5.3 below lists the program reviews completed since 2014.

Table 5.3 – Program Review since 2014

Program Reviews at Brooklyn College are completed on a 10-year cycle and include all programs offered by a department simultaneously. Both the time span and review scope present significant challenges that make what is already a substantial undertaking more difficult. The challenges programs have experienced include: faculty continuity due to retirements, resignations, non-reappoints and changes in program leadership, the need for significant curricula revision, and modifications in a department or the structure of a program. Academic Affairs leadership will begin sharing best practices and assessments of our current process with all faculty in the spring 2019 at the annual Chair’s Retreat. Moving the campus to a five-year assessment cycle for each

---

42 See Appendix 5.E for all forms
individual program will be a topic for the faculty’s consideration. Emphasis will be placed on action plan development and timelines that will be cooperatively developed by the Chair and Dean.

5.3.1 Initiatives Implemented to Foster a Culture of Assessment

In addition to improving the reporting process for individual units, a number of development opportunities have been offered to staff and faculty in the last several years to spur the growth of a culture of assessment.

X # of workshops were held for both academic and administrative units to support their efforts in completing the assessment template since 2016. XXX number of total faculty and staff attended. Throughout the summer and into early fall 2017 the focus of activities was the development of assessment plans to be implemented during the 2017-2018 year. For the AES units, XXX# of workshop were scheduled throughout the summer to coincide with pre-existing staff meetings, XXXX# of administrators and staff participated. This format enabled smaller group sessions and the use of examples more specific to the individual areas. For academic units, one workshop was held in early Fall, 2017; xxx# of department chairs and assessment coordinators attended. These meetings throughout 2017 focused on the ‘planning’ aspects of the assessment cycle. The same strategy was utilized during the summer and fall of 2018; the focus shifted during this period, however, to assessment reporting. X# of workshops were held this fall, and y# of staff and faculty attended.

Beyond formally scheduled meetings and workshops, bi-weekly Assessment Table sessions were initiated during the Spring of 2018. Following the model of language tables, the Assessment Table was designed to provide an informal, open door time slot for people to drop in with their assessment questions and concerns, regardless of their level of experience in assessment. Communications stressed that no question was too simple or to challenging. Either the Associate Provost for Institutional Planning and Assessment or the Academic Assessment Manager were on hand during the scheduled time. X # of faculty have participated in the Assessment Tables. Although the numbers are lower than we would like to see them, this approach was also well received. The Tables elicited participation from a different audience than the one that has attended the workshops.

Other strategies also have been employed. Members of the Institutional Assessment Committee suggested an event focused on the assessment needs of the AES units to share their successful assessment strategies and stories. The first Assessment Day targeted staff and was scheduled in January with that audience in mind. Attendance was robust and reflected genuine interest in finding out how to do the assessment of their unit effectively.43 Plans are currently underway for a second Assessment Day to be held in early January 2019.

Moreover, faculty with externally accredited programs and schools are often advocates for accreditation and have also learned to conduct it well. Exemplary assessment that closes the loop to improve student learning takes place in many programs. This year the College plans to showcase assessment practices undertaken by faculty at Brooklyn College that have clearly made a difference in improving student learning. By showing the impact of closing the loop through our

43 Presentations from that day are located XXX.
faculty’s efforts, we will demonstrate the profound impacts assessment has on improving our students’ learning outcomes and bolstering the excellence of our academic programs. This strategy we believe will extend the adoption of assessment practices further and also improve the quality of yearly reporting among all levels of faculty and staff. Some examples of programs we plan to showcase are below. While assessment in them all is comprehensive, we believe the results will inspire faculty to delve deeply into the adoption of unfamiliar assessment practices, improving the quality of assessments overall. We will also provide examples of less robust but excellent models, since we know that what can be sustained in one contest differs in another. Some of these examples are also described below.

5.4 Academic Assessment: Case Studies

The School of Humanities and Social Sciences’ Communication Arts, Sciences and Disorders Department offers an excellent example of comprehensive assessment processes that close the loop on assessment for program improvement.

The department engages in the ongoing and rigorous assessment of its programs from its bachelor’s programs to its participation in the Audiology doctoral program at the Graduate Center. Several of its programs have earned external accreditation.

The M.S. program in Speech-Language Pathology (SLP) has been accredited by the Council on Academic Accreditation of the American Speech-Language Hearing Association since 1968. A distinguishing feature of the department’s assessment process is that it does not rely on an individual coordinator. Rather, assessment is conducted by a committee chaired by the program director/graduate deputy. An interactive, standardized tracking tool is used to monitor student learning outcomes based upon the current national certification standards. The tool lists 14 learning and skills outcomes within specific standards, which students must demonstrate across a number of clinical domains. Students provide formal and informal feedback about the program through the first-year forum, an exit survey, and the student leadership organization. Students conduct self-assessments related to outcomes, and reflective supervision practices are employed. The faculty engage in monthly area meetings and one two-day meeting every year, which focuses on the assessment of student learning. Faculty members are encouraged to report positive trends and concerns so that they can be added to the program’s monthly strategic planning meeting’s agenda. Employer, student and alumni survey tools are distributed and analyzed.

Various faculty members assume the role of reviewer of student assignment artifacts each semester. Every clinical report is reviewed by the assigned instructor and by another faculty member, who later provides feedback to the clinical instructor.

Distinct elements of the comprehensive process help the program identify program areas that need to be improved to ensure the attainment of student learning outcomes. Upon review of summative exams several years ago, for example, the program identified concern of a knowledge deficiency across several students in a specific clinical domain (dysphagia/swallowing). The program director subsequently surveyed all second-year graduate students regarding knowledge, and separately surveyed clinical SLPs employed by externship sites regarding clinical expectations. Survey results identified limitations in the application of clinical dysphagia
intervention and resulted in the program implementation of a series of required experiential learning activities. Follow-up surveys of students and clinicians revealed an improvement in learning and skills outcomes. These activities have now been formally adopted by the program.

Another area the program most recently identified that needed improvement is the development of clinical writing skills. An ongoing review of student clinical writing revealed both faculty and student concerns about the level of mastery, which were further supported by feedback from internship and externship clinical instructors. A series of clinical writing workshops have been implemented in the current semester with the support of a CUNY doctoral teaching fellow. As this is currently in progress, data cannot yet be used to demonstrate improvement, but anecdotal evidence is promising.

The School of Education’s methods differ from those from the Speech-Language Pathology programs because of disciplinary differences and the distinct processes required by the accreditor. The difference underscores the importance of particularizing assessment to the program. The discussion below highlights these factors.

Currently, the School of Education is transitioning to a new accreditor, the Association for Advancing Quality in Educator Preparation (AAQEP). Before the decision was made to pursue AAQEP accreditation in May, 2018, program faculty in each undergraduate and graduate program in the School of Education (SOE) developed assessments and rubrics aligned with learning goals and standards in their respective fields. Each Specialized Professional Association, or SPA, requires that programs within its purview submit candidate completer data on six to eight assessments that include state educator licensure exams, a measure of content knowledge, a measure of candidates’ ability to plan and implement instruction, an evaluation of student teaching or practicum performance, a measure of impact on P-12 student learning, a measure of relevant nonacademic factors or educator dispositions, and one or two optional additional assessments chosen by faculty in teacher preparation programs. Educational Leadership and School Psychology programs follow the same procedures but submit slightly different measures based on standards in their fields. The final section in each report is a description of how a program analyzes all assessment data collected and uses these data to revise goals, assessment measures and rubrics for continuous program improvement and growth in student learning. Most of these same types of assessments and all procedures are also required by AAQEP.

Each program determines which data to collect at various checkpoints: college admission, admission to specific program, admission to practicum/internship, performance in practicum/internship, and certification/licensure. Multiple measures are required at each of these stages that include grade point average, test scores, performance evaluations, candidate reflections, employer and completer surveys, focus groups, curriculum and lesson plans, and portfolios. At least once per semester, all faculty members in each program meet to analyze all required data that has been collected and document changes made based on this analysis. Additionally, a team of faculty members with interest and expertise in assessment, representing each of the four departments in the School meets frequently each semester to review and revise assessments and develop common assessments across programs as appropriate. The Dean has invited school and community stakeholders to serve on the Dean’s Advisory Council as well as students recommended by faculty
from each of our programs to participate in a Student Advisory Council. Each council meets once per semester to advise the Dean on ways to meet student and community needs.

Another model used across a school, is the model used by the Koppelman School of Business. The Assurance of Learning Steering Committee (AOLSC) is charged with development and review of policies related to all Assurance of Learning (AOL) activities in the School. The AOLSC consists of six faculty representatives, two from each of the three departments engaged in AACSB accreditation and is chaired by the Associate Dean. Five sub-committees report to the AOLSC. Each sub-committee develops and refines conceptual/operational definitions, rubrics, and assessment procedures related to one of the learning goals. The sub-committees consist of three to four volunteer faculty members who expressed particular interest in a sub-committee’s assigned learning goal. The Assurance of Learning program also includes faculty course coordinators assigned for each of the multi-section foundation and business core courses in the BBA and BS degrees programs. Core course coordinators review syllabi to assure that there is consistent content and learning goals across sections. The program infrastructure actively engages 31 faculty members and provides a process designed to ensure rigor and sustainability.

The development and revision of learning goals for the undergraduate and graduate degree programs relies on multiple sources of information: (1) Annual Alumni/Employer surveys; (2) Annual studies of the NYC job market; (3) Continuous employer/faculty interaction scheduled in collaboration with the MCC; (4) Annual Business Matters event and the Business Matters speaker series; (5) Bi-annual benchmarking of AACSB competitors in the New York City area; (6) and nationally published employer studies of needed 21st century undergraduate learning skills. Data and information are reviewed by the Assurance of Learning Steering Committee and recommendations are forwarded to the Department Curriculum Committees.

During the last 5 years, 6 learning goals were conceptually and operationally defined for the BS and BBA programs at the undergraduate level and the MSBA and MS program at the graduate level. Learning opportunities relevant to each learning goal were embedded in each core business course, and tools and rubrics were developed for assessment of each learning goal. Since spring 2014, learning goal definition, assessment, close-the-loop, and learning goal revision have occurred for each learning goal in both the undergraduate and the graduate programs. In most cases at the undergraduate level, the results of closing the loop on assessment have been profound. Student outcomes on 5 of the 6 learning goal assessments show substantial performance improvements. Of particular note, the assessment scores of students’ written communication were 63.4%, 73.1%, and 84.5% proficient or better in 2014, 2016, and 2018, respectively. Similarly, students’ scores on the critical thinking assessment increased from 54% proficient in fall 2016 to 81% proficient in fall 2018. Perhaps, of greatest consequence students placed in the 24th percentile nationally in 2016 and in the 30th percentile nationally in fall 2018 on the ETS Major Field Test in Business. This is an outstanding achievement that speaks to the improved culture of assessment among in the Koppelman School of Business.

In addition to the above examples, many other departments have taken bold steps in closing the loop, entirely revamping a major (e.g., Television and Radio), shaking up a string of requirements (e.g., Theater), re-evaluating their pre-requisites (e.g., Business), refashioning course sections for particularly vulnerable populations (e.g., Physics), or adding new courses (e.g., Accounting).
To design effective interventions to deepen the culture of assessment at the College, we have examined results from the MSCHE faculty and staff surveys. They elucidate faculty and staff perceptions about assessment at the College. Roughly three quarters of the faculty and staff surveyed agree that Brooklyn College values assessment, but fewer agree that Brooklyn College values the time needed to conduct assessment as Table 5.4 below shows. Roughly half the faculty and approximately two thirds of staff agree that the College administration clearly communicates their expectations around assessment. A majority of faculty find that their department chairs communicate well how they are to conduct student assessment in their classes, but are divided on how well the dean performs this same role.

Table 5.4
Learning Outcomes Assessment – Survey Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Faculty (n=277)</th>
<th>Staff (n=367)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brooklyn College values learning assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brooklyn College values the time needed to effectively assess student learning outcomes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College administrators clearly communicate their expectations for learning outcomes assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MSCHE Surveys 2018

To address this, the provost is now linking responsibility for assessment to the dean’s role in collaboration with the associate provost. The dean’s annual evaluation of each department will
include the assessment of student learning. This will allow deans to more closely monitor the implementation of assessment plans and to provide encouragement, expertise, and resources to departments as these are needed to improve student learning.

Another advance the college has most recently made on assessment is the development of a General Education assessment plan. As outlined in Chapter 3, CUNY instituted, Pathways, a system-wide general education curriculum in 2012 that Brooklyn College faculty did not formally adopt until Spring 2017. The provost established the position of General Education Faculty Director in fall 2018 and appointed Professor Caroline Arnold to fill the role. Part of the responsibility of the director is leadership for general education assessment. Professor Arnold is working with the Faculty Council General Education Committee and across the College to complete the assessment plan for the new Pathway’s curriculum. It is anticipated that the plan will be established by the end of spring 2019, and that it will be implemented immediately thereafter.

The Academic Assessment Council completed a small-scale pilot assessment of the written communication outcome of Pathways in Spring 2018. Student papers were secured based upon a review of syllabi from faculty volunteers. Faculty who participated (n = 5) were asked to redact student identity and submit papers from the end of the Fall 2017 semester. Members of the Brooklyn College Academic Assessment Council reviewed the student artifacts using the Value Rubric from the American Association of Colleges and Universities. The results are shown in Table 5.5, below. Though the sample was small and must be interpreted cautiously, the results show student writing is weakest in mechanics and strongest in ___________. This data coupled with other course level data provides insight for further investigation as assessment of the new General Education program moves forward.

Table 5.5 here – results of SPSS analysis

5.5 Success of Students After Graduation

The Brooklyn College Office of Institutional Research, in cooperation with the CUNY Central Office, annually surveys recent graduates. The 2017-2018 survey showed that 74% of our undergraduates were employed at the time of the survey and an additional 17.4% were pursuing further education. Graduate students were faring even better: 84.7% were employed and 7.3% were pursuing further education. While employment and graduate school outcomes appear favorable, income levels do not, despite the fact that the college is among the most successful in the country at moving students out of poverty. The college has just begun to examine this issue. It is recommended that the college investigate this further and develop closer ties between individual programs and communities of practice to learn more about the income opportunities that are available for graduates in their chosen careers.

In cooperation with the Office of Alumni Affairs a survey was sent to all Brooklyn College alumni as part of the self-study process. A total of 1057 alumni responded, representing graduation cohorts from 1944 to 2017. From the survey, we learned

44 See the draft General Education Assessment Plan in Appendix 3.D.
45 See Appendix 5.F.
Individual schools engage in some tracking of recent graduates with an eye towards the preparedness of students from both the student and employer perspectives. For example, the School of Education actively mines two tools for measuring the success of their graduates. These are the Brooklyn College Office of Institutional Research 2013 Alumni Survey and the Brooklyn College Employer Satisfaction Survey 2016-2017. According to the former, 78% of the School of Education alumni as compared to 59% of non-School of Education alumni said they were either very well or well prepared for their jobs by their Brooklyn College education. The response rate to the Employer Satisfaction Survey 2016-2018 (ESS) was low; of those who responded 55% thought the program prepared teacher candidates for their professional experiences either very well or well.

The Department of Health and Nutrition Sciences keeps track of graduate success by reviewing the results of the registered dietician-nutritionist examination. The pass rates are favorable. In 2015, 94% of Brooklyn College graduates passed the exam within one year. In 2016, there was a decline, with an 82% pass rate. While the number still compares favorably with the national average of first time test takers, the Department will closely monitor the pass rate to see if adjustments are needed. The department also reports success with post-graduation internship placements, graduate program acceptances, publications and awards. A survey of their 2017 graduates found that 77% were currently working in schools.

A number of departments indicate that they maintain a database of contact information for alumni. In interviews conducted by Working Group members, two departments specifically indicated working with the College Alumni Office to identify and contact alumni but with different levels of success. Most academic departments lack a regular plan for follow-up with their graduates. This is also true of the Office of Graduate Studies. More typically, departments and programs gather anecdotal information about their graduates when graduates themselves choose to stay in touch with a favored professor. Of particular note, both the English Department and the History Department were able to supply long lists of graduates who have gone on for further studies (masters or PhD level) or who have careers teaching in higher education.

Among the operational units, the Honors Academy is a model in longitudinal assessment of its graduates. They survey outgoing seniors and track their yearly post-graduate outcomes and progress through email. It is not atypical to see students in each cohort with multiple graduate school acceptances, whereas others have opted for a gap year abroad or opted for officer training in the military. Other units of note in this regard include the Scholarship Office; it invites Rosen Scholar alumni back to campus to meet each new undergraduate cohort and the Learning Center keeps track of tutors and their pursuit of higher education and employment post-graduation through email but does not track students who use their services post-graduation.

The Magner Center maintains connections with alumni and uses a google form to keep their information on alumni up-to-date. The Center is in regular conversation with the Brooklyn College Foundation which shares an interest in alumni as a resource. Whereas the Foundation primarily cultivates donors, the Magner Center sees alumni as a source of expertise, mentoring and internships. In turn, their efforts to bring alumni on campus for speaker panels and other events that often lead to an increased interest in monetary giving. The Center regularly follows up with
employees who hosted Brooklyn College student interns to learn if they have placed students into paid jobs post-graduation.

*Among non-degree units, learners who complete programs have shown marked success. The Adult Literacy Program, for instance, is funded by WIA/AIOA Title II and as such is required to report quantitative data on student post-graduation activity. In FY 2016 73% of those who completed the program 73% entered post-secondary education or training; 67% entered employment, and 80% retained or improved their employment. Another program is the BC Bound high school equivalency to degree program, which is funded...*

*A number of operational units do not look at their specific role in the success of Brooklyn College graduates, but gathering data could be valuable, especially to determine the effectiveness of the Center for Academic Advisement and Student Success (CAASS), First Year College, International Education and Global Engagement and International Student and Scholar Services.*

5.6 Sharing of Information

Communication of assessment results is valuable in that it allows departments, programs, and units to offer examples of pro-active engagement in the entire assessment process and provides models for peers. A significant number of departments are currently communicating results within their own departments and chairs are expected to send these reports to their school deans. The role of the Dean in monitoring had not been established before this year; we believe that it will make a difference, especially because the Dean can act as a helpmate to the Department and marshall resources that may be necessary for program improvement. The Dean can also provide systematic and regular feedback with a depth that the departments may not have previously experienced. And the Dean’s role helps facilitate the sharing of assessment results for continuous improvement across schools and across the College. Assessment must be seen consequential for faculty to fully embrace it and utilize to its fullest for program improvement; otherwise it appears as make work.

Indeed, obstacles to communication include lingering attitudes that outcomes assessment is a process demanded by the administration and not desired by the teaching faculty. Additionally, a lack of clarity as to who has authority, particularly in interdisciplinary programs closely aligned with one department or another, also may interfere with both follow-through and communication of an assessment report. We believe that the steps we are taking this year to demonstrate the positive impacts of assessment through faculty-led sharing and decanal involvement will make a marked difference.

Among administrative units, the Office of Scholarships offers a fine example of assessment results shared in an operational unit reaching beyond the expected audience. The Office reports that donors are apprised of what others are doing in support of Brooklyn College students. The Zicklin Summer Fellowship program, which provides students with funding for credit-bearing domestic internships and summer course work, is considering broadening its own criteria to mirror the Rosen Fellowship. The Rosen Fellowship gives support to international student summer travel.

Lastly and most broadly, results of the Office of Institutional Research reports, many of which speak to institutional effectiveness, are published on the College web site but are password
protected. This practice impacts on the ability of the College to communicate any of its successes, particularly related to institutional effectiveness, to those outside of the College who may be interested. A site could be created specifically to facilitate the sharing of assessment data that does not need to be password protected. Additionally, the development of an assessment scorecard along with analytical reports that summarize data would be helpful for the college community.

5.7 Conclusions

Carrying the assessment process through from plan to closing the loop reaps rewards for the institution beyond changes that are made to pedagogical practices and support operations. Success in completing an assessment cycle is emboldening for those who have come through the process and can be inspiring for those taking their first steps through the process or others reluctant to begin. Brooklyn College departments and units that have completed an assessment cycle are eager to share their experience and ready themselves for another round of assessment. Moreover, many departments have found the assessment process itself an opportunity to reconsider how they carry out assessment. An interest in improving the assessment process itself is pivotal in assuring that assessment will be sustained within a department, program or unit, and is just as important as a department’s following through with closing the loop at the end of an assessment cycle. Interest in changing and improving the assessment process keeps the work alive and compelling, just as change in pedagogy, initiated by the assessment process, makes teaching more effective.

Brooklyn College has made progress towards building a culture of assessment since the 2016 Monitoring Report, through the encouragement of the work of individual departments and the development of clearer processes, and the investment in assessment expert staff at the executive and managerial levels. The role of each of these is to look at the large and complex tapestry of assessment on campus, identify gaps in the fabric, propose remedies in processes, and offer support so that the culture of assessment will permeate all offices and departments.

5.8 Recommendations Aligned with the College’s Strategic Plan

The following recommendations are offered for moving Brooklyn College forward in its work in institutional effectiveness and assessment in addition to strategies already discussed above and appreciably underway.

- Explore the feasibility of reducing the number of years that the program review covers from ten to five and limiting reviews to individual programs (Goal 1.A.a)
- Add additional faculty to the Academic Assessment Committee
- Leverage and publicize the success of departments and units that are sustaining an assessment process. Share these successes as models that others can follow. Continue to award model initiatives and departments and provide opportunities for mentorship (1.A.a)
- Begin assessment orientation early in the careers of faculty and staff to help them see the value and importance of a sustained assessment practice. Target new faculty and staff for workshops, both internal and external, and continue to work with department chairs and unit heads. These steps must be monitored and repeated, as there is frequent turnover and ongoing training has to be sustained.
• Build responsibility for assisting in closing the loop on program assessment into the Dean’s role.

CHAPTER 6

STANDARD VI: PLANNING, RESOURCES, AND INSTITUTIONAL IMPROVEMENT

The institution’s planning processes, resources, and structures are aligned with each other and are sufficient to fulfill its mission and goals, to continuously assess and improve its programs and services, and to respond effectively to opportunities and challenges.

6.1 Summary of Evidence of Compliance with the Standard

Table 6.1 summarizes the evidence that demonstrates the College’s compliance with Standard VI: Planning, Resources and Institutional Involvement.

Table 6.1
Standard VI: Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>EVIDENCE OF COMPLIANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. institutional objectives, both institution-wide and for individual units, that are clearly stated, assessed appropriately, linked to mission and goal achievement, reflect conclusions drawn from assessment results, and are used for planning and resource allocation;</td>
<td>Each academic and AES unit is expected to have outcome/objective appropriate to their mission (the scope of what they do). The annual assessments are used to inform unit-level decision moving forward. CUNY Master Plan Brooklyn College Strategic Plan Annual Integrated Planning Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. clearly documented and communicated planning and improvement processes that provide for constituent participation, and incorporate the use of assessment results;</td>
<td>Assessment Highlights and Awards Annual Integrated Planning Process PMP Planning CUE Planning and Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. a financial planning and budgeting process that is aligned with the institution’s mission and goals, evidence-based, and clearly linked to the institution’s and units’ strategic plans/objectives;</td>
<td>Master Planning, Educational Policy and Budget Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. fiscal and human resources as well as the physical and technical infrastructure adequate to support its operations wherever and however programs are delivered;</td>
<td>Please see Human Resources and Financial IPEDS reports [here...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. well-defined decision-making processes and clear assignment of responsibility and accountability,</td>
<td>Brooklyn College Strategic Plan President’s Cabinet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. comprehensive planning for facilities, infrastructure, and technology that includes consideration of sustainability and deferred maintenance and is linked to the institution’s strategic and financial planning processes; Master Planning, Educational Policy and Budget Committee

7. an annual independent audit confirming financial viability with evidence of follow-up on any concern cited in the audit’s accompanying management letter; Audit reports

8. strategies to measure and assess the adequacy and efficient utilization of institutional resources required to support the institution’s mission and goals; and Master Planning, Educational Policy and Budget Committee

9. periodic assessment of the effectiveness of planning, resource allocation, institutional renewal processes, and availability of resources. All units (academic and AES) are required to submit annual assessment reports, to report on the achievement of states outcomes.

6.2 Introduction

Brooklyn College demonstrates compliance with Standard VI. The chapter highlights our use of assessment and evaluation to drive decision-making processes primarily by focusing on the offices of (1) Budget and Planning, (2) Information Technology Services, and (3) Facilities, Planning, and Operations. Across these units, individual unit objectives are consistent with internal goals, in alignment with the overarching goals of the College, and in compliance with CUNY policy and guidelines. The studies also show that data-driven decision making and planning occurs in multiple ways across a range of units. Data and assessment driven measures have helped mitigate the impact of the significant reductions in New York State funding the University has experienced in 2015-2018. The chapter also integrates discussion of the following research questions.

1. How do we demonstrate our compliance with Standard VI?
2. What are the most significant challenges facing Brooklyn College regarding its human, financial, technological, and physical resources? How are these issues identified? How are they addressed?
3. Are the appropriate stakeholders aware of how resources are allocated from CUNY and other sources? How nimble is Brooklyn College in responding to changes?
4. How does Brooklyn College use assessment information for planning, resource allocations, and institutional improvement to achieve its mission and ensure students complete their degree in a timely manner?

6.3 Linkages among Institutional Objectives, Assessment, Planning and Resource Allocation

A key component of the college’s recent strategic planning process was the review of a wide-array of institutional assessment and evaluation data tied to the CUNY strategic framework. This included an examination of student enrollment and success data, faculty satisfaction, research, and teaching assessment and capacity data, and financial and administrative reports among other available information. Trends were identified that informed the development of the Brooklyn
College Strategic Plan 2018-2023 that have been described throughout the Self-Study Report. President Anderson and her cabinet will review progress on the Strategic Plan quarterly and as part of this monitoring process will identify any misalignments between the budget and the plan’s actual implementation. With the implementation of the College’s new strategic plan, the president’s cabinet is working on an integrated annual planning and assessment process that will specify the individual activities related to planning, budgeting, and assessment and place them on a timeline with the identification of most accountable persons, committees and cross-institutional teams. We anticipate completing the document by the end of the academic year and working with all stakeholders to make them fully aware of the processes and their role in them.

6.4 General Process of Administrative Oversight and Planning

The three offices highlighted in this chapter--Budget and Planning; Human Resource Services; Information Technology Services; and Facilities, Planning, and Operations-report to the Senior Vice President for Finance and Administration (SVPFA): their respective directors sit on the SVPFA cabinet, which was formed in spring 2018. This permits inter-unit discussion among directors, facilitates opportunity for collaboration, and allows for the marshaling and leveraging of appropriate resources. Individual SVPFA units collect and assess data on both a regular and ad-hoc basis, and automated and scheduled reports inform baseline performance and function. Each unit submits an annual planning document to the Institutional Assessment Committee, which is charged with providing feedback.

6.5 The Financial Planning and Budgeting Process

6.5.1 The Basic Operating Budget

Prior to 1976, the full costs of operating CUNY were paid by New York City. However, the near bankruptcy of city in the 1970’s led to an agreement by then-Governor Hugh Carey to take over fiscal responsibility for the CUNY senior colleges, while funding of the community colleges remained the responsibility of the city. As a result, the majority of Brooklyn College’s public funding comes from New York State, as Brooklyn is a senior college

Brooklyn College’s operating budget is largely funded by tax levy from New York State (about 24%) and New York City (1%), as well as tuition revenue (75%). As a result, the College’s annual fiscal year budget is heavily dependent on deliberations between the University and the State of New York. Our planning and budgeting processes are therefore subject to those of the University and the State.

In FY2018, the College’s tax levy base budget was $122,292,702. Table 6.2 provides a snapshot of recent funding.46

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tax Levy Funding (in thousands)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

46 Detailed information can be viewed in Appendix 6.A.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2014 Actual</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2015 Actual</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2016 Actual</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2017 Actual</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2018 Proj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CUTRA Beginning Balance</td>
<td>3,294</td>
<td>2,176</td>
<td>2,611</td>
<td>4,553</td>
<td>4,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>117,063</td>
<td>122,500</td>
<td>123,996</td>
<td>153,266</td>
<td>135,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>118,181</td>
<td>122,074</td>
<td>122,055</td>
<td>153,371</td>
<td>136,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUTRA Adjustment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUTRA Ending Balance</td>
<td>2,176</td>
<td>2,611</td>
<td>4,553</td>
<td>4,462</td>
<td>3,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition Revenue</td>
<td>89,264</td>
<td>94,748</td>
<td>100,566</td>
<td>103,940</td>
<td>109,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State /City</td>
<td>27,799</td>
<td>27,752</td>
<td>23,430</td>
<td>49,326</td>
<td>26,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Bargaining - State/CUNY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Reserve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centrally Administered Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65,736</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY2019 baselines changed due to process changes with Feirstein and UWI

**Source:**

Each CUNY college has a base budget that is rolled over from year to year; new allocations (or reductions) are then applied to this base budget. Additional lump sums – i.e. those not impacting the base budget – are then allocated; these generally consist of funding for short-term or limited academic and/or student-based initiatives. During the year, colleges can request additional funding from CUNY’s central administration (subject to a review process). Tuition revenue, also transferred as a lump sum, is based upon enrollment targets; colleges are able to keep any surplus in a de-facto reserve fund (CUTRA, the City University Tuition Reimbursement Account).

### 6.6 Alternative Sources of Funding and Revenue

In addition to tax levy funding, the College utilizes several other funds to support institutional activities:

#### 6.6.1 Income Funds Reimbursable (IFR)

IFR funds are considered state funds but, unlike the tax levy budget, are cash-based, revenue generating, self-sustaining accounts that exist for a distinct purpose. For example, the college collects materials fees as part of students’ tuition bills. These fees are accounted for separately from regular tuition payments and are placed into an IFR account that has been purpose to provide specific materials for a given area. For example, it is used to collect tuition from institutional partners and noncredit students for Adult and Continuing Education. These funds cannot be transferred to a regular tax levy budget and can be rolled over from year to year.

#### 6.6.2 Non-Tax Levy

Non-Tax levy funds are generated through various means outside of regular tuition and state allocations. The College collects over $3.5 million annually from student activity fees, which support the Student Center, Brooklyn College Association (which includes student government, student clubs, athletics and recreation, Health Clinic, and EMS) Athletics, and the Early Childhood...
Center. Several other non-tax levy accounts exist, which are used by departments with revenue-generating abilities to support their programmatic needs. To enhance administrative efficiency and oversight, the staff who deal with non-tax and tax levy-budget and finance were recently consolidated, as transactional and budgetary processes will be soon migrated to CUNYfirst.

6.6.3 Auxiliary Enterprise Corporation (AEC)

The AEC is a self-supporting, revenue generating, not-for-profit corporation created and operated for the principal purpose of benefiting the students, faculty, staff, and other members of the community. The AEC provides auxiliary services including – but not limited to – food services, pouring rights, external rentals, ATM’s, parking operations, and trademark licensing. Annual Auxiliary Enterprise Corporation Revenue totals about $850,000.

6.6.4 Brooklyn College Foundation (BCF)

The BCF is the private fundraising arm of the college. Funds are raised in the form of gifts from alumni and friends of the college, institutional grants, and earnings from both the endowment and other investments. The BCF has undergone various structural permutations. At present, it is a standalone, self-administered entity. Since FY 2006, BCF’s net assets have risen by 71%, from $51.7 million to $88.2 million (close of FY 2017). Since FY 2007, the College has provided oversight of the Foundation’s finances and managed its accounting operations. The college began managing its daily financial transactions and monitoring its budgets in FY 2015.

6.6.5 CUNY Research Foundation (RF)

The RF is a not-for-profit educational corporation with an “arms-length” relationship to CUNY. The RF manages private and government-sponsored grants and funded programs at CUNY, charging transaction-based fees for its services. In FY2017, 108 awards brought $11,687,837 to the College. To date, for FY2018, 84 awards have provided $7,600,539 to advance faculty research and student success programs at the College. The RF maintains its own budgeting, reporting, and administrative processes, separate from those of the College. Indirect cost recoveries from funded projects through the RF typically generate between $1.9 and $2.5 million in funding that is used by the College to support and advance faculty research and institutional priorities. Distribution of these funds is controlled by the College’s senior administrators.

6.7 Budget and Planning

The College’s budget and planning operations are led by several units that report to the SVPFA. These include the offices of Budget and Planning, Student Financial Services, Comptroller, and Compliance (each with a number of subsidiary departments and units).

Other than funds earmarked for specific purposes, seek as SEEK or Coordinated Undergraduate Education (CUE) funding, individual CUNY campuses determine their own internal use of state funds. Three-year financial plans must be developed in consultation with elected faculty and student representatives and submitted to the University. The SVPFA presents an annual overview of the budget and budget process at Faculty Council, Council on Administrative Policy, Policy
Council, and to student leaders at the Brooklyn College Association. New academic chairs are also given an introduction to budget and planning by the SVPFA as part of the orientation process. In addition, subcommittees on Faculty Council (Master Planning, Educational Policy and Budget Committee and Policy Council (Fiscal, Infrastructure and Planning Committee) provide input and feedback regarding budgetary matters.

Through the Strategic Planning Process, the need to increase transparency, communication, and inclusion in the financial planning process became apparent. To address this, the Budget and Planning Committee was established in 2018 as an advisory body on the budget. It is also charged with disseminating more detailed and complex information about the budget to the college community. Its membership currently includes faculty and executive level administrators. Plans are underway to expand inclusion to representatives from HEO, civil service staff and student leadership.

Brooklyn College brings its strategic plan, budget, and planning processes into alignment at the cabinet level. Institutional priorities, as set by the President and articulated in the strategic plan, are implemented as summarized in section 6.2 above through the vice-presidents in collaboration with their respective staff. Decision-making is informed by ongoing and ad-hoc data from the offices of Business Analytics and Data Reporting and Institutional Research and Data Analysis. The Strategic Planning Group, composed of the members of the cabinet (without the president), meet regularly to assess progress towards the interrelated goals of the College’s 2018-2022 Strategic Plan, CUNY’s Strategic Framework (“Connected CUNY”), and the PMP (Performance Management) process. At the close of the fiscal year, each member submits to the President a report of accomplishments for the preceding year and goals for the coming one on behalf of their divisions; these include explicit connections to the Strategic Plan, PMP, CUNY Master Plan and to each division’s efforts toward each goal; thus, objectives for the coming year (FY’19) are specifically linked to Year 1 benchmarks across the five goals of the Strategic Plan.

Departments are issued base budgets for Other than Personnel Services (OTPS) and Temporary Services (TS). The latter includes funds to support adjunct faculty and part-time employees. These funds that are generally rolled over from year to year, though increases (or reductions) can result in an adjustment to the overall base amount.

Historically, lump sums were issued to schools to pay for adjunct faculty, which represent roughly 50% of overall instructional capacity. The college is re-examining this roll-over, lump sum budget allocation method based on the following assessment information. 41.9% of the fall 2017 transfer cohort who responded to the transfer survey indicated that they were unable to register for any of their first choice classes or find others they wanted to take. To address the shortfall in section scheduling, a zero-based budgeting model was piloted in fall 2018. In this structure, adjunct and course staffing priorities were determined by deans and chairs and funded on an as needed based on student demand. The pilot is being assessed. It appears at first blush that the strategy was successful. Based on our increased fall enrollments, it appears that a higher percentage transfer students were able to enroll in courses they needed for their degree programs or wanted to take.

6.8 The Office of Budget and Planning: Primary Challenges
Given the College’s place within a large, public university system, we are somewhat limited in options and flexibility with which to meet larger institutional goals. Raising tuition and fees, for instance, would require the approval of CUNY’s Board of Trustees. Also, because CUNY is heavily unionized, it can be difficult to reduce staff or to redeploy personnel to areas of critical need. In some cases, legacy units on campus are staffed at levels beyond current needs while at the same time, other areas struggle with significant understaffing.

The diversity of account types in use across campus (e.g. tax levy, IFR, nontax, BCF, and RF) further complicates efficient use of available funds. Accounts administered by the College (including, but not limited to, tax levy, IFR, and nontax levy) are governed by different rules and requirements depending on their type, while those of the BCF and RF represent separate legal entities. The limited fungibility across the different funding sources reduces options for allocating funds and addressing financial needs or adjust planning to conform to allocations.

Another challenge is the frequent funding lag between the state’s fiscal year and the disbursement of funds to the individual campuses (which can vary with the legislative cycle). Though the State and the University operate on a July 1-June 30 fiscal cycle, in some years funding allocations have not been received until the early fall. As a result, the College and its units sometimes begin the new fiscal year with a budget amount that is based on historical data and not the actual allocation. Units then must sometimes delay making strategic funding decisions necessary to advance their needs and priorities.

### 6.8.1 The Office of Budget and Planning: Addressing the Challenges

All budget and planning units actively utilize data collection and assessment in their operations. When issues are identified, the Office of Business Analytics and Data Reporting with the guidance of the SVPFA helps identify: (1) the types of data required to measure and assess improvement; (2) the systems and tools from which data can be extracted; and (3) the appropriate parameters and benchmarks for success. Refinements to this process can help further narrow down and identify the causes of the challenges being addressed.

The Office of Business Analytics and Data Reporting provides support for every academic and administrative unit on campus. Each receives regular reports (daily, weekly, monthly) which help guide decision-making, permit performance assessment, and facilitate oversight. In addition, the office creates customized reporting on academic, administrative and financial processes as necessary.

### 6.8.2 Office of Information and Technology Service (ITS)

Information and technology services and support are provided by two units of the college: (1) Information and Technology Services (ITS) and, (2) the Office of Academic Information Technologies (AIT). The ITS office reports to the SVPFA and is responsible for the overall technical infrastructure of the institution. ITS uses of data and analysis in the discharge of its responsibilities, including the monitoring of infrastructure and alert systems; regular faculty
surveys with regard to the technological experience in classrooms and labs, and ad hoc user surveys on relevance and service quality.

The range and variety of information collected by ITS provide a robust body of data with which to address problems and formulate strategies to minimize potential problems. The following serve as examples. Real time infrastructure monitoring and alert systems help identify potential issues before they can escalate into significant problems. Feedback solicited about the Helpdesk drives customer service, and surveys to faculty about technological in classrooms informs priority setting for repairs and maintenance. In addition, ITS utilizes external expertise in assessment when necessary. For instance, two external evaluations\(^ {47}\) were undertaken sequentially in 2013 to provide baseline information regarding the integrity of the College’s IT infrastructure. Through these assessments, ITS was able to redress critical data protection and information security issues.

Assessment revealed ongoing challenges for the unit. These include the lack of appropriate space for network equipment, and the impact of budget restrictions on the 3-4 year computer equipment replacement cycle, space for IT equipment, facilities constraints related to the age of our buildings, ongoing needs for reprogramming to increase the speed of systems, and to further increase cross-institutional collaboration to better meet user needs.

### 6.8.3 College Facilities

Our campus is one of the largest and oldest in the CUNY system, and its buildings vary in age and condition. Years of deferred maintenance have taken their toll and preventative maintenance, in many cases, has fallen behind schedule. Consequently, the College has often struggled to fully maintain its infrastructure. This has resulted in disruptions of service (plumbing, HVAC, etc.), quality of life concerns, and negative publicity. It is unlikely that the College will be able to secure the funding to completely rebuild the entire infrastructure (currently estimated at $940 million). Attention is therefore devoted to prioritizing needs and finding creative and effective strategies for addressing facilities challenges. Infrastructure repairs are also a double-edged sword: current renovations to address some of the infrastructure issues have led to serious disruptions in classes and research labs because, in most cases, the College cannot close to permit more rapid project completion and the kind of swing space required in not available.

Facilities staffing is also a significant problem, with staff reductions, which have occurred through attrition and are impacting nearly every facet of operations. The staffing variance between 2013 and 2018 is -15 (137 total full and part time staff in 2013; 122 in spring 2018). This is especially marked among custodial assistants (72 to 60).

In late spring 2018, the SVPFA with the support of CUNY’s central administration and the assistance of multiple working groups embarked on an intensive 90-day effort to address the most critical facilities issues on campus. These included repairs to restroom facilities and a host of other general repair needs. The overall project was driven by the Facilities Success Team, with input and external guidance from an ad hoc committee of faculty, staff, and students (the Facilities Advisory Group). The project identified specific goals and outcomes, as well as metrics and a timeline.

---

\(^ {47}\) 2013 (Hill, P. *Assessment of Campus Technology for Brooklyn College* and Stillman, K. *Brooklyn College Network Assessment*)
The goal was to make significant and broad-based repairs. This required significant changes to the processes and procedures used by the Facilities unit. The effective management of tools and resources for maintenance and repair is supported by accurate record keeping, data collection and analysis, and rationalized planning. The process also sought to foreground the importance of this underlying knowledge, skill and ability set. Without this cognizance, any lasting change to the unit’s practices would not occur.

Central to this was a concerted effort to improve and complete the data in the Archibus system, with a focus on updating and correcting the data and developing systems to streamline and facilitate use of the program; ITS, for instance, introduced mobile devices and applications to permit in-field service teams to catalog campus problems and update the system as repairs were completed. To help facilitate adaptation and use of the system, changes were made to its internal workflow. New customized status messages for customers were created, and a scorecard to monitor progress and pending items was developed. This allowed for operational facilities staff to be more effectively deployed.

A comprehensive survey of needs was undertaken, and a 90-day initiative (the “90-Day Facilities Challenge”) was undertaken from April to June. Additional resources were allocated, temporary staff hired, and comprehensive repairs undertaken to address the most critical needs of the campus. Priority was also placed on communications, in order to keep the campus community informed about and engaged in the success of these efforts.

Over the 90-day period, the following successful outcomes were obtained: All 529 bathroom fixtures were repaired and 227 of the 228 of the general issues resolved (the one exception a bathroom door in need of replacement): a success rate of 99.9%. The “BC Fix-it” app was launched, and all custodial supervisors were trained in its use. The “You Matter to Us” Initiative was announced. In order to capitalize on the momentum of the 90-Day Challenge, a plan was formulated to insure continued improvement. “You Matter to Us” connects these ongoing efforts with the new, 5-year Strategic Plan and explicitly links the work of the entire Finance and Administration portfolio to supporting students, faculty, and staff success. Specific consideration was also given the Academic Momentum initiative.

Prior to the 90-Day Facilities Challenge, Archibus (a CUNY-wide system for facilities management) was largely underutilized and its database incomplete. This was in part due to: (1) a shortage of trained supervisors limiting the number of individuals with the appropriate training to use the system; and (2) the value of the system was not fully realized in part because of the poor management of data entry priorities. Although improvements have been made, two features of Archibus remain underutilized:

As of Spring, 2018, the college was not using the system’s scheduled maintenance function, so has no accurate calendar of what needs to be done or when.

The system’s inventory function, which permits storage and retrieval of plans and schematics, was also not used. The University’s central office controls this feature, not the individual colleges. To this end, they send a team of interns every four years to update information, which results in information that is often outdated and incomplete. Having this information in real time would greatly improve maintenance and repair efficiencies.

Because the data in Archibus was variably incomplete, inaccurate, and underutilized and there was a shortage of personnel able to use the system, the college was unable to make effective use of a powerful analytical tool with which to manage its facilities, maintenance, and operations. The new system should address all these issues.
The 90-Day Facilities Challenge was an entirely data-driven initiative that utilized both objective (e.g. number of repairs versus total stock) and subjective (survey) measures; it employed specific goals and metrics and was based upon the perceived shortcomings of a system that had been largely divorced from data-driven planning and decision-making. The success of the initiative demonstrates well the necessity of a continuous cycle of assessment and improvement. It will now form the core of the “You Matter to Us” program.

The project significantly improved the morale of the Facilities staff and provided concrete evidence to the entire College community that with appropriate strategies and collaboration, Brooklyn College can tackle and overcome challenges, even with insufficient budgets.

6.8.4 Communication and Dissemination of Information

As a public institution, transparency and accessibility of information are a legal requirement. The Office of Institutional Research and Analysis provides a wealth of material on its website (http://www.brooklyn.cuny.edu/bc/offices/avpbandp/ipra/index.htm). This includes all IPEDS (Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System) reports prepared by CUNY, an annual requirement of the Higher Education Act of 1965 for all institutions participating in federal student aid programs. Submitted annually to the federal government, these provide information on enrollments, program completions, graduation rates, faculty and staff, finances, institutional prices, and student financial aid. The IRDA website also posts a range of other materials, including (but not limited to): survey results, data on student persistence and attrition, analyses of freshmen, transfer, and graduate students, statistics by major, time taken to obtain degrees, as well as historical enrollment reports dating back to the college’s opening in 1930.

The College also posts information regarding its progress in supporting and advancing CUNY’s larger institutional goals. These Performance Management Process (PMP) reports are posted on the IRDA website and provide additional information on enrollment trends, graduation rates, educational infrastructure initiatives, instructional improvements, faculty research support, diversity trends, etc. (http://www.brooklyn.cuny.edu/bc/offices/avpbandp/ipra/pmpreports.htm).

6.9 The Use of Data Collection and Analysis to Improve the Delivery of Administrative Services

This section provides specific examples about how the College utilizes data and metrics to inform and guide decision-making in support of the institution. Particular initiatives related to improving student tuition collection rates and procurement processes are explored to demonstrate how we increase efficiencies to support the institution’s mission and goals.

6.9.1 Enhancing Student Collection Rates

The introduction of CUNYfirst in FY2013 necessitated significant changes to the standards of practice on the Brooklyn College campus. Though the system’s inauguration came with a number of challenges, it also offered the opportunity to revisit many longstanding operations.
One area of concern was the college’s collection rate on delinquent accounts; at the time of CUNY first’s introduction, these were suboptimal – in the low 90s (%) – and student accounts were not sent to external collection agencies in a timely manner. Moreover, communications between the college and its students were ad hoc and informal, leading at times to ill-will on behalf of students and frustration on the part of the college.

As a result, a new initiative was implemented: Target 98.6, a comprehensive effort to raise collection rates. Central to this initiative was the implementation of a communication plan to help students best plan for funding their education, and to provide them with timely notification with regard to the handling (and escalation) of past due balances. Critical to the success of the effort was a thorough review of the accuracy and integrity of student data in the migration to the new system.

With accurate data and appropriate reporting in place and a thorough student communication and notification system deployed, analyses identified patterns and provided insights into corrective strategies: for instance, certain groups had higher rates of delinquency across the payment lifecycle (transfer, international, and non-degree for instance). Once segregated by category, causes were identified and remediation plans formulated; transfer students, for instance, often had delays in the updating of their student records – a circumstance that was easily rectified.

Data collection and reporting functions were updated as needed. For instance, although CUNY set a one-year target for benchmarking collections rates, Brooklyn College established a two-year measure, which better reflected the actual lifecycle of student debt collection. In this regard, outstanding accounts are held for six months before being sent to a collection agency, which returns these after a year; once reassessed by the college, outstanding debts are sent to a final collection agency, a roughly two-year cycle and beyond which debts are seldom collected.

Although the process took several years, the College achieved the 98.6% by FY2016-2017, a benchmark which it has since maintained and exceeded. The analysis and reporting processes are ongoing, and the next phase consists of an integration of the broader student financial offices (Bursar, Financial Aid, Scholarships, and Auxiliary Enterprises Corporation) into a new division, Student Financial Services (SFS), with which to provide greater economies of scale and better mechanisms of student support.

The improved collection rate has had a significant impact on the college’s bottom line: in general, a 1% increase realizes about a million dollars more in revenue. This improved rate, the highest across the University, is a model of university best practices. It has proved a significant hedge against reduced state funding since FY2016.

6.9.2 Improving the Purchasing and Procurement Department

Procurement is a complex process at Brooklyn College, necessitating adherence to and compliance with several entities, including local College requirements, legal review for contracts at CUNY’s central administration, and procurement guidelines. To assess the actual performance of the department, a system of daily data reporting was implemented in FY2015. This monitoring system has been continuously updated and refined, and currently consists of 13 reports measuring a range
of criteria, including buyer performance statistics; status of requisitions and purchase orders (by
time and location in process), and reports on user errors and system glitches.

Examined diachronically, the data indicated the veracity of a range of issues connected to
prioritization of workflow and processes. At the same time, the unit reported frequent and repeat
errors in user requisitions; these are factors outside their control.

In November-December 2017, a survey\(^\text{49}\) was sent to the College community seeking feedback
about the department. Though the department’s longstanding issues are well-known, the feedback
had been largely anecdotal. Analysis of the information collected confirmed that there were
internal structural issues, and also verified the lack of clarity and understanding of the process
among requestors. A corrective plan was implemented. The unit was restructured internally; the
unit was refocused on procurement, its primary responsibility. It was also able to provide better
oversight of Central Services such as the consolidation of Printworks and Central Services.

A revamped training process for end users was developed and implemented in fall of 2018. This
initiative was coordinated with Human Resource Services to insure integration with their schedule
of employee trainings, alignment with their larger processes and protocols for staff training and
development, and correspondence with existing curricular training and format.

Finally, this effort has demonstrated that the static nature of the daily data reports lacks sufficient
flexibility to help in resolving issues. The ever-growing array of reports undermined their original
purpose; reviewing and acting upon the reports in-and-of-itself became a time-consuming process.
As such, the next phase in the process is the development of an informational dashboard, can be
used in tandem with a streamlined set of basic reports.

The success of these initiatives will be reassessed and corrective actions undertaken as indicated.

### 6.10 The Use of Assessment Information to Achieve the Institutional Mission

As described in Chapter 5, the College is currently building out its support of CUNY’s Academic
Momentum initiative, which focuses on the positive correlation between the speed with which
undergraduates proceed through college and the likelihood of their completing a degree.*
Academic Momentum requires the synchronicity of all of the institution’s levers and gears,
including academic planning, advising, student financial services, and adjunctive support systems.
Given the size and scale of such an undertaking, the entire process is undergirded by data
collection, analysis, decision-making, and assessment across multiple offices and units of the
institution. This ranges from scheduling of courses to the application of staffing resources in order
to support student movement across the undergraduate lifecycle.

### 6.11 Recommendations Aligned with the College’s Strategic Plan

\(^{49}\) See Appendix 6.B for a copy of the survey.

Based upon our analysis of Standard VI: Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement, we recommend the following:

- The use of data in assessment is inconsistent across the administrative units of the campus. To facilitate its use, a proactive approach to disseminating analyses of data to units across the college based on a regular schedule tied to the assessment and planning cycles would be useful. (Goal 4.E.a)

- Because data collection and analysis is a critical resource, more attention needs to be given to prioritizing requests across the campus. While the working group found a great interest in getting data, the utility of the reports was not always apparent. (Goal 4.A.a)
CHAPTER 7

STANDARD VII: GOVERNANCE, LEADERSHIP AND ADMINISTRATION

The institution is governed and administered in a manner that allows it to realize its stated mission and goals in a way that effectively benefits the institution, its students, and the other constituencies it serves. Even when supported by or affiliated with governmental, corporate, religious, educational system, or other unaccredited organizations, the institution has education as its primary purpose, and it operates as an academic institution with appropriate autonomy.

7.1 Summary of Evidence of Compliance with the Standard

Table 7.1 below provides links to summary evidence that demonstrates Brooklyn College’s compliance with Standard VII: Governance, Leadership and Administration.

Table 7.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>EVIDENCE OF COMPLIANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a clearly articulated and transparent governance structure that outlines roles, responsibilities, and accountability for decision making by each constituency, including governing body, administration, faculty, staff and students;</td>
<td>College and University Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a legally constituted governing body that; serves the public interest, ensures that the institution clearly states and fulfills its mission and goals, has fiduciary responsibility for the institution, and is ultimately accountable for the academic quality, planning, and fiscal well-being of the institution;</td>
<td>CUNY Bylaws of the Board of Trustees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has sufficient independence and expertise to ensure the integrity of the institution. Members must have primary responsibility to the accredited institution and not allow political, financial, or other influences to interfere with their governing responsibilities;</td>
<td>Officers of the Board (Bylaws)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ensures that neither the governing body nor its individual members interferes in the day-to-day operations of the institution;</td>
<td>CUNY Bylaws of the Board of Trustees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oversees at the policy level the quality of teaching and learning, the approval of degree programs and the awarding of degrees, the establishment of personnel policies and procedures, the approval of policies and by-laws, and the assurance of strong fiscal management;</td>
<td>CUNY Bylaws of the Board of Trustees CUNY Manual of General Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plays a basic policy-making role in financial affairs to ensure integrity and strong financial management. This may include a timely review of audited financial</td>
<td>CUNY Manual of General Policy (see Article III, “Fiscal Affairs”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements and/or other documents related to the fiscal viability of the institution;</td>
<td>CUNY Bylaws of the Board of Trustees (see §11.4, “The President”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appoints and regularly evaluates the performance of the Chief Executive Officer;</td>
<td>CUNY Manual of General Policy (see Article §5.05 “Chancellor and Presidents, Review and Assessment”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is informed in all its operations by principles of good practice in board governance;</td>
<td>CUNY Board of Trustees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>establishes and complies with a written conflict of interest policy designed to ensure the impartiality of the governing body by addressing matters such as payment for services, contractual relationships, employment, and family, financial or other interests that could pose or be perceived as conflicts of interest;</td>
<td>CUNY Manual of General Policy (see Article II “Board of Trustees”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supports the Chief Executive Officer in maintaining the autonomy of the institution;</td>
<td>CUNY Manual of General Policy (see Article II “Board of Trustees”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a Chief Executive Officer who: is appointed by, evaluated by, and reports to the governing body and shall not chair the governing body;</td>
<td>CUNY Bylaws of the Board of Trustees (see §11.4, “The President”) In a joint statement, Board of Trustees Chairman Benno Schmidt and Chancellor James B. Milliken stated: &quot;Anderson brings to Brooklyn College a record of extraordinary academic leadership and success, a strong commitment to students, an exemplary record of public service and a deep belief in Brooklyn College's mission of academic excellence and opportunity. She will build upon an exemplary foundation of student and faculty achievement nurtured and enhanced by President Karen Gould at an institution so vital to our state, city, and nation.&quot; Read more about President Anderson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has appropriate credentials and professional experience consistent with the mission of the organization;</td>
<td>President Michelle J. Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has the authority and autonomy required to fulfill the responsibilities of the position, including developing and implementing institutional plans, staffing the organization, identifying and allocating resources, and directing the institution toward attaining the goals and objectives set forth in its mission;</td>
<td>CUNY Bylaws of the Board of Trustees (see §11.4, “The President”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has the assistance of qualified administrators, sufficient in number, to enable the Chief Executive Officer to discharge his/her duties effectively; and is responsible for establishing procedures for assessing the organization’s efficiency and effectiveness;</td>
<td>President’s Cabinet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an administration possessing or demonstrating; an organizational structure that is clearly documented and that clearly defines reporting relationships;</td>
<td>Brooklyn College Organizational Charts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
an appropriate size and with relevant experience to assist the Chief Executive Officer in fulfilling his/her roles and responsibilities;

members with credentials and professional experience consistent with the mission of the organization and their functional roles;

skills, time, assistance, technology, and information systems expertise required to perform their duties;

regular engagement with faculty and students in advancing the institution’s goals and objectives;

systematic procedures for evaluating administrative units and for using assessment data to enhance operations; and

periodic assessment of the effectiveness of governance, leadership, and administration.

President’s Cabinet

President’s Cabinet

President’s Cabinet


All units (academic and AES) are required to submit annual assessment reports, to report on the achievement of states outcomes.

All units (academic and AES) are required to submit annual assessment reports, to report on the achievement of states outcomes.

7.2 Introduction

This chapter provides an examination of the College’s organizational structure and staffing, an assessment of its governance documents, and an analysis of assessment processes. This investigation verifies that Brooklyn College is transparent in its governance and administrative structures and that these structures facilitate the ability of Brooklyn College to carry out its mission and goals effectively in order to serve its students and all other stakeholders. The chapter integrates discussion of the following research questions.

1. How do we demonstrate our compliance with MSCHE Standard VII?
2. What have been the major developments and accomplishments in areas of institutional leadership, governance, and administration since the 2009 Self-Study?
3. Given the amount of administrative restructuring that has taken place since our 2009 self-study, what evidence allows us to determine whether the current structure effectively serves the Brooklyn College community? What has been the impact of these changes? What might improve institutional governance?
4. Bearing in mind variation in the user (staff, manager, faculty advisor, department chair), what impact has the implementation of CUNYfirst had on administrative processes, financial management, and student services?
5. Do the current administrative and governance structures/processes allow input from all affected stakeholders?
6. Do the faculty, administration, governance bodies, and staff reflect the diversity among Brooklyn College students?

7.3 Governance Structure

Brooklyn College operates within a framework of governance policies and structures established by the City University of New York. It also maintains its own fully-articulated set of governance structures and policies that are clear and transparent and in alignment with those of the University. Both the University and the College support a governance structure for the College that effectively benefits the institution and advances its mission.

All educational institutions in New York State that grant degrees are required to be members of the University of the State of New York and are governed by the Board of Regents, an unpaid board of 17 member elected by the state legislature for five-year terms. New York State Education Law, the Rules of the Board of Regents, and the Commissioner’s Regulations Concerning Postsecondary Education constitute the state-level framework within which CUNY and its constituent colleges operate. Within CUNY, the corpus of policy documents that guide all operations are the Bylaws of the Board of Trustees, the Minutes of the Board of Trustees, the Manual of General Policy, and the Records Retention and Disposition Schedule. All of these documents are publically available and searchable on the CUNY’s Policy website.

The “constitution” of the University is the Bylaws of the Board of Trustees (last amended, January 2017). Colleges are required to follow the Bylaws and to organize themselves according to a local Governance Plan, which is subject to the Board of Trustee’s approval. CUNY Bylaws, Article IX, Section 9.6 states the following with regard to the organization and duties of academic departments. “The provisions in a duly adopted governance plan shall supersede any inconsistent provisions contained in this article.” This provision allows colleges to shape their own faculty personnel processes and to each specify the purview of academic departments through their approved governance plans.

In addition to defining requirements of academic departments, the Brooklyn College Governance Plan specifies the following governance bodies: the Policy Council, the Faculty Council, the Council on Administrative Policy, the College-wide Committee on Personnel and Budget, the Committee on Promotion and Tenure, the Academic Department (with prescribed standing committees), and the Student Governments. Some of these governance bodies have their own bylaws to clarify voting rules, purpose, and limitations.50 The governance bodies on campus each have their own constituencies and role in decision-making and guiding the work of the College. Student Government and Faculty Council are elected bodies with a single constituency. Other governance bodies include multiple constituencies. The Council on Administrative Policy (CAP) and the Committee on Personnel and Budget (P&B) include academic department chairs and College administrators; the Committee on Promotion and Tenure includes department chairs as voting members and academic administrators (provost, associate provosts, and deans) as non-voting members with voice; Policy Council includes equal representation from the three major

50 See the Bylaws of the Brooklyn College Policy Council, Faculty Council By-Laws, and the constitutions of the CLAS, SGS and GSO student governments.
campus constituencies, students, faculty, and administrators, each nominated and elected annual by their constituencies.

In addition to governance bodies covered by the Governance Plan, both the Brooklyn College Association and the Brooklyn College Auxiliary Enterprises Corporation have their own board or oversight panel. The College also benefits from an independently operated Brooklyn College Foundation, which funds scholarship, endowed professorships and administers substantial gifts to the College. The Foundation Board includes 36 trustees, including President Anderson as a non-voting member, six governors, and three honorary governors. The board also serves as an informal advisory body on important College matters.

All CUNY Colleges are also subject to the provisions included in the various collective bargaining agreements between the University and the faculty and staff unions.

The CUNY Board of Trustees is the ultimate authority for personnel decisions; the Board of Regents and the State Education Department are the ultimate authority for curricular and degree-granting programs and innovations proposed by the College. The New York State Legislature, the State Education Department, and the CUNY Board of Trustees together and separately impose other requirements on personnel, curriculum, and operating procedures at the College.

7.3.1 Changes to Local Governance and Bylaws

In a continued effort to clarify and streamline the governance processes, the Brooklyn College Governance Plan has been revised or amended five times since the 2009 Self-Study. Many of these revisions were editorial; others rectified the unintentional exclusion of an individual because of a title error or change. Some changes were substantive as described below.

The list of standing committees of Policy Council (Article I) was removed to allow changes to this council’s standing committees and ad hoc committees without the need for further revision to the Governance Plan, conforming with the Policy Council Bylaws and College practice. The CAP Liaison Committee membership (Article IV) and the membership of the Committee on Personnel and Budget (Article V) were aligned with the structure of the College’s five schools upon their establishment in 2011. There was also clarification about the participation of the academic administrative officers in the Personnel and Budget Committee. Revisions were made to the Committee on Promotion and Tenure (Article VI). These include alignment with the new five school structure, clarification of the review process for College laboratory assistants not housed in an academic department, and explicit clarification of the dean’s role at the school level.

Since the last Self-Study, Policy Council was the only governance body to modify its bylaws. The March 2016 revision was the first update since April 1986. Most significant are adjustments to the required standing committees, the composition their membership, and their charge.

---

51 The adoption of the Governance Plan amendments are included in the Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes linked here: June 27, 2011; September 24, 2012; May 5, 2014 (item in appendix is erroneously labeled April 28, 2014); January 26, 2015; and May 1, 2017. The set of six Governance Plan versions, including the February 23, 2009 version in force at the time of the previous Self-Study, are included in Appendix 7.A.
A document that identifies the changes is included in Appendix 7.B.

### 7.4 Administration

The Chancellor of CUNY is charged by the Board of Trustees to uphold the CUNY bylaws, promote the CUNY Mission Statement, and ensure the academic and financial integrity of all CUNY campuses by defining yearly CUNY performance goals. Much of this work is delegated to the presidents of the colleges. The President ensures that the educational needs of college are met and that the mission is actualized. In addition, the President, with the input and support of the college community, articulates and provides the support necessary to meet the goals of the Strategic Plan. Yearly assessment of the Chancellor’s and the President’s performance is detailed in the [CUNY Manual of General Policy 5.05](#).

Brooklyn College is led by our President Michelle Anderson and is organized according to six executive divisions: (1) the Office of the President, (2) the Office of the Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, (3) the Office of the Senior Vice President for Finance and Administration, (4) the Office of the Vice President for Enrollment Management, (5) the Office of the Vice President for Institutional Advancement, and (5) the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs. All administrators have the appropriate academic credentials and were appointed by the College and the University following established search and hiring procedures. The relationships among these functions and their respective divisions are specified on the college’s organizational charts.

There have been significant changes to the College’s administrative structure since the last Middle States Self-Study in 2009, including the institution of a school structure and other adjustments to administrative units. These are discussed in more detail below.

The administration executes the activities of our very complex institution. During the academic year, the president meets regularly with her direct reports, both individually and in presidential cabinet meetings. Meetings such as the Academic Affairs Council (provost’s cabinet) and Enrollment Management Division managers meetings, include high-level administrators from across the College and ensure that coordination among and between administrative offices occur with regularity. Top level administrators meet regularly with faculty leadership, governance committees, and other constituencies to ensure open lines of communication and information sharing.

The elected Council on Administrative Policy (CAP) Liaison Committee meets monthly with the President and Provost to discuss issues of interest and concern to the department chairs. The CAP Agenda Committee meets monthly with the President, Provost, and Senior Vice President for Finance and Administration to jointly set the agenda for that month’s CAP meeting. The Faculty Council Steering Committee meets with the President and Provost before each Faculty Council meeting to review the agenda. The President, Provost, and Senior Vice President for Finance and Administration also meet with the Faculty Council Committee on Master Planning, Educational Policy and Budget each semester. Meetings are held once or twice each semester with the President, Provost, Vice President for Finance and Administration, and Assistant Vice President for Human Resource Services with the officers of the local chapter of the Professional Staff.
Congress (PSC), the union of the faculty and professional staff at CUNY. Similar meetings are convened with representatives from District Council (DC) 37 and other unions representing the College’s employees.

7.4.1 Implementation of a Five School Structure

A wide-reaching transformation occurred in fall 2011 with the creation of four new schools and the arrival of deans to head them. During the 2010-2011 academic year, then president Karen Gould held a series of town hall meetings to discuss the reasons for this change. Specially-prepared documents that explained the need for the school structure also circulated as part of the transition process.

One such document is entitled “Benefits of a School Structure at Brooklyn College.”52 It lists benefits for students, faculty, and the College at large. Among those for the students: The school structure “increases student engagement by establishing a ‘home’ for students and bonding them more closely to the College.” Other benefits listed in the document include fostering greater interdisciplinary efforts, facilitating scheduling and academic services, creating a “focal point for broadcasting clear, consistent institutional messages about learning outcomes [and] student responsibilities,” and expanding “horizons of high impact educational activities such as research, place-based learning, study abroad, and career exploration.”

For faculty, the new structure was envisioned as a “framework for improved peer mentoring and more informed peer review through increased opportunities for colleagues from related disciplines to interact.” The schools would facilitate “increased collaboration” among faculty, enable more focused “programmatic and resource decision-making,” and “provide faculty with more immediate access and improved response time.” An additional benefit was the “potential of a middle management career ladder for those faculty interested in pursuing career opportunities in academic administration.”

The College as a whole would benefit from a school structure that could support student success, provide “nimble academic leadership,” bolster “data-informed strategic planning and resource allocation,” offer a “platform for the consideration of issues from a broader, College-wide perspective within the existing governance structure,” and create a “framework for increased, targeted fundraising.” The administration indicated that the adoption of a school structure “enables the College to more effectively participate in CUNY initiatives on a level playing field.”

Participants in the town hall meetings that were held by the administration also received a document identifying “Primary Responsibilities of the Deans at Brooklyn College” and another sketching out “School Configurations for Discussion.”53

As mentioned above, the Faculty Council Committee on Master Planning, Educational Policy and Budget developed a report in xx year on the school structure. It describes some of the planning process and focuses on the implementation and the reactions of the College community. The report

52 See Appendix 7.C.
53 Appendix 7.D. also includes both of these documents.
was based on town hall meetings, interviews with the deans, and a survey of department chairs. Here are some of their findings:

A common theme in both the chair survey and town hall meetings was the perception that the implementation of the school structure at Brooklyn College left much to be desired. For example, in response to the survey statement “The School structure works well for Brooklyn College as a whole,” 10 chairs agreed or strongly agreed, 18 disagreed or strongly disagreed, four responded “Don’t Know,” and two did not respond. Overall, 53% of Chairs responded negatively to this question. The staff town hall meeting reflected significant confusion about the school structure and identified the lack of integration of administrative units into the structure. They also identified a missed opportunity to use the school structure to create better student engagement and integration into the life of the College. This language refers to the initial justifications provided by the administration. The faculty town hall meeting reflected dissatisfaction with the implementation of the school structure and a concern about isolation. The Committee on Master Planning reported that constructive criticism regarding the school structure fell into three major categories: (1) the process by which schools were established; (2) the creation of silos and competition; and finally, (3) dean effectiveness/cost.

In response to the Committee on Master Planning’s report, President Anderson made a presentation to Faculty Council on October 2017. She reviewed the changes in dean/administrative positions as a result of the creation of the schools. Overall, positions remained the same in number, but they were reallocated and mostly transformed into more senior positions. For example, the position of Dean of Research and Graduate Studies was eliminated, as were associate and assistant dean lines, but four new school dean positions were created to join the already existing Dean of the School of Education.

With regard to financial impact, President Anderson’s presentation detailed how the cost of the dean structure was covered. More than two-thirds of tax levy costs came from existing sources. 20% came from Central or Compact Funds and 13% came from reallocation of tax levy funds. Brooklyn College’s administrative costs are below average compared to other CUNY Colleges.

The President also stated that the current school structure would not be eliminated or radically altered. However, she recognized that some work needs to be done regarding the schools. Steps towards this end include clarifying the roles of the deans: providing greater transparency in school budgets, priorities, and decision-making; and decreasing redundancies across the schools.

The master planning report on the schools included various recommendations. A report on the discussion at a chairs’ retreat, which was included as an addendum to the master planning report, offered a general perception that schools were created to alleviate administrative burdens but were not properly focused on addressing departmental, faculty, curricular, or student needs.

Better defining the roles of the school deans continued as a major item of discussion on the CAP agenda during the Spring 2018 semester. This resulted in additional recommendations by the department chairs and recommendations from the Academic Affairs Cabinet (provost, associate provosts and deans) submitted to the president toward the end of the 2017-2018 academic year.
In concert with the newly appointed provost (starting August 2018), and integrating the feedback of these various constituencies, President Anderson will define the roles and responsibilities of the deans moving into the 2018-2019 academic year. President Anderson and other members of the senior administration have made it clear in CAP and other venues that continuing with ambiguous roles and authority is untenable. If necessary, the Governance Plan will be revised to reflect certain aspects of the deans’ roles. To begin the process this year, the newly appointed Provost, Anne Lopes, has charged the deans to work closely and collaboratively with their faculty to clarify and establish each of their school’s identities. Work on mission, goals, short and long-term school planning that is integrated with the college’s strategic plan and the academic plan is currently underway. The deans have also been charged with oversight for school-wide assessment and with fourth year faculty review. Ensuring that each school develops activities that build community and collaboration is part of the deans’ envisaged portfolios as is yearly departmental evaluation.

In the spring 2019 CAP will hold a chair’s retreat that focuses on the dean’s role. Planned is a review of all the various reports and assessments, with a goal of establishing a set of recommendation for the President’s consideration that specifies the dean’s role at the College.

In conjunction with the establishment of the new school structure in Fall 2011, the College-wide programs and services previously managed by the offices of the undergraduate and graduate deans were consolidated under a newly constituted Office of the Associate Provost for Academic Programs. This included programs and services such as student tutoring services, graduate studies, the honors programs, career services, student advisement, and first year programs. In response to financial pressures in 2017, the office was discontinued. Oversight for the programs and services under its umbrella was distributed to other areas of the College. The College plans to evaluate the impact of this change in 2019.

7.4.2 Technology to Support Administration

Since the previous Self-Study, the University has replaced the majority of the University-wide data systems with a customized Oracle/PeopleSoft suite of products, branded as CUNYfirst (CUNY’s Fully Integrated Resources and Services Tool). This massive systems overhaul has attempted to integrate all the institution’s data and processes into a unified system. While certain reporting processes (faculty workload reporting, limited human resources reporting) occurred much earlier in the process, major implementation of CUNYfirst was achieved in 2013-2014 leading to integrated student services (admissions, registration, course scheduling, billing, transcripts), financial aid, purchasing and procurement, and human resources function (recruiting, appointments, payroll). Combined, these systems affect every student, faculty member, staff and administrator at Brooklyn College and across the entire University.

While there is no formal assessment information on CUNYfirst available on a CUNY-wide level, one only has to walk into any Brooklyn College office or department to ask about CUNYfirst and get a surplus of comments about it. With respect to administration, knowledgeable representatives from the Registrar Office, the Office of Student Success and Academic Advisement, Office of the Dean of the School of Natural and Behavioral Sciences and an Assistant Director of Finance,
Budget and Planning were asked to briefly describe positive impacts and challenges in using CUNYfirst.\textsuperscript{54}

Since its roll-out at Brooklyn College, training for administrative functions has shifted from University-level to the individual campuses. The Brooklyn College Office of Information Technology Services (ITS) has developed a responsive team of specialists to provide troubleshooting and technical support. Frustrations with CUNYfirst are generally expressed in relation to the facility of the previous systems that were designed to meet the specific needs of its users. It is expected that as personnel turn-over occurs, the older systems fade from the collective memory, CUNYfirst undergoes upgrades, it will become the fully appreciated system it is meant to be.

Since 2015 Brooklyn College has made available to faculty new tools to facilitate and improve student advising at the departmental level. These include E-notes, Department Advisement Appointment Tool (DATE) and DegreeWorks. E-notes allows all advisors of a particular student and the student to summarize the meeting, allowing for transparency, consistency, and accountability. E-notes is at its core a virtual student record. Users can e-mail the entry to the students after the meeting creating a sturdier connection and providing an easily accessible reference of the session for the students. Students are able to correspond directly with the sender of the e-note, which enables students to have a more robust connection with their advisor. Unique text can be entered or users can choose pre-loaded text from a drop down menu. There are safeguards that protect privacy. Additionally, E-notes is an excellent communication tool; a user may add content to one student’s note and then send blind copies to an unlimited amount of other students. Many offices on campus have begun to use e-notes as a way to memorialize not only advisement interactions, but also important notes related to Financial Aid, SEEK, and Registrar activities. A more widespread use of the system would be beneficial to our students.

DATE is an online application created by the BC ITS Database Group in August of 2015. Faculty advisors can create schedules that reflect their availability for student advisement appointments. Previous to this tool being created there was no comprehensive way that faculty advisors across campus were able to make their availability transparent to students. Currently 19 academic departments use DATE. Since the implementation of DATE appointment scheduling has gone from 865 appointments in 2015 to 3456 in 2017.

DegreeWorks is a web-based program that enables students to easily track their academic progress. Advisors and students are able to see how specific College requirements have been met and what courses students can take to fulfill the requirements which are remaining. Grades, GPAs, major average, transfer information, degree composition, impact of selections on degree plans, academic standing, semesters to completion and pre-requisites are also part of the available student information.

7.5 Assessment of Administrative Units

\textsuperscript{54} A full list of comments can be found in Appendix 7.E.
7.5.1 Within Unit Assessment

As reviewed in Section V, Brooklyn College has made notable strides in assessment of administrative units. Units are now using a consistent template (see Appendix 5.E) and are reporting on a consistent schedule. Table 7.2 provides an overview of the units that have submitted plans and reports, and also shows the status of assessment within each unit.

Table 7.2 – Assessment within Administrative Units

7.5.2 Assessment of the College President, College Leadership and Administration

The CUNY Manual of General Policy describes the review and evaluation process for all college presidents. Evaluation occurs at least every five years. Every three to five years the Chancellor may seek additional feedback from the college community. The evaluation focuses on ensuring that “educational quality” is the primary purpose of the institution and that all facets of leadership and administration are reviewed as per Standard VII. The criteria for the President’s evaluation also includes communication of the mission and priorities to the college community and larger public. The policy specifically states, “The President must understand and be committed to the educational needs of his/her college, and have the ability to articulate and to meet these needs at all levels.” She must also work to “maintain an effective administrative team, to develop sound and responsive management practices, to develop and carry out an effective affirmative action program, to designate the appropriate use of fiscal resources, to coordinate the advancement of campus construction programs, where relevant, and to maintain ongoing programs of planning, evaluation and review.”[1]

The CUNY Performance Management Process (PMP) is the annual mechanism that CUNY uses to evaluate the institution and the leadership of the President. The Chancellor and the presidents set PMP goals for the coming year for their respective colleges, consistent with the strategic plans of the University and the colleges, sometime in the spring or summer. At Brooklyn College, both the PMP campus-based objective/target planning and assessment processes are led by the President. At the end of the academic year, the President then reports progress on the PMP to the Chancellor; the report assesses each goal set forth, marks progress on each, identifies strengths and accomplishments of the College, and sets out challenges. After receiving these assessments, the Chancellor conferences with the President to discuss her performance and to set priorities for the coming year. The discussion between the Chancellor and the President is memorialized in a confidential letter from the Chancellor that specifies areas of leadership and administrative strength, as well as areas for improvement. Based on these assessments and any new University priorities, the President engages her cabinet in refining campus goals for the following year’s PMP.

As part of CUNY, the College also has specified processes in place to evaluate its senior leadership. The President conducts yearly evaluations of her vice presidents and other direct reports. They are responsible for the oversight of their units and for meeting specific yearly goals aligned with and designed to carry out the goals of the campus Strategic Plan. The President evaluates her direct reports based both on their accomplishments of a set of task-focused goals established during the prior year, as well as based on her evaluation of behavioral goals for the
strong leadership of executives. The vice presidents also evaluate their direct reporting administrators and staff, who are in turn responsible for the evaluation of their staff.

7.6 Recommendations Aligned with the College’s Strategic Plan

Based on our analysis of Standard VII: Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement, we recommend the following:

- Continue to focus on developing a culture of transparency, service, and trust and to make the College’s bureaucracy more responsive and efficient by streamlining administrative, academic and facilities processes. This includes documenting standard operational procedures in order to enhance best practices.
- Revise governance documents to incorporate the responsibilities and authority of the deans.
- Continue the recently implement initiative of the Office of Diversity and Equity Programs requiring the filing of department-specific affirmative action plans to increase opportunities to hire minority and women faculty where they are underrepresented.