



STONY BROOK UNIVERSITY

DESIGN FOR INSTITUTIONAL SELF-STUDY

**SUBMITTED TO
MIDDLE STATES COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION**

**SUBMITTED BY
STONY BROOK UNIVERSITY
STONY BROOK ♦ NEW YORK ♦ 11794**

AUGUST 2002

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction	3
II.	Nature and Scope of Self-Study	5
III.	Specific Goals and Objectives	6
IV.	Organizational Structures of the Steering Committee and Subcommittees	6
V.	Charges to Subcommittees	12
VI.	Outcomes Assessment	20
VII.	Inventory of Support Documents	21
VIII.	Timetable	24
IX.	Editorial Style and Format of Subcommittee Reports	25
X.	Format of the Self-Study Report	25
XI.	Profile of the Evaluation Team	26

I. INTRODUCTION

Stony Brook University (SBU) is set on Long Island's North Shore, 60 miles east of New York City and 50 miles west of Montauk Point. Established in 1957 as part of the State University of New York system, SBU has grown at a prodigious rate and is now recognized as one of the nation's finest public research universities. Physically and academically integral to SBU is its academic health sciences center, which comprises the Schools of Dental Medicine, Medicine, Nursing, Health Technology and Management and Social Welfare, as well as the SBU Hospital. The Carnegie Foundation has classified SBU as a Research 1 Institution, and a study published by John's Hopkins University Press (*The Rise of American Research Universities*, by Hugh Graham and Nancy Diamond, 1997) places SBU among the top three public research universities in the country, second only to the University of California at Berkeley and tied with University of California at Santa Barbara in terms of per capita faculty research productivity. In addition, SBU Hospital has been ranked among the top 15 teaching hospitals in the country. In May of 2000, the Association of American Universities recognized SBU's achievements when it invited SBU to join its ranks.

In keeping with a tradition of improving upon excellence, SBU has a five-part mission:

- To provide comprehensive undergraduate, graduate, and professional education of the highest quality;
- To carry out research and intellectual endeavors of the highest international standards that advance theoretical knowledge and are of immediate and long range practical significance;
- To provide leadership for economic growth, technology, and culture for neighboring communities and the wider geographic region;
- To provide state-of-the-art innovative health care, while serving as a resource to a regional health care network and to the traditionally underserved;
- To fulfill these objectives while celebrating diversity and positioning the University in the global community.

SBU enrolls more than twenty-one thousand students, thirteen thousand of them undergraduates, most of whom attend full time. SBU offers more than 50 majors to its undergraduate students through the College of Arts and Sciences, the College of Engineering and Applied Sciences, the School of Health, Technology and Management, the School of Medicine, the School of Dental Medicine, the School of Nursing, the School of Social Welfare, the Marine Sciences Research Center, the School of Professional Development and the W. Averell Harriman School for Management and Policy. SBU offers a variety of innovative programs to undergraduate students, including the Honors College, the Educational Opportunity Program/Advancement on Individual Merit (EOP/AIM), a program designed to provide access to higher education for economically disadvantaged students, as well as several Learning Communities and Living Learning Centers, and Women in Science and Engineering (WISE).

Five-year combined bachelor's and master's degrees are available to students in such areas as earth and space sciences, chemistry, engineering, management, marine sciences, public affairs, and applied mathematics. New York State's provisional teaching certification is available in the sciences, mathematics, foreign languages, social studies, English, and the teaching of English to speakers of other languages.

Graduate and professional study is offered in 45 different areas, including the health sciences. The doctoral degree is offered in 38 areas, the MA in 28 areas, and the MS in 20 areas.

At any one time Stony Brook students are studying abroad in approved exchange programs spread across the globe, in countries such as France, Poland, Italy, Bolivia, Jamaica, Spain, Germany, England, and South Korea. International students representing some 90 countries attend Stony Brook.

In the past few years SBU has also added several new undergraduate majors, including Athletic Training Education, Bioengineering, American Studies, Environmental Science, Health Science, Cinema & Cultural Studies, Women's Studies, and Computer Engineering. In addition, SBU offers several new graduate programs, including Optoelectromechanical Systems Engineering, Molecular & Cellular Biology, Public Policy, Industrial Management, Technology Management, Art & Philosophy, Biology, Social Work/Law (in conjunction with Touro Law School), Operations Research, Physical Therapy, Biomedical Engineering, Endodontics, and Oceanic Science.

Our student enrollment has increased by nearly four thousand in the last five years. At the same time, SAT scores of all regularly admitted students have risen about 80 points, the average having ascended from 1093 to 1172 in the six years since the SAT scores were recentered. This year 17 freshmen were either National Merit finalists or semifinalists or Intel semifinalists, and 27 were valedictorians.

SBU's student body is highly diverse. Fourteen percent of our students identify themselves as members of historically underrepresented groups (African American and Hispanic), 17% Asian American, and 9% Foreign. Only 42% of our students identify themselves as Caucasian (18% do not identify their origin). In addition, SBU has a great number of students who are the first in their families to attend college or who come from low-income homes. Eighty five percent of first-time, full-time Stony Brook students are still in attendance after their first year. Approximately 58% of each incoming freshman class graduates from Stony Brook within six years.

Since 1996, we have increased graduate enrollments by approximately 1,200 students. Moreover GRE scores have risen 100 points in the past two years.

Stony Brook's distinguished faculty is proud to include sixteen members of the National Academy of Sciences, four members of the National Academy of Engineering and a member of the National Academy of Medicine; a Nobel Laureate in Physics; thirteen members of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences; four MacArthur Fellows; four members of the Royal Society; a Fields prize winner; recipients of the national Medal of Technology and the Benjamin Franklin Medal. Stony Brook's faculty are also dedicated teachers, and include 105 recipients of the Chancellor's Awards for Excellence in Teaching. More than 300 scholars from 40 countries pursue research here and teach at Stony Brook throughout the year.

SBU's faculty totaled 1,849 in the fall of 2001. 1,319 of SBU's faculty are full time with 530 faculty members part time (most of these being clinical faculty). 946 faculty are tenure or tenure track, with 624 faculty off track and 279 adjuncts (defined as part-time lecturers included in the instructional faculty). Nearly all of Stony Brook's full-time faculty hold doctoral degrees or the highest degree in their field and more than 90% of the faculty are engaged in active research

leading to publication and development of new technologies, such as MRI and bar code decoding. The great majority of adjuncts are in professional programs, composition, and the arts. We have increased by nearly 100 full-time faculty over the past five years and in 2001 increased by 21 faculty campus-wide. The preliminary data for our tenure-track faculty show that 83% are Caucasian, 10% Asian, 4% of African origin, and 3% Hispanic.

II. NATURE AND SCOPE OF THE SELF-STUDY

The major theme of Shirley Strum Kenny's presidency at Stony Brook since 1994 has been the student-centered research university. Students are also the focus of the blueprint for undergraduate education developed by the Boyer Commission, which Dr. Kenny chaired. The topic that we have chosen as the focus of Stony Brook's self-study in preparation for its ten-year reaccreditation therefore lies at the core of the institution's history over the last decade: **the student experience at Stony Brook.**

When the Stony Brook co-chairs (Professors Aronoff and Djuric) attended the November 2001 Self-Study Institute, two points became clear: first, that Stony Brook's self-study should concentrate on a single selected topic, because a comprehensive self-study would be much less useful to the institution; and second, that this topic should relate to students. Conversations with MSA senior staff at the Institute confirmed both these points, and when the co-chairs returned to Stony Brook to talk with the President and the Provost, there was quick general agreement on the topic of the student experience.

After some discussion about whether the self-study should confine itself to undergraduate students, it was agreed that at a research university like ours, where there is significant interaction between undergraduate and graduate students, it is unwise to try to separate the two groups. Stony Brook also has a large health sciences center on campus that educates students at all levels: undergraduate, graduate, and professional. The health sciences are integrated into the rest of the university, not only geographically, but in all dimensions: major academic departments in the life sciences (e.g. biochemistry and neurobiology) span both sides of the campus, and we have degree programs from bachelors-level to doctoral-level that integrate instruction from both halves. We will therefore seek to examine the experience of all students in the entire institution to measure student learning outcomes and determine the value and effectiveness of the education provided at SBU.

Our plan is to approach the standards for reaccreditation from a variety of perspectives, using numerous methods to begin answering the fundamental question of whether Stony Brook as an institution is doing the best that it can do to educate its students. By and large, we can document the fundamental elements of each standard for reaccreditation by existing materials and data, so that the major efforts of the subcommittees will be directed more towards analysis and planning.

By focusing our self-study on one topic: the student experience at Stony Brook, we are at least implicitly focusing this self-study on those standards that address educational effectiveness: standard 7, institutional assessment; standard 8, student admissions; standard 9, student support services; standard 10, faculty; standard 11, educational offerings; standard 12, general education; standard 13, related educational activities; and standard 14, assessment of student learning. We have deliberately chosen, however, not to approach these standards as a checklist, but rather as

all contributing in an integrative fashion to the overarching standard of educational effectiveness, which is, in truth, the focus of our self-study.

For some standards, the Middle States reaccreditation process coincides with efforts that are underway in response to SUNY system-wide policies and mandates. In General Education, for example, Stony Brook has been working for the last three years to bring its program into line with system-wide requirements and to establish an assessment program for general education. We are also now required by SUNY to assess each academic major on a regular basis. We expect, therefore, to address certain Middle States standards through documentation of our compliance with SUNY mandates.

We have elected to follow option 1 for the review of documents pertaining to the standards related to institutional context that are not fully addressed in the self-study (standards 1 through 6). Accordingly, we will have assembled in time for the visit of the team chair and the designated generalist evaluator sufficient documentation to allow these team members to verify institutional compliance with these standards.

III. SPECIFIC GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The overarching goal of this self-study is to help Stony Brook University truly become a student-centered research university. As the Boyer Commission report attests, the trend in American research universities over the last century has, to a great extent, run counter to the interests of students. But in order to even begin to make it possible to achieve this goal, we need a cultural transformation. Towards that end, the major objective of our self-study is to study, understand and assess the student experience at SBU and its relation to student outcomes, so that we can use this understanding to drive change in the direction of our goal. In our self-study, we will identify what real progress we have made to date towards our goal, what the important gaps are, and what we need to develop or improve.

SBU has a wide variety of assessment mechanisms, all of which will be coordinated to provide an integrated view of our university. In the somewhat longer term, we believe that the self-study will help drive a cultural change throughout the entire university community, faculty, staff, and students. In this new culture, both learning and assessment will be more highly valued and, most importantly, will not be viewed as antagonistic forces, but rather as two sides of a single coin.

It is easy to talk about large goals, but harder to achieve results. In keeping with President Kenny's philosophy of planning and implementation, which has always been at the level of concrete actions, we will establish through our self-study a set of deliverable actions that we expect to have a positive impact on the experience of SBU students within a five-year period. Our progress in these areas will form the core around which our 2009 periodic review report will be organized.

IV. ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE AND SUBCOMMITTEES

The formation of the steering committee for the self-study has been quite deliberately organic. Before being appointed, the two co-chairs had worked together for several years on a committee

that coordinates undergraduate mathematics instruction. Together, they selected a small group of five additional close colleagues to form the core of the steering committee and begin deliberations. The President of the University Senate also joined the steering committee in this formative stage, with the understanding that he would participate only in our formative discussions and then leave once the full steering committee was formed. This group met for the first time on February 1 of this year. Its membership comprised the following:

- **Mark Aronoff**, Co-chair of the Self-Study Steering Committee, Professor of Linguistics, Deputy Provost of SBU.
- **Petar Djuric**, Co-chair of the Self-Study Steering Committee, Professor of Electrical Engineering.
- **Peter Baigent**, Steering Committee Liaison and Co-Chair of Subcommittee 6, Research, Associate Vice President for Student Affairs.
- **Christopher Berndt**, Steering Committee Liaison and Co-Chair of Subcommittee 3, Education and Scholarly Activities, Professor of Materials Science, Associate Dean of the College of Engineering and Applied Sciences.
- **Kathleen Breidenbach**, Steering Committee Liaison and Co-chair of Subcommittee 2, The 1st & 2nd Year Experience, Assistant Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.
- **Martha Furie**, Steering Committee Liaison and Co-chair of Subcommittee 1, Transition to Stony Brook University, Professor of Pathology.
- **Emily Thomas**, Steering Committee Liaison and Co-Chair of Subcommittee 6, Research, Director of Planning and Institutional Research.
- **Benjamin Walcott**, Steering Committee Consultant, Professor of Neurobiology, President of the University Senate.

This core group met weekly for six weeks to deliberate on two issues: the partitioning problem (what should the subtopics be?) and the proper final structure of the steering committee and subcommittees. It eventually arrived at a unified solution to both problems: five themes, with a subcommittee devoted to each theme and each subcommittee co-chaired by two members of a steering committee made up by augmenting the original core group. A sixth committee would address the more technical aspects of data gathering. The co-chairs of the steering committee would not sit on any of the subcommittees. This structure remains in place, with one addition: **Elyce Acierno**, Staff Assistant to the Provost, has joined the steering committee. Ms. Acierno has superb organizational and writing skills and has begun to play an important role in all stages of preparation of the self-study.

In deciding on what subtopics to choose, the steering committee was acutely aware of the danger that in breaking the topic up into manageable pieces we might lose the essential relatedness of the whole. For example, one partitioning that we discarded early on was the following: undergraduate education; graduate education; extracurricular academic life; and quality of life. We did so because we agreed that this division would make the final integration of these subtopics harder instead of easier. The five subtopics that we arrived at in the end divide the

topic up thematically, along both diachronic and structural dimensions. Diachronically, we will trace the student's progress through his or her academic career. Structurally, we will examine the student's educational and social environment at the university, which should together foster growth of the complete person.

The themes are described in more detail below:

Theme 1: Transition to Stony Brook

Who are our incoming students, how do we prepare them before they begin their education at Stony Brook, and how do we facilitate their transition to Stony Brook? This theme should cover the students' first experience with Stony Brook including their first few weeks here. We should consider the experience of our freshmen, transfer students, and first year graduate students. Issues to be addressed include student orientation, academic advising, and students' familiarity with student life.

Theme 2: First and second year at Stony Brook

Do the first and second years of our students prepare them for further success at Stony Brook? Issues comprise academic foundations, doing well in large, introductory classes, interaction with faculty and TA's, mentoring, social adjustment (social clubs), etc. For graduate students, major issues are teaching assistantships, mentoring, and expectations.

Theme 3: Education and scholarly activities

Do we provide an integrated diverse education for Stony Brook students? Topics include teaching, learning, research and creative activities, science for the nonscientists, libraries, laboratories, and instructional facilities, the role of research in education, and interdisciplinary programs.

Theme 4: Stony Brook as a community

How good is the Stony Brook community as an environment for intellectual growth? The scope of the theme is quite general. It consists of issues like interactions among different communities at SB, interactions with off-campus communities, the social and cultural experiences and their integration with the academic experience, diversity, and commuter students. The physical environment and student services are also part of this theme.

Theme 5: Life beyond Stony Brook

Are our students prepared for life beyond Stony Brook? The focus is on the adequacy of our programs for preparing our students for life beyond Stony Brook. We should also look at internships, preparation of graduate students for academia (teaching), expectation of employers, and other related issues.

Having arrived at these themes, the steering committee began to augment its numbers in a systematic fashion. Three of the original seven steering committee members (Christopher Berndt, Kathleen Breidenbach, and Martha Furie) were each asked to serve as co-chair of a thematic subcommittee; two original steering committee members (Peter Baigent and Emily Thomas) will co-chair the research committee. After some deliberation, the group asked the following people to join the steering committee:

- **Alan Inkles**, Steering Committee Liaison and Co-chair of Subcommittee 4, Community, Director of the Staller Center for the Arts.

- **Partap Khalsa**, Steering Committee Liaison and Co-chair of Subcommittee 4, Community, Assistant Professor of Orthopedic Surgery and Biomedical Engineering.
- **Craig Lehmann**, Steering Committee Liaison and Co-chair of Subcommittee 5, Life After Stony Brook, Professor of Clinical Laboratory Sciences, Dean of the School of Health Technology and Management.
- **Manuel London**, Steering Committee Liaison and Co-chair of Subcommittee 1, Transition to Stony Brook University, Professor of Business Management, Associate Provost for Enrollment and Retention Management.
- **Marianna Savoca**, Steering Committee Liaison and Co-chair of Subcommittee 5, Life After Stony Brook, Director of the Career Center.
- **Nancy Tomes**, Steering Committee Liaison and Co-chair of Subcommittee 2, The 1st & 2nd Year Experience, Professor of History.

These new members were selected for the most part because of their individual expertise in the particular areas covered by each of the themes. The steering committee now has a total of fifteen members, with one subcommittee co-chair yet to be named, which will make for a final total of sixteen members. The size of the steering committee was determined by the desire to represent the diversity of Stony Brook's campus, including representatives from throughout the academic and administrative sectors, while keeping the size within reason to be effective and efficient. Ten of these members co-chair thematic subcommittees and two co-chair the research committee. The decision to have co-chairs for each subcommittee arose out of our success in having co-chairs for the steering committee and it makes it more likely that at least one co-chair from each subcommittee will be present at both all the meetings of the individual subcommittees and all the meetings of the steering committee. The full steering committee has met regularly since early April and is functioning very well as a group.

The role of the steering committee is to provide the overarching guidance and coordination of the assessment processes carried out by the subcommittees. The steering committee will also meet regularly with the President and Provost to ensure that the self-study is consonant with the mission and goals of the university. The steering committee will coordinate the self-study process campus wide. Other responsibilities of the steering committee include tracking progress, giving direction and advice to ensure that the subcommittees stay on track and avoid duplication of information, setting deadlines, assisting subcommittees in setting up assessment activities, and providing legitimacy in incorporating the data into our campus-wide activities.

A major role of the subcommittees is to keep in touch with the campus community and represent all areas of campus in making concrete suggestions. The responsibilities of the subcommittees are to assemble and review existing evidence, collect additional data where necessary, identify short and long term goals, evaluate our current state, suggest actions, and provide a timeline.

Subcommittee co-chairs were charged with two tasks: build the subcommittees and begin to formulate a set of questions around which their subcommittees could do their work. The questions as they currently stand are given in the following section. We do not view these

questions as in any way final, but rather as a starting point. We are confident, though, that the process so far has put us in an excellent position for a successful self-study.

The subcommittees are now almost complete and will begin working in earnest in September. The major constituency that remains to be properly represented is the students themselves, most of whom will be recruited early in the fall semester. The steering committee did not want to burden students with a commitment extending for so much of their university careers, from Spring 2002 to Spring 2004. A three-semester commitment is still substantial for any student, undergraduate or graduate, but we hope that it will be more attractive. The current membership of each subcommittee is:

Subcommittee 1: Transition to Stony Brook University

- **Martha Furie**, Steering Committee Liaison and Co-chair of Subcommittee 1, Transition to Stony Brook University, Professor of Pathology.
- **Manny London**, Steering Committee Liaison and Co-chair of Subcommittee 1, Transition to Stony Brook University, Professor of Business Management, Associate Provost for Enrollment and Retention Management.

- **Elizabeth Barnum**, Assistant Dean for International Services.
- **Judy Burke-Berhannan**, Associate Dean of Admissions.
- **Brian Delong**, Senior Staff Associate for New Student Orientation.
- **Paul Kassel**, Assistant Professor and Director of Undergraduate Studies of Theatre Arts.
- **Joan Kenny**, Assistant Dean of the College of Engineering & Applied Science.
- **Robert Kerber**, Distinguished Teaching Professor of Chemistry.
- **Kay Losey**, Associate Professor of English, Director of the Writing Program.
- **Lenora McClean**, Dean and Professor of the School of Nursing.

Subcommittee 2: The 1st & 2nd Year Experience

- **Kathleen Breidenbach**, Steering Committee Liaison and Co-chair of Subcommittee 2, The 1st & 2nd Year Experience, Assistant Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences.
- **Nancy Tomes**, Steering Committee Liaison and Co-chair of Subcommittee 2, The 1st & 2nd Year Experience, Professor of History.

- **Leo Bachmair**, Professor of Computer Science.
- **Dallas Bauman**, Assistant Vice President for Campus Residences.
- **William Collins**, Associate Professor of Neurobiology & Behavior, Director of Undergraduate Biology.
- **Stephanie Foote**, Staff Associate of New Student Orientation.
- **Richard Gerrig**, Professor of Psychology, Chair of the Honors College.
- **Cheryl Hamilton**, Director of Educational Opportunity Program/Advancement on Individual Merit.
- **David Hanson**, Professor of Chemistry and Chair of the Learning Communities.
- **Joseph Lauher**, Professor of Chemistry.
- **Sara Lipton**, Associate Professor of History.
- **Karen Mendelsohn**, Assistant Dean of the School of Health, Technology & Management.
- **Kamal Sridhar**, Associate Professor of Linguistics.

Subcommittee 3: Education and Scholarly Activities

- **Christopher Berndt**, Steering Committee Liaison and Co-chair of Subcommittee 3, Professor of Materials Science, Associate Dean of the College of Engineering and Applied Sciences.
- **William Arens**, Professor of Anthropology, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.
- **Paul Bingham**, Associate Professor of Biochemistry and Cell Biology.
- **Christian Filstrup**, Dean and Director of Libraries.
- **Joanna Harris**, Director of Disabled Student Services.
- **Wendy Katkin**, Director of the Reinvention Center.
- **Miriam Rafailovich**, Professor of Materials Science & Engineering.
- **Olufemi Vaughan**, Associate Professor of Africana Studies.
- **Troy Wolfskill**, Instructional Support Specialist for Chemistry.

Subcommittee 4: Community

- **Alan Inkles**, Steering Committee Liaison and Co-chair of Subcommittee 4, Director of the Staller Center for the Arts.
- **Partap Khalsa**, Steering Committee Liaison and Co-chair of Subcommittee 4, Assistant Professor of Orthopedic Surgery and Biomedical Engineering.
- **Thomas Biancaniello**, Professor and Vice Chairperson of the Department of Pediatrics.
- **Patrick Calabria**, Director of Media Relations for the Health Science Center.
- **David Ferguson**, Distinguished Service Professor of Technology & Society, Director of the Center for Excellence in Learning & Teaching.
- **Nina Maung**, Coordinator of the Center for Inclusive Education.
- **Christine McCormick**, Associate Director of the Center for Excellence & Innovation in Education.
- **Jill Richards**, Internship Training Director in the University Counseling Center.
- **Edward Schlissel**, Director of Continuing Dental Education.
- **Yvette St. Jacques**, Assistant Vice President of Communications.
- **Suzanne Velazquez**, Assistant to the Associate Vice President of Student Affairs.

Subcommittee 5: Life after Stony Brook

- **Craig Lehman**, Steering Committee Liaison and Co-chair of Subcommittee 5, Professor of Clinical Laboratory Sciences, Dean of the School of Health, Technology & Management.
- **Marianna Savoca**, Steering Committee Liaison and Co-chair of Subcommittee 5, Director of the Career Center.
- **Marijean Bushe**, Instructor in the School of Nursing.
- **Dahna Jones**, Student.
- **Jovanna Little**, Director of Advancement Service.
- **Glenn Lopez**, Professor of Marine Benthic Ecology in the Marine Science Research Center.
- **Sanal Mazvancheryl**, Assistant Professor of Marketing in the Harriman School for Management & Policy.
- **Joan Miyazaki**, Curriculum Coordinator for Undergraduate Biology.
- **Ann-Maria Scheidt**, Director of Economic Development.
- **Wendy Tang**, Associate Professor of Electrical Engineering.
- **Deborah Zelizer**, Educator in the Department of Physical Therapy.

Subcommittee 6: Research

- **Peter Baigent**, Associate Vice President for Student Affairs.
 - **Emily Thomas**, Director of Planning and Institutional Research.
- (We are currently identifying the membership of this subcommittee)

V. CHARGES TO THE SUBCOMMITTEES

The subcommittees prepared initial sets of questions that identify specific topics addressing core issues of the self-study with respect to the guidelines in the *Characteristics of Excellence*. The sample questions were posed in such a way that formative answers could be provided from our students, faculty and staff constituencies on a wide variety of issues. They include students' expectations and perceptions of the education, services, and the environment at SBU, the students' personal and educational needs, and the impact of SBU on the student's lives. Questions are also posed for the collection of reliable information about student learning outcomes that will be used for curriculum evaluation and identification of areas that need improvement.

Subcommittee 1: Transition to Stony Brook University

The objective of subcommittee 1 is to assess the earliest interactions of students with the University, beginning with applying to Stony Brook and concluding with their experiences during the first few weeks of classes. It is the intent of the committee to address the expectations of all populations of students with respect to the topics listed below. These populations include domestic and international students at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, commuter students, transfer students, and students in the Health Sciences Center. For each topic, the goals are to evaluate how well current procedures meet the needs and expectations of the students, to determine whether existing resources (facilities, faculty, and staff) are sufficient (*Standards 3, 5, and 9*), to identify areas that need improvement, and to propose changes based on examples of excellent practice at other institutions. In other words, are the admissions, placement/registration, and orientation processes effective and efficient, and does the manner in which students are introduced to the University have a positive effect on learning outcomes (*Standards 7 and 14*)? Examples of questions that will guide subcommittee 1 in achieving our goals follow.

Stage 1: Applying to SBU and Making the Decision to Attend

1. Who applies to SBU and why?
 - a. Is accurate and complete information regarding the University's mission, academic programs, admissions policies and criteria, and assessments of student learning outcomes readily available to prospective students? (*Standard 8*)
2. To whom are offers of admissions made?
 - a. Are admissions policies clearly stated, fairly implemented, and reflective of the mission of the university? (*Standards 1 and 8*)
3. Who accepts offers of admission and why?
 - a. What factors deter students?
 - b. What is being done to encourage accepted candidates to choose SBU? Are scholarships, grants, and loans being offered in a manner that is effective and consistent with the goals of the University? (*Standards 5, 8, and 9*)

Stage 2: Getting Ready to Attend

1. Is the information that new students receive from various entities prior to arriving on campus accurate, comprehensive, cohesive, and user-friendly? (*Standard 8*)

2. What are the course registration processes for new students?
 - a. Do students receive adequate and accurate advice during registration? (*Standard 9*)
 - b. Are sufficient classes available for entering students? (*Standard 10*)
3. Are procedures for placement of undergraduate students in mathematics, science, writing, and language courses appropriate and efficient? (*Standard 8*)
4. Do policies and procedures regarding transfer of credits from other institutions serve both students and the institution well? (*Standards 8 and 11*)
5. How are incoming students' interests (including major, minor, and co-curricular) discerned and then disseminated to the appropriate departments an/or organizations? How do departments and organizations respond to students' interests? (*Standards 5 and 9*)

Stage 3: Arriving on Campus

1. What events occur for undergraduate and graduate students during Opening Week Orientation? (*Standard 9*)
 - a. Do the orientations meet both the social and academic needs of students?
 - b. Do the orientations address the particular needs of all populations of students?
 - c. How do individual departments and programs participate in the orientation of new students?
 - d. Will the orientation processes need changes to accommodate the implementation of freshman colleges?
2. What steps are taken to make new students feel welcome as valued members of the University community? Are faculty, support staff, and more senior students perceived as available, helpful, and friendly? (*Standards 5, 9, and 10*)

Subcommittee 2: The First & Second Year At Stony Brook University

The objective of subcommittee 2 is to improve alignment of SBU's students and faculty. In the last ten years, Stony Brook has had great success in improving the caliber of its undergraduate education, both in terms of academics and student life more generally. Still, there is too often a serious misalignment between what faculty expect of students in their classes and what the students expect of themselves, of their courses and of their instructors. We as a university must re-examine our own expectations and consider how we can meet students' expectations in order to help them to succeed at Stony Brook. For our self-study, we want to focus on the issue of expectations: how can we more effectively identify and respond to unrealistic and changing expectations in the first two years at SBU. Subcommittee 2 has proposed the following questions that relate to this larger issue.

New First-Year Undergraduate Students

1. How do math and writing placement affect student attitude, performance and retention in first-year courses?
2. How can we more effectively communicate the importance of appropriate placement to students?
3. What do students take in the first year and how does that impact retention to the second year?
4. What do students take in the second year and how does that impact retention to the third year?
5. How can we improve the availability and quality of course offerings to enhance student success and improve student retention?
6. How much classroom time do undergraduates in the first two years spend with different kinds of instructors: TAs, lecturers, adjuncts, tenured or tenure-track faculty? And how does this affect their experience and choices?

7. Do students feel “valued” in the classroom?
(Standards 8, 9, 11, 14)

Programs and Curriculum

In the last ten years, we have instituted a number of new programs and policies in order to provide first year students a more coherent learning experience. Some of these have integrated residential and classroom experiences. Others provide academic and living experience. Recent revisions to the curriculum have also redesigned introductory courses to make extensive use of inquiry based learning and collaborative learning methods. The following are some questions related to these issues.

1. How effective have the new programs been in enhancing student success and improving retention? How do they meet different needs?
2. Is the balance between them appropriate?
3. How do commuter students fit into this equation?
4. How might such programs extended to the sophomore year be beneficial?

Programs to be reviewed and assessed include:

Residential programs

- Living/Learning Centers
- University College
- University Scholars

Curricular Programs

- Learning Communities
- USB 101
- WISE
- Honors College

Revised curricula

- Undergraduate Biology
- Undergraduate Chemistry
- Writing

(Standards 7, 9, 10, 11, 14)

Transfer Students

1. How do transfer students’ expectations of SBU differ from first year students?
2. In what areas do transfer students experience the most difficulty in achieving their goals at SBU?
3. How do the attributes of admitted transfer students match the university’s mission and programs?
4. Are there sufficient seats available in high demand courses needed by transfer students and what can be done to improve availability?

(Standards 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12)

First-Year Graduate Students

1. How do graduate students’ expectations differ from the needs and mission of their department and the university?
2. In what areas do graduate students experience the most difficulty in achieving their goals in their first year at Stony Brook?

3. What tensions/conflicts result from the mismatch between grad students' own education goals and demands imposed by the requirements of graduate student support (teaching, research)?
4. Are there ways to improve the first year for graduate students? E.g., TA funding, research and/or teaching responsibilities, course workload.

(Standards 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12)

Expectations

1. How do entering freshmen's expectations differ from those of the faculty and the university?
2. Do we provide information on student learning outcomes to prospective—and to enrolled—students?
3. How do the attributes of admitted students match the university's mission and programs?
4. How and with what success do faculty, TAs and administrators communicate their expectations of student learning goals and outcomes to the students themselves?

(Standards 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12)

Academic preparation

1. How prepared are students for the level of academic performance expected of them in their first year courses at SBU?
2. What are the consequences, academic and personal, of widespread underpreparation for college level work?
3. How well do we provide remediation?

(Standards 7, 8, 9, 13, 14)

Undergraduate teaching

1. How are instructors chosen for introductory courses? Are particular ranks or types of teachers most effective in these courses?
2. How are TA's assigned to introductory courses and how are they prepared to handle these courses?
3. How do they approach the challenges of teaching their subject material in an often large class to many different levels of students, primarily freshmen?
4. Would instructors of introductory courses benefit from targeted support services from CELT, distinguished faculty?
5. How effectively does the institution support the development of pedagogical innovation and skills development?
6. Does the tenure and promotion process reward faculty for teaching first and second year undergraduate students?

(Standards 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14)

Learning outcomes

1. How can we get faculty to think more consciously about expected student learning outcomes and articulate learning outcomes and responsible learning to students? How can we get faculty to measure their effectiveness in fostering student learning? How many syllabi actually incorporate students' expected learning outcomes?
2. How do we get students to be more active learners, to take responsibility for their own learning, to be motivated to achieve appropriate learning outcomes and to be aware of progress toward them?
3. How can we expand assessment of general education requirements and courses and improve upon them?

(Standards 10, 11, 12, 14)

Advising

1. How and when do students find their way into majors and career paths?
2. What student advising is available, how is it delivered, and what can we do to improve advising opportunities?
3. How can we help students make choices appropriate to their abilities and interests?
4. Over the course of the first two years, how do students' interests in specific majors change and why?
5. How well do we communicate to students the anticipated learning and career outcomes of majors?

(Standards 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14)

Student success

1. What are the significant differences between students who stay and succeed at SBU versus those that do not?
2. For any entering class, who stays, who leaves, when, and why?
3. How have new academic standing policies affected student success and retention?
4. How do students' residential experiences add to/detract from their academic progress at SBU?
5. Do commuters enter SBU with markedly different expectations than residential students?
6. Are our student support services appropriate to student strengths and needs and consistent with student learning expectations?
7. How has SBU's entry to division I athletics affected support of student athletes?

(Standards 7, 8, 9, 14)

Infrastructure

1. How good is our infrastructure for creating a supportive learning environment? E.g., classroom space and quality, availability of computers, copiers, and printers, laboratories. How do we use technology, what do we use it for, and how does that affect the student experience?
2. How well is SBU keeping up with new developments in classroom information technology and how are we helping students to take advantage of new technologies and information sources?
3. Given SBU's population, are students disadvantaged if they do not have the necessary technology, e.g., own a computer, have an Internet account?

(Standards 7, 8, 9)

Subcommittee 3: Education and Scholarly Activities

The objective of subcommittee 3 is to determine if we provide an integrated diverse education for Stony Brook students. Topics include teaching, learning, research and creative activities, science for the nonscientists, libraries, laboratories, and instructional facilities, the role of research in education, interdisciplinary programs. The subcommittee has posed the next set of questions in order to initiate discussion concerning the third theme of the self-study.

Research-focused

Questions that focus on student opinions about research.

1. Does Stony Brook provide adequate opportunities to engage students in original activity/research outside the classroom?
2. How do students describe the research culture of Stony Brook?
3. Do research experiences, both active and passive delivery modes, enhance UG education at SBU?
4. How does SBU, overall, value student's engagement in research activities?
5. Do students want formal recognition for their involvement in research (i.e., college credits? honors?) recorded on their college transcript for further professional advancement?

(Standards 9, 11, 13)

Questions that focus on students in the international arena.

1. Should research opportunities be expanded to include international activities?
2. Are students interested in being exchange students with other countries?
3. Do students want to study/work/ or research in another country?
4. What is the optimum stay? One semester? One year? One day?
5. Should Stony Brook host exchange students from foreign countries?
6. Would hosting foreign students detract or enhance student's own educational experience?

(Standards 9, 11, 13)

Questions that focus on Professors / Instructors.

1. How should great researchers be enabled or steered to also commit to being great teachers?
2. What are the students' perceptions on research emphasis and experiences within "the sciences" compared to "the social sciences?"

(Standards 9, 10, 11,13)

Student-focused

1. How do students describe their skills in (i) writing, (ii) analysis, (iii) cognitive abilities, and (iv) communication?
2. Do students feel that Stony Brook prepares them for their intended job market?
3. What are the students' perceptions of t SBU providing them with an education that allows them to continue learning after graduation?

(Standards 9, 11, 12, 13)

Questions that focus on the space available for Stony Brook students to examine whether our facilities are conducive from teaching and learning perspectives.

1. Is there space for students to ponder, study, and solve problems by themselves?
2. Is there space for students to meet as part of a team or group and work together?
3. Is there sufficient space in café-type environments for informal or detailed discussions?
4. Is there sufficient space for commuters?
5. Is there sufficient space for disabled students who have special needs?
6. Is there sufficient space for students at risk?
7. Does SBU provide public events, which are sufficiently attractive to keep people on campus for extra-curricular activities?

(Standards 9, 13, 14)

Curriculum-focused

1. Do departments offer attractive and creative cross-listing of courses?
2. Are the comparative and global studies courses sufficiently attractive to the students?

3. Would students be attracted to Stony Brook if it had more professional programs, such as law or civil engineering? What programs would be most attractive?
4. Is the linkage between our interdisciplinary programs (Women studies, SSI, MTD, & AFS) and the major academic departments in the social sciences and the humanities adequate?
5. How does Stony Brook showcase our academic programs such as the Honors College, the Learning Communities, the Living/Learning Colleges, WISE, etc.?
(Standards 9, 11, 12, 13)

Subcommittee 4: Stony Brook as a Community

The objective of subcommittee 4 is to better understand and foster the relationships and connections between students, faculty and staff in SBU's internal community and with our surrounding external community. The next several questions have been posed to identify areas of community that need further development.

Student-focused

1. What is the number of programs for international students and what are their fundings, interactions, and emphases? (Standards 9, 13)
2. What is the number, categories, and range of activities offered to students? (Standards 9, 11, 12, 13)
3. What is the number of students involved in various activities? (Standards 9, 13)
4. How does the on-campus and off-campus housing affect student life? (Standard 9, 13)

Resource / Administrative focused

1. What is the number of Diversity Programs on campus and what are their fundings, interactions, and emphases? (Standards 9, 13)
2. How often and by what vehicles do we solicit information from different SBU communities? (Standards 9, 13)
3. What types of interactions exist between the three campuses (East, West, South [Dental School, & Marine Sciences]) that comprise SBU? (Standards 9, 13)
4. What is the number and type of extracurricular activities? (Standard 13)
5. What are the kinds of activities that students, faculty, and staff want that could be provided by SBU? (Standards 9, 13)
6. What mechanisms (e.g., student ID card for discounts at local businesses) have been previously utilized to build community and how effective have they been? (Standard 9, 13)
7. What are the tangible activities that have been done to improve the physical beauty of the campus? What are the specific plans for the future? (Standard 7)

Characterization of Community

1. What are the various societies/communities that exist at SBU? (Standard 13)
2. What is the number and types of events that occur on weekends? (Standard 13)
3. What is the number of religious organizations at SBU and how do they interact? (Standard 13)
4. What types of interactions exist between the Schools and Colleges? (Standard 10, 11, 13)
5. What is the number of faculty involved with various programs, committees, extracurricular activities, advisors? (Standard 10)

Problem Solving

1. How does SBU handle crises, such as the 9/11 terrorist incident, that affect all of its constituents? (Standard 9)

2. What characterizes SBU as a "commuter" institution? Does this detract from the sense of community? Could it be used to build community? (*Standards 9, 13*)

Subcommittee 5: Life beyond Stony Brook

The primary objective of subcommittee 5 is to determine the value of Stony Brook's education to its graduates. We also want to determine if our students have what they need to be successful in their chosen career and how SBU is supporting their career aspirations – curricular and co-curricular. We wish to ascertain where our students are going after graduation, which employers are hiring them and what those employers are looking for in recent graduates. Lastly, we want to find out the perceived value of the SBU educational experience to the success of our graduated students; the following questions were formulated to assess these concerns.

Part A. Alumnus (a) Focused

The Experience at SBU in Selecting a Career

1. How does the students' experience at Stony Brook impact their selection of a career and/or graduate program? (*Standards 9, 10, 11, 12*)
2. How does the availability of majors/minors affect their choice? (*Standard 11*)
3. What student support services do students access to assist in their choice -- Faculty Advisor? Career Center? Supervisor? (*Standard 9*)
4. If they seek counseling /advising, is their experiences helpful? (*Standard 9*)
5. Are external factors (e.g. family, friends) part of their decision process?

Value of Students' Experience to their Chosen Paths:

1. What values does the overall college experience (curricular and co-curricular) at SBU have for students' lives beyond Stony Brook? (*Standards 7, 12*)
2. Do students participate in pre-professional experiences (internships, part time jobs, leadership roles, volunteerism) to help them gain entry into their career? What are these experiences and what is their relevance for the transition from college to career. (*Standards 13, 14*)
3. What aspects of the SBU education are relevant for graduate programs? (*Standards 11, 12*)
4. How does SBU compare to the institution(s) that students attend after SBU?

Rethinking Stony Brook:

1. What are the three strengths of SBU in preparing students for their career paths?
 2. What are the three weaknesses of SBU in preparing students for their career paths?
 3. What changes would students make in their education at Stony Brook?
 4. Do SBU students recommend SBU to others? Why?
- (*Standards 7, 14*)

Part B. Employer Focused

1. What do employers look for when hiring candidates directly from colleges & universities?
 2. How competitive are SBU candidates for positions?
 3. How prepared are SBU students? What are their strengths and weaknesses?
 4. What values do SBU graduates at their organizations?
- (*Standard 14*)

Part C. Faculty Focused

1. How often do faculty advise students about careers and graduate programs?

2. How often do faculty advise alumni about careers and graduate programs?
 3. Do departments track placements in employer or graduate school?
- (Standards 12, 14)*

Subcommittee 6: Research

Subcommittee 6 is charged with the collection and distribution of statistical and analytical data to the rest of the steering committee, guiding the subcommittees in conducting surveys and studies, and providing reports and documentation supporting the fulfillment of the standards set forth by the Middle State Commission on Higher Education.

VI. OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT

Inclusion of the Director of Planning and Institutional Research (IR) on the Self-Study Steering Committee will provide the principal conduit for assessment information. As one of their first tasks, the self-study subcommittees will formulate questions whose answers would inform their work. The Director of IR will respond to those questions by providing the Steering Committee with an agenda identifying:

- Questions answered by previously completed analyses, by the Office of Institutional Research (OIR) or other areas
- Questions that can be answered with existing data during the self-study process
- Questions best answered by focus groups with students and other constituents during the self-study process
- Questions to be added to the outcomes-assessment agenda in future years

Following editing and approval by the Steering Committee this agenda will guide the incorporation of outcomes assessment data into the self-study report and also contribute to a section of the self-study reviewing current outcomes assessment activities. We do not plan a self-study assessment agenda that includes major survey activity. New insights will rather be gained through focus groups, new analyses of institutional and survey data, and possibly highly-focused telephone surveys by Stony Brook's Survey Research Center. Projects contributing to the self-study will be OIR's highest priority for 2002-03.

A substantial inventory of survey data is available for use in the self-study. Principal components include the following:

National Study of Student Engagement

We have data for 2000 and 2001, and, in addition to analyses of the standard reports, we are in the process of completing a comparison with 15 other public research universities using data available through the AAU Data Exchange. We will participate again in 2003 and use the data in the self-study if they are available in time.

Student Opinion Survey

All SUNY campuses conduct a student satisfaction survey every three years, and we have an extensive analysis of data collected in spring 2000 and spring 1997. In addition to comparative analysis between these two years and with the other SUNY university centers, OIR staff wrote a research paper on student satisfaction using these data that is currently in review for publication.

We will conduct this survey again in 2003 and use the data in the self-study if they are available in time.

CIRP New Student Survey

We participate in this survey every year to obtain a profile of new students.

Alumni Survey

We survey our new alumni every fall, in the year after their graduation, to obtain information on how many go on to school in what types of program and institution, and how many are working, in what types of jobs, in what locations, at what salaries.

CIRP Faculty Survey

In spring 2002 we participated in a SUNY faculty survey to develop a better understanding of the issues that are important to faculty and describe their activities and accomplishments.

Comparative data will be available for use in the self-study, from SUNY's other university centers and a national peer sample.

OIR Data Summaries and other analyses

The Office of Institutional Research produces a series of Data Summaries: short documents answering specific questions about student performance and other campus issues. These or other analyses previously completed by OIR or other offices may answer questions raised by the self-study subcommittees.

VII. INVENTORY OF SUPPORT DOCUMENTS

The material listed below directly relates to the standards of the self-study on which we are focusing and will be made available to the members of our subcommittee through a secure on-line resource/document library. Non-confidential materials will also be available to the campus community on our Middle State Website under the heading of Resource Library.

Mission/Vision Statements

As a public research university, SBU strives to provide the best in education and research, as stated in the university's five part mission, as well as the mission and vision for the university reflected in the President's *Five Year Plan* and for the academic sector illustrated in the Provost's *Developing a Strategic Plan*.

SUNY Memorandum Of Understanding

This joint agreement between SBU and SUNY Administration sets the goals, visions and overall mission and expectations for the university and where we will go in the future. Specific goals are stated for enrollments and admissions, student outcomes, faculty development and scholarship, academic programs direction, and infrastructure and technology.

Five-Year Plan and Accomplishment Reports

We are currently in the third year of Stony Brook's second *Five-Year Plan*, which establishes goals and a concrete action agenda to move Stony Brook toward further excellence in education, research and service through innovation and the improvement of core programs and services. The *Plan* identifies specific projects to be completed each year, with a focus on providing a

campus environment in which students, faculty and staff will flourish and developing new initiatives. It complements academic plans developed by the Provost and the Vice President, Health Sciences Center.

The *Five-Year Plan* includes a date for each action and the administrators responsible. The President makes annual *Accomplishments Reports* to the campus community to document the completion of each project.

Provost's Strategic Plan

Robert McGrath, SBU's Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs, assembled a committee of faculty and administrators in February of 2002 to form the Strategic Plan Advisory and Coordinating Committee. A draft of the Provost's strategic plan will be available to the campus community for discussion in the fall of 2002. Other materials include *Developing a Strategic Plan*, *SPACC Members List*, and *Strategic Plan Task Forces*.

Capital Plan

SBU's capital plan is updated and submitted to SUNY Administration every five years for funding of new construction and rehabilitation projects on SBU's campus and also details plans for future growth on the campus.

General Education Assessment Plan

This SUNY Administration mandated plan answers the questions regarding how SBU assesses its general education offerings.

Enrollment Management Plan

Each year, the Enrollment and Retention Management (ERM) Division prepares a document that reviews the prior year's accomplishments and outlines goals for the coming year. Undergraduate enrollment targets for the desired number and quality of freshmen and transfers are set by the President and Provost after consultation with an enrollment management advisory group and in relation to the University's Memorandum of Understanding with SUNY Systems Administration. The *ERM Strategic Plan* explains how the Admissions and Transfer Offices plan to achieve these targets through marketing and recruitment initiatives to enhance inquiries, applications, deposits, and enrollments. The ERM Plan also outlines accomplishments, goals, and planned activities for Financial Aid, Academic Merit Scholarships, the Parents Office, the Registrar's Office, Summer Sessions, Health Sciences Center Student Services (which supports admissions, financial aid, and registration/records functions in the Health Sciences Center), New Student Programs, Academic Advising, and Student Data Systems.

Mission Review

The report provides answers to questions on Mission Review posed by the Office of the SUNY Provost in his April 2 letter to campus Presidents, submitted to SUNY Administration on September 29, 1998. Provost Salins' letter and attached materials are included in the Appendix to this report.

University Bulletins

Materials include the *Graduate Bulletin*, *Undergraduate Bulletin*, and *The Health Sciences Center Bulletin*, listing all pertinent information for prospective students, including general information about the university, admissions guidelines, programs offered and course descriptions.

Special Accreditation Reports and External Reviews

The materials provided will include most recent external reviews of SBU's departments, chair's responses to those reviews and official report to SUNY Administration, as well as the external accreditation reports for our programs.

Middle States Publications

Middle State Publications provided to the steering committee and subcommittees include *Characteristics for Excellence in Higher Education* and *Designs for Excellence* as well as periodic updates on procedures, policies and topic specific handbooks provided by the Middle States Association, Commission on Higher Education.

Faculty/Student Handbooks

SBU's *Faculty Handbook* is designed to orient faculty to their position at SBU and provide them with guidelines for teaching, research, and acclimate new faculty to life in and around SBU.

Our *Student Handbook* is designed to orient students to life in and around the university and provide them with an easy guide to transitioning into college.

Admissions Materials

Admissions materials include a host of publications, such as the campus *Viewbook*, the *Search* brochure (to entice inquiries), and many other communications, printed and electronic, aimed at attracting applications and enhancing enrollments.

Orientation Materials

Orientation materials are produced by the offices of Admissions and New Student Programs, to guide new students through the enrollment process (placement testing, registration, and opening week orientation). They include the *Guide for Enrollment*, and *Experience Stony Brook*.

Data Summary Series

The Data Summary series produced by the Office of Institutional Research will provide background on student characteristics, academic processes, and student outcomes. Other offices such as Student Affairs have also produced analyses, such as studies of student opinion data that will inform the self-study.

Previous Self-Study

SBU's previous Institutional Self-Study, submitted to the Middle States Association, Commission of Higher Education by President in 1994.

MSACHE Follow-up to Previous Self-Study

The Evaluation Team Report of 1994 and the 1996 Follow-up Report submitted to the Middle States Association, Commission of Higher Education by President Kenny.

Periodic Review Report

SBU's Periodic Review Report submitted to the Middle States Association, Commission of Higher Education by President Kenny on June 1, 1999.

VIII. TIMELINE FOR THE SELF-STUDY

November 2001

- Steering committee co-chairs, Mark Aronoff & Petar Djuric selected by President Kenny.
- Co-chairs attended the Middle States Commission on Higher Education Self- Study Institute in Philadelphia, PA, November 7-8, 2001.

February 2002

- Co-chairs recruit faculty and administrators to form steering committee and establish weekly meetings.

April 2002

- Steering committee establishes 5 themes under the overarching design and identifies 5 subcommittees to study each theme.

June 2002

- Middle States Commission on Higher Education staff liaison self-study preparation visit to SBU.

August 2002

- Design for Self-Study submitted to Middle States Commission on Higher Education.

September 2002 – February 2003

- Steering committee and subcommittees complete information gathering and analysis of data.

January 2003

- Middle States Commission on Higher Education appoints evaluation team chair.

February - March 2003

- Middle States Commission on Higher Education selects evaluation team members.

May 2003

- Subcommittee final reports presented to steering committee

June – August 2003

- Steering committee prepares draft of self-study.

September 2003

- The draft of SBU's self-study is distributed throughout campus and available on the website www.sunysb.edu. Steering committee hosts open meetings and invites written comment on the draft via email link on website.

October – November 2003

- Final version of self-study is prepared.
- Evaluation team chair's preliminary visit and compliance audit.

December 2003

- Self-Study is submitted to the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, with copies to each evaluation team member.

Spring 2004 (Prior to April 15, 2004)

- Middle States Commission on Higher Education team visit.

May 2004

- Middle States Commission on Higher Education Committee on Evaluation Reports meets in Philadelphia to review SBU's Self-Study.

June 2004

- Middle States Commission on Higher Education full commission meets to discuss granting reaccreditation to SBU.

July 2004

- Middle States Commission on Higher Education informs SBU of their decision regarding reaccreditation.

IX. EDITORIAL STYLE AND FORMAT

The software used will be Microsoft Word 2000, Times New Roman font, 12 point. Headers will be in all caps, with a limit of two levels. Each subcommittee's reports will be given an allowance of 30 pages double-spaced, one-inch margins, no appendixes, with the stipulation that the steering committee will edit the reports as it sees fit. A professional copy editor will also be employed to review the final document. The tone of the document will be in the first person for the institution and the committee. The institution will be addressed throughout as Stony Brook University or SBU and persons by name and title.

X. PROPOSED FORMAT OF THE SELF-STUDY REPORT

Executive Summary

Institutional Profile

Overview of the Self-Study Process

Chapter 1: Transition to Stony Brook University

- SBU's Incoming Students
- Preparing our Students for their Education at SBU
- Facilitating their transition to SBU
- The Freshmen Experience
- The Transfer Student Experience
- The First Year Graduate Student Experience
- Orientation
- Academic Advising
- Students' Familiarity with Student Life

Chapter 2: First and Second Year at Stony Brook University

- Preparing First and Second Year Student for Further Success at SBU?
- Academic Foundations
- Doing well in Large Introductory Classes
- Interaction with Faculty and TA's
- Social adjustments
- Teaching Assistantships
- Mentoring
- Student Expectations.

Chapter 3: Education and Scholarly Activities

- Providing an integrated diverse education for our students
- Teaching, Learning, Research and Creative Activities
- Science for the Nonscientists
- Libraries, Laboratories, and Instructional Facilities
- The Role of Research in Education
- Interdisciplinary Programs

Chapter 4: Stony Brook as a Community

- Using the community as an environment for intellectual growth of our students
- Interactions among Different Communities at SBU
- Interactions with Off-Campus Communities
- Social and Cultural Experiences
- Integration with the Academic Experience
- Diversity
- Commuting Students
- Physical Environment and Campus Services

Chapter 5: Life beyond Stony Brook University

- Preparing our Students for Life beyond SBU
- Internships
- Preparation of Graduate Students for Academia (teaching)
- Success of Students
- Continuing Education
- Expectation of Employers

Conclusion

Index of Recommendations

Inventory of Support Documents

XI. PROFILE OF THE EVALUATION TEAM

The chair of the evaluation team should be from an AAU Institution that has been successful in improving its educational focus.

The evaluation team should include more than one representative from an Academic Health Center. The team should also include a representative who has previous experience in assessment in a public research university, representatives from the fields of Engineering and Applied Sciences, as well as broad representation in Arts and Sciences.

We also believe that members of the evaluation team should share the philosophy of unity of academic and student affairs.