

BROOKLYN CAMPUS SELF-STUDY DESIGN

Campus Overview and Mission	B-1
Nature and Scope of Self-Study	B-3
Specific Goals and Objectives of Self-Study	B-6
Organizational Structure of the Campus Accreditation Review Committee and Task Forces	B-10
Charges to the Task Forces	B-20
Outcomes Assessment	B-42
Inventory of Support Documents	B-44
Timetable	B-44
Editorial Style and Format	B-44
Format of the Self-Study Report	B-44
Profile of the Evaluation Team	B-44

BROOKLYN CAMPUS SELF-STUDY DESIGN

Campus Overview and Mission

Mission Statement

Expressed in its still relevant motto – Urbi et Orbi – the mission of Long Island University since 1926 has been to open the doors of the city and the world to men and women of all ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds who wish to achieve the satisfaction of the educated life and to serve the public good. Its mission is to awaken, enlighten and expand the minds of its students.

Generation after generation, the students who have enrolled in the Brooklyn Campus of Long Island University have come from varied, primarily urban backgrounds. Like their predecessors, many of today's students are new to America and new to the English language or are the first in their families to seek a university education. At the Brooklyn Campus, all students find an academic community where cultural, ethnic, religious, racial, sexual, and individual differences are respected and where commonalities are affirmed. This requires the Campus to be open and welcoming, even as it maintains respect for intellectual, cultural and academic traditions.

Nationally recruited, the faculty has a strong commitment to teaching, to personal advisement of students, to the fullest range of scholarship, and to faculty development and service.

The Brooklyn Campus recognizes both the faculty's training and experience and the character of its diverse student body as two of its greatest strengths and challenges. No matter what their background or generation, students come to the Campus to build the educational and intellectual foundations for successful personal and public lives and careers. The Campus faculty and administration believe that a liberal education—the basis for a free, informed citizenry—along with careful preparation for a fulfilling career, is the best way to achieve this end.

To carry out its mission, the Brooklyn Campus offers comprehensive undergraduate curricula, supported by advanced courses for specialized knowledge and graduate programs in those areas in which it has developed strength or has a unique contribution to make. In addition, the Campus has designed programs to permit students to acquire essential literacies, intellectual curiosity, analytic and reasoning skills, and effective communication skills. In this way, the Campus serves as a conservator of knowledge, a source and promulgator of new knowledge, and a resource for the community it serves.

The original unit of the three residential campuses of Long Island University, the Brooklyn Campus is a private, non-sectarian, and co-educational institution of higher learning. The Campus is organized into seven units: The Richard L. Conolly College of Arts and Sciences; The School of Business, Public Administration and Information Sciences; The School of Health Professions; The School of Education; The School of Nursing; The Arnold and Marie Schwartz College of Pharmacy and Health Science; and The Office of Continuing Education. Each of

these units, in conjunction with the College of Arts and Sciences, offers its majors a unique program of educational opportunities.

Campus Goals

A unique variety of students come to the Brooklyn Campus, ranging from new freshmen with no pre-defined educational or career objectives in mind, to students with clear professional ambitions, to those determined to go on to graduate or higher professional school. In addition, the Campus attracts a large percentage of transfer students with different prior higher educational backgrounds. Added to the mix is the range of academic preparedness of the students: the superior student, the adequately prepared student, and the student whose prior preparation is inadequate. This diversity poses an especially vigorous challenge. The Brooklyn Campus must not only maintain and strengthen the academic programs designed for the adequately prepared student, but it must also continue to provide and improve courses of study designed to challenge the superior student and to continue to develop and improve programs and services for those students with potential whose prior preparation was inadequate. Furthermore, as the Campus continues to serve its undergraduate population, it must improve the programs and opportunities of study for numerous graduate students both in the liberal arts and sciences and in the professional schools. The Campus is also committed to meeting the special needs of older students who matriculate in traditional programs or who require special non-traditional programs for continuing education in their present or new careers.

To meet the challenges inherent in serving the needs of a continuing population of diverse students, the Campus has established the following goals:

1. Improve, modify, and develop the curriculum, i.e., program development and curricular modification designed to meet the educational and career aspirations of students,
2. Ensure that the Campus's strong liberal education foundation provides students with communications, computational, critical thinking, independent learning, and problem solving skills to prepare them for advanced education, careers, and adult responsibilities, including the capacity for leadership,
3. Ensure that the Campus provides comprehensive support services closely aligned with its academic mission, thus enabling students of all ages and cultural and diverse academic backgrounds to achieve their educational goals whether at the undergraduate or graduate levels,
4. Strengthen efforts to assist students in securing productive, satisfying employment upon graduation,
5. Ensure faculty and staff with ongoing development and growth opportunities and administrative support for the realization of the Campus vision and to ensure academic excellence,
6. Strengthen the Campus planning and management system, including periodic reviews of its mission and goals, for the purpose of increasing the Campus's overall academic quality, inherent strength and fiscal stability,

7. Continue to improve the process by which the Campus' administrative and educational units plan, manage, and evaluate the use of resources to reach objectives,
8. Improve articulation and coordination among academic units and between and among instructional, administrative, and student services activities,
9. Increase the use of the resources of the city in the education of students, and
10. Make the Brooklyn Campus a recognized model private, urban university of inclusion and a critical educational resource for the community and enhance its visibility and impact in the region.

Nature and Scope of Self-Study

Overall Purpose

The Brooklyn Campus of Long Island University undertakes the Middle States Self-Study as an opportunity and commitment to appraise not only the major aspects of the Campus' educational effort in relation to self-defined goals, but also to help the Campus continue to implement and press forward with its new core, formulate a comprehensive review of graduate educational programs, and concentrate on enrollment planning and services. For this reason the Campus has selected a *comprehensive self-study design with special emphases* as a means to focus both on comprehensiveness and current initiatives and issues. The Campus Accreditation Committee is convinced that this approach will be profitable to the Campus because it provides the impetus to assess the efficacy of programs, resources, and overall operations and further assists in improving on-going self-study processes, in bringing greater coordination and planning to essential activities, and in considering new initiatives. In this process, the Campus recognizes the need for open discussion on all levels – departmentally, within and across disciplines, and throughout the University.

This self-study will evaluate the prescribed areas for investigation to assess and strengthen Campus fulfillment of its stated mission and to build on strengths, address weaknesses, identify opportunities, and propose recommendations that will promote the Brooklyn Campus's continued educational effectiveness well into the twenty-first century.

Rationale for Selecting Comprehensive Self-Study Design with Special Emphases

The areas of special emphases are the new core curriculum, graduate education, and enrollment planning and services. These emphases are inextricably linked to the Brooklyn Campus's recently developed Strategic Plan. While each emphasis is self-contained, taken together they serve as a common foundation for building effective student learning and for building a responsive and responsible urban learning community. Combined in a complementary relationship, these special emphases are not simply important realities that warrant thorough consideration, but are like fulcrums where those educational realities interact with the Campus' mission.

After almost a decade-long collaborative examination, resulting in a transformed core curriculum, the Campus now finds itself strategically poised to begin the process of implementation. The new core not only provides a significant part of the curriculum for undergraduate students—who continue to make up the clear majority of the student body—but also continues to be the foundation for undergraduate education and for students’ lifelong learning. Therefore, the Campus Accreditation Review Committee believes it is appropriate for all the Campus to devote such time and emphasis on its implementation, assessment, and refinement. This self-study emphasis will also allow the Campus to begin to evaluate the impact of the new writing-across-the-curriculum component of the core on student writing and cognitive development. Moreover, the self-study will examine the central impact of the core on building community between and among the faculty, among faculty and students, and among the students.

Effective development and strengthening of graduate education in areas where the Campus can demonstrate strength and have a contribution to make will position the Campus as a critical resource for the community and expand the capacity of students to assume roles of leadership. A structure for new program development, an evaluation process for on-going programs, and an examination of services that support programmatic and students’ needs are critical to the goals of the Campus mission and to the effective education of a significant number of students and must therefore be examined. Consequently, the Campus Accreditation Review Committee must analyze the continued growth of graduate education and its relationship to the undergraduate programs at the Brooklyn Campus to insure that sufficient planning, adequate funding, and program quality are assured.

The third emphasis, an examination of enrollment planning and services, is critical not only to maintain the strength and health of a campus that is heavily tuition dependent (85%), but also to promote all Campus activities that have an impact on student learning and student life. Therefore, the Campus Accreditation Review Committee plans to study retention strategies, academic program planning and advisement, administrative services assisting students in registration and financial matters, and student services that impact the learning environment. The Brooklyn Campus is a private urban educational community with a student population of diverse backgrounds, and thus enrollment planning and services assume a pivotal role that warrants campus-wide analysis and a related plan of action.

Major Changes Over Past Decade

Since the last Middle States Accreditation Report in 1993, a number of significant structural, personnel, and programmatic changes on the Brooklyn Campus have resulted in considerable improvements both in the academic and student services areas.

Physical Structure

The several structural improvements on the Brooklyn Campus include:

- The new William Zeckendorf Health Science Building,
- The new Jeanette and Edmund T. Pratt Jr., Center for Academic Studies Building,

- Fourth (Humanities Facility) and Eighth (Social Science Facility) Floors of Humanities Building, totaling over 2 million dollars 10th, 7th and 6th floors renovations in Metcalfe for science facilities, over \$3 million dollars,
- Restructuring and remodeling of the Library Learning Center,
- New outdoor tennis courts and rebuilding of the sports field,
- Approved plans for new theater/arts facility,
- Redesigned outdoor landscaping, and
- New Learning Center for Educators and Families.

Personnel

The decade saw renewal in the Campus' academic and administrative leadership, as outlined in the following new appointments:

- Dean for the School of Business, Public Administration and Information Sciences,
- Dean for the School of Education,
- New position created—Dean of Library,
- Significant expansion of library faculty, staff, and resources,
- New position created—Dean for Graduate Research,
- New position created—Dean of Institutional Advancement,
- Associate Dean of Continuing Education, and
- Increase of full-time faculty since 1993 by over 50%.

Program Changes

A number of new academic programs, consistent with the Campus mission and goals, have been approved by the faculty of the Campus and the State Education Department and are currently be offered.

- Doctor of Pharmaceutics
- Doctor of Pharmacology program
- Masters of Media Arts
- Bachelors and Masters of Science of Communication Disorders
- Bachelors of Science of Biochemistry
- Bachelors of Social Work
- Establishment of the Center for Urban Educators

Equally important are the completion of the Strategic Plan 2001-2006, the beginning and sustaining efforts in Outcomes Assessment within departments and throughout the Campus, and the finalized proposal for a new core curriculum presented to the faculty.

Specific Goals and Objectives of Self-Study

The Brooklyn Campus Self-Study has three specific purposes:

1. To examine and evaluate the new core curriculum, including the new writing-across-the-curriculum program, by assessing the core's relationship to the Campus mission and its goals, by studying the core's impact on students' intellectual development, and by overseeing, coordinating, and advancing the various implementation efforts associated with the new core,
2. To analyze the expanding role and quality of graduate education on a campus whose primary focus is on undergraduate education, to build a more effective structure to plan, fund, evaluate, and advance ongoing and prospective graduate programs, and to improve the support and services for graduate students, and
3. To examine the effectiveness of the Campus efforts in enrollment planning and services: academic program planning consistent with retention and student progress towards the degree; administrative services that assist new and continuing students in registration and financial matters; and student services impacting the learning environment.

By emphasizing the core curriculum, graduate education, and enrollment planning and services as the special emphases of its self-study, the Campus hopes to provide the Middle States accreditation team with a clear, comprehensive picture upon which it can base its study and conclusions.

In addition, planning-related questions have been integrated into the charges of the various Campus investigating committees, along with questions that specifically address the core curriculum, graduate education, and enrollment planning and services. In so doing, the self-study offers the Campus an opportunity to promote discussions on continuing the movement of the Brooklyn Campus to a more sustained strategic planning process. It is expected that this design will forge a closer connection between planning activities and the stated mission and goals and will result in a set of recommendations that will help the Brooklyn Campus advance its strategic planning.

Goals for Areas of Special Emphasis

Core Curriculum

The core curriculum is the foundation for all undergraduate learning at the Brooklyn Campus and the five year Doctor of Pharmacy; in addition it serves a prime means for a student's developing educational skills, a knowledge base, and perspectives on responsibilities to

self and to others. By having specific goals with a series of objectives, it is expected that the Middle States working committees will undertake their charges with guidelines with which to consider the place and implementation of the core curriculum in their areas of jurisdiction and analysis.

It is important to note that core curriculum embraces the spirit of the Campus's mission:

No matter what their background or generation, students come to the Brooklyn Campus to build the educational and intellectual foundations for successful personal and public lives and careers.... In addition, the Campus has designed programs to permit students to acquire essential reasoning skills and effective communication skills. In this way, the Campus serves as a conservator of knowledge, a source and promulgator of new knowledge, and a resource for the community it serves.

The new core is designed to satisfy the core curriculum goals, as stated in the *Middle States Self-Study, 1993*, and updated by the Core Curriculum Committee in 1998. In focusing on its implementation over the next several years, these goals remain central:

1. Cognitive skills: *To help students strengthen their capacities for inquiry, abstract thinking, and critical analysis*

The aim is to enhance students' ability to:

- understand, analyze, and interpret reading and other material critically
 - write organized, coherent discourse
 - speak organized, persuasive discourse
 - listen critically
 - research efficiently and knowledgeably
 - reason abstractly
 - interpret numerical data
2. Knowledge: *To help students acquire a general understanding of a body of knowledge in a variety of content areas and a foundation for further in-depth knowledge*

Students will be prepared to:

- demonstrate knowledge and awareness of philosophical and ethical
- demonstrate an understanding of literary genres and world literary schools
- display an understanding of fundamental scientific and mathematical concepts and an awareness of the impact of technology on society and the environment

- identify and understand general historical trends in world civilizations and demonstrate familiarity with social science concepts and ideas
3. Perspectives and Behavior: *To help students develop respect for both human commonalities and human diversity*

To take responsibility for their choices and for their roles in society, student will be trained to:

- gain historical and diverse perspectives (for example, scientific, aesthetic, social, etc.)
- develop their ability to reflect on ethical issues and to develop a sense of ethical behavior

The core successfully integrates Information Literacy throughout the curriculum, thus insuring that graduates possess the ability to find, retrieve, evaluate, and use information effectively.

Graduate Education

The importance of the Campus Mission and existing faculty strengths cannot be overstated for justifying the development of new graduate programs that are deemed essential to the growth and health of the Campus. Consequently, the Campus Accreditation Review Committee has insisted that a sense of what is essential graduate growth take its justification in turn from a primary commitment to a strong undergraduate education. However, although the Mission statement clearly confirms that the primary focus of the Brooklyn Campus undergraduate education, graduate education represents a substantial part of the Campus's educational effort, principally at the master's level but also at the doctoral level. When developed and implemented, new graduate programs must have the ability to attract a critical mass of students, have appropriate institutional and, where required, external funding, have a marketplace need for graduates, and have the existing academic strength and the resources to hire new faculty. This planned growth and strengthening of graduate education are likewise consistent with the Campus strategic vision of becoming a critical educational resource for the community and to expand the capacity of students to assume roles of leadership.

To achieve planned growth of in graduate education consistent with the Campus mission, the self-study identifies the following goals:

1. To provide a visible, strengthened structure to guide the effective review and development of graduate education and to effect better data gathering, shaping of collaborative programs, sharing of market information, acting on improvements, and cooperation, promotion of graduate programs,
2. To aim for a growth of the graduate student population by some 2% to 3% each of the next five years to better utilize Campus faculty and physical resources,

3. To insure that any future growth of graduate education will be based on additional, new resources generated to avoid straining resources for undergraduate program or based on the reassessment and reallocation of resources among existing programs, and
4. To provide more effective services and supports for graduate students and a more focused graduate educational experience by identifying physical spaces and appropriate offices.

It is expected that all working committees will consider these graduate education goals in the course of their investigations in the areas of their jurisdiction and analyses.

Enrollment Planning and Services

To develop the ability of the Brooklyn Campus students to persist towards the successful completion of a degree is a single issue that cannot be neglected nor divorced from providing students with the enthusiasm for college and the intellectually rich life. Fulfilling this primary responsibility may be, of all responsibilities, the most challenging for faculty, administrators, and staff because it is an institutional obligation, supported by multiple campus constituencies.

Beyond a positive classroom experience, effective and appropriate curricula, and academic support systems, there exist other services and interventions that impact on students' retention, adequate progress, and graduation. Several of these include academic program planning, administrative services (Admissions, the Registrar, Student Financial Services, Bursar etc.), and student services (Residence Life, Career Services, Student Activities etc.). The goals listed below for Enrollment Planning and Services are designed to provide guidance for all activities at the Brooklyn Campus, to assist faculty, administrators, and staff to evaluate and or reevaluate their roles and to assist departments, schools, and administrative units in reexamining their activities and, if need be, in formulating an action plan for change.

1. To increase the number of students who complete their semester's coursework and the number who progress satisfactorily toward the degree,
2. To improve communication among students, faculty and administrators to achieve a coordinated system of support in the areas of academic planning, academic support, student services, financial planning, and career planning,
3. To meet this central goal of comprehensive and effective service, by instituting efforts to continually improve services and develop all Campus services personnel, and
4. To reexamine faculty and staff involvement as an important part of a renewed focus on retention and graduation.

It is expected that all the task forces will consider these enrollment planning and services goals in the course of conducting investigations in their areas of jurisdiction and analysis.

Organizational Structure of the Campus Accreditation Review Committee and Task Forces

Responsibility of the Campus Accreditation Review Committee

The Campus Accreditation Review Study Committee undertook the responsibility to develop the overall design and to draw up charges for the self-study and its relevant working committees and is responsible for coordinating these working committees on the issues to be studied. As indicated, each working committee will further refine its charges and research questions and will further elaborate on its methodology. The Campus Accreditation Review Committee has the responsibility to insure that the working committees interact with campus groups. In addition, the Committee will periodically meet with the chairs of the working committees to monitor progress and make any necessary recommendations. In this way, the Committee will maintain responsibility for reviewing the progress of the working committees and with the liaisons will assure that these committees remain focused on their tasks and on schedule.

The Campus Accreditation Review Committee will likewise be responsible for reviewing the reports of the individual self-study committees and of accepting, modifying, or rejecting recommendations depending on the supporting evidence and analysis for each area. By the late Spring of 2002, the Committee will present a preliminary draft of the Campus self-study to the faculty, administration, staff and students. A series of campus meetings will allow comments on the draft. In addition, campus constituents will have an opportunity to respond in writing. This opportunity will be made clear when the document is first publicly circulated. Taking this critique into account, the Committee will make all appropriate changes to the self-study report. The Committee has final responsibility for approving the document submitted to the University as part of the Long Island University Self-Study to the Middle States Association.

Organization

The Brooklyn Campus self-study process will incorporate the general questions suggested in the Middle States Association's *Design for Excellence: Handbook for Institutional Self-Study* (p. 17) and principles from *Characteristics of Excellence*. Some forms of the following questions from the Handbook are included in the charge or in the research questions of the Campus Accreditation Review Committee and the task forces:

1. What are the Campus's educational obligations posed by its mission, goals, and objectives, and what educational obligations does it have? Are all the Campus's activities consistent with its mission and goals? Are the mission, goals, and objectives appropriate for advancing undergraduate and graduate student learning?
2. Is there an effective information system to support the committee's work?
3. How can the results from the formal strategic planning process of the Campus be incorporated into the committee's work?
4. What is the process for systematically reviewing and improving student learning outcomes?

5. What major studies are in progress or recently completed that the committee can utilize information or data from to avoid unnecessary duplication?
6. What recent events (within the last 10 years) might cause significant changes in the Campus?
7. Have appropriate plans been made to have adequate representation and involvement of all the Campus's constituencies and larger community?

Following closely the areas suggested in the *Designs for Excellence*, the Brooklyn Campus Self-Study Committee has organized its task forces to investigate and analyze the following areas:

- Mission, Goals and Objectives,
- Students, Campus Life, Cultural Activities, and Athletics,
- Faculty,
- Educational Program and Curricula,
- Library, Educational Technology, and Other Learning,
- Facilities, Equipment, and Other Resources,
- Institutional Effectiveness and Outcomes,
- Strategic Planning and Resource Allocation,
- Organization, Administration, and Governance,
- Alumni and Community Relations, Marketing, Catalogs, and Publications.

Each of the task forces will work closely with the Campus Accreditation Review Committee and will be familiar with the criteria from the *Designs for Excellence* and the *Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education*. Furthermore, each task force will refine its initial charges as it begins its deliberations and, with the approval of the Campus Accreditation Review Committee, will incorporate changes into the charges and into the list of research questions. To promote coordination and to insure timely progress, at least one member from the Campus Accreditation Review Committee will serve as a liaison on each task force.

Methodology

The Brooklyn Campus Accreditation Review Committee has shaped the structure of the self-study and has charged each of the working committees to investigate key questions concerning

- goals and objectives in each area of examination,
- fit of area goals and activities with Campus mission and goals,
- evidence that the Campus is currently achieving these goals and objectives and that it will continue to do so in the future,

- problems that must be addressed to meet objectives,
- planning processes, plans, and level of coordination to support and improve the Campus’s ability to achieve objectives,
- evidence of effective and timely communication on matters concerning the area of investigation, and
- specific analysis of how the area of investigation impacts on the areas of special emphases: core curriculum, graduate education, and enrollment planning and services.

Each task force will further develop the methodology that it will employ to answer the research questions, and will supplement the inventory of documents, reports, statistical data, and interviews or surveys.

Beyond the statement of the purpose of its research and investigation and of the particular focus that the committee developed, each task force will submit to the Campus Accreditation Review Committee:

- the questions that were answered, and if appropriate, questions that might be further explored as part of enhanced planning,
- a narrative description of what the committee did, with the major emphasis on analyzing the materials it investigated,
- an up-to-date inventory of documents and other supporting materials used during the committee’s work,
- a clear statement of findings and a clearly defined section on the impact of findings on the special areas of emphases—core curriculum, graduate education, and enrollment planning and services, and
- summary of strengths, weaknesses, challenges, and recommendations in priority order as part of its general conclusions.

Membership

Campus Accreditation Review Committee

Co-Chairs

David Cohen	Dean	Richard L. Conolly College	david.cohen@liu.edu
Al DiMaio	Professor	Political Science	alfred.dimaio@liu.edu
Gladys Schrynemakers	Administrator	Provost Office	gladys.schrynemakers@liu.edu

Members

Rhianon Allen	Professor	Psychology	rhianon.allen@liu.edu
Bernice Braid	Dean	Instructional Resources	bernice.braid@liu.edu

John Brennan	Professor	History	john.brennan@liu.edu
Donna Dolinsky	Professor	Pharmacy	donna.dolinsky@liu.edu
Ed Donahue	Professor	Chemistry	edward.donahue@liu.edu
John Ehrenberg	Professor	Political Science	john.ehrenberg@liu.edu
Ofelia Garcia	Dean	Education	ofelia.garcia@liu.edu
Steve Gross	Dean	Pharmacy	stephen.gross@liu.edu
Gale Haynes	Provost	Provost Office	gale.haynes@liu.edu
Dawn Kilts	Professor	Nursing	dawn.kilts@liu.edu
Valerie Lava	Professor	Education	valerie.lava@liu.edu
Tom Schmitz	Professor	Physical Therapy	thomas.schmitz@liu.edu
Bill Susman	Dean	Physical Therapy/Nursing	william.susman@liu.edu
David Toise	Professor	English	david.toise@liu.edu
Kathy Waldron	Dean	Business	kathy.waldron@liu.edu
Bernadette Walker	Dean	Dean of Students	bernadette.walker@liu.edu
Constance Woo	Dean	Library	constance.woo@liu.edu

Task Force on Mission, Goals and Objectives

(Members to be appointed.)

Task Force on Institutional Integrity

(Members to be appointed.)

Task Force on Students, Campus Life, Cultural Activities and Athletics

Co-Chairs

Bob Nathanson	Professor	Education	robert.nathanson@liu.edu
Ross Wheeler	Administrator	Honors	ross.wheeler@liu.edu

Liaisons

Valerie Lava	Professor	Education	valerie.lava@liu.edu
Bill Susman	Dean	Physical Therapy/Nursing	william.susman@liu.edu

Members

Martin Brown	Dean	Pharmacy	martin.brown@liu.edu
Tommy Castiglione	Administrator	Registrar	thomas.castiglione@liu.edu
Brad Cohen	Administrator	Provost Office	brad.cohen@liu.edu
Ralph Engleman	Professor	Journalism	ralph.engleman@liu.edu
Joe Filonowicz	Professor	Philosophy	joseph.filonowicz@liu.edu
Mohammed Ghriga	Professor	Computer Science	mohammed.ghriga@liu.edu

Gail Ann Greaves	Professor	Communication Studies, Performance Studies & Theatre	gailann.greaves@liu.edu
Michael Hittman	Professor	Anthropology	michael.hittman@liu.edu
Rose Iannicelli	Dean	Student Financial Services	rose.iannicelli@liu.edu
Linda Penn	Professor	Psychology	linda.penn@liu.edu
Monique Scott	Student	SGA President	
Okarita Stevens	Administrator	HEOP	okarita.stevens@liu.edu
Judy Stuart	Professor	Dance	judith.stuart@liu.edu
John Suarez	Administrator	Athletics	john.suarez@liu.edu
Cora Van Derveer	Professor	Nursing	cora.vanderveer@liu.edu
Bernadette Walker	Dean	Dean of Students	bernadette.walker@liu.edu
Susanna Yurick	Administrator	Honors	susanna.yurick@liu.edu

Task Force on Faculty

Co-Chairs

Amy Ginsberg	Professor	Education	amy.ginsberg@liu.edu
William Burgos	Professor	English	william.burgos@liu.edu
Andreas Zavitsas	Professor	Chemistry	andreas.zavitsas@liu.edu

Liaisons

Tom Schmitz	Professor	Physical Therapy	thomas.schmitz@liu.edu
David Toise	Professor	English	david.toise@liu.edu

Members

Vicci Hill-Lombardi	Professor	Sports Sciences	vicci.hilllombardi@liu.edu
Sam Jones	Professor	Social Work	samuel.jones@liu.edu
Cecilia Kovac	Professor	Biology	cecilia.kovac@liu.edu
Sylvester McKenna	Professor	Biology	sylvester.mckenna@liu.edu
Marianne Mortera	Professor	Occupational Therapy	marianne.mortera@liu.edu
Isabel Pascale	Professor	Education	isabel.pascale@liu.edu
John Sannuto	Professor	Communication Studies, Performance Studies & Theatre	john.sannuto@liu.edu
Bob Schick	Professor	Public Administration	robert.schick@liu.edu
John Suarez	Administrator	Athletics	john.suarez@liu.edu
Paolina Taglienti	Professor	Library	paolina.taglienti@liu.edu
Diana Voelker	Administrator	HEOP	diana.voelker@liu.edu
Linda Zelski	Professor	Nursing	linda.zelski@liu.edu

Task Force on Educational Program and Curricula

Co-Chairs

Hildi Hendrickson	Professor	Anthropology	hildi.hendrickson@liu.edu
Bernice Braid	Dean	Instructional Resources	bernice.braid@liu.edu

Liaisons

Rhianon Allen	Professor	Psychology	rhianon.allen@liu.edu
John Ehrenberg	Professor	Political Science	john.ehrenberg@liu.edu

Members

Nina Bennahum	Professor	Communication Arts	ninotchka.bennahum@liu.edu
Glen Lawrence	Professor	Chemistry	glen.lawrence@liu.edu
Deborah Mutnick	Professor	English	deborah.mutnick@liu.edu
Eric Posmentier	Professor	Physics/Mathematics	eric.posmentier@liu.edu
Gregary Racz	Professor	Foreign Language	gregary.racz@liu.edu
Vincent Reid	Professor	Pharmacy	vincent.reid@liu.edu
Michelle Relyea	Administrator	COOP	michelle.relyea@liu.edu
Benedicte Reyes	Professor	Business	benedicte.reyes@liu.edu
John Roche	Dean	Continuing Studies	john.roche@liu.edu
Bob Schick	Professor	Public Administration	robert.schick@liu.edu
Anne Scott	Professor	Occupational Therapy	anne.scott@liu.edu
Gerald Silveira	Dean	Richard L. Conolly College	gerald.silveira@liu.edu
Jessica Trubek	Professor	Education	jessica.trubek@liu.edu

Task Force on Library, Educational Technology and Other Learning Resources

Co-Chairs

Kevin Lauth	Professor	Media Arts	kevin.lauth@liu.edu
Jayne Werner	Professor	Political Science	jayne.werner@liu.edu

Liaison

Gladys Schrynemakers	Administrator	Provost Office	gladys.schrynemakers@liu.edu
----------------------	---------------	----------------	------------------------------

Members

Ellen Becker	Professor	Respiratory Care	ellen.becker@liu.edu
Debe Bednarchak	Professor	Mathematics	debe.bednarchak@liu.edu
Ping-Tsai Chung	Professor	Computer Science	tsai.chung@liu.edu
Anthony DePass	Professor	Biology	anthony.depass@liu.edu
Winnie Donahue	Administrator	Testing/Placement	winfred.donahue@liu.edu
Jane Dorfman	Professor	Library	jane.dorfman@liu.edu
Stuart Fishelson	Professor	Media Arts	stuart.fishelson@liu.edu

Marshal Hagins	Professor	Physical Therapy	marshal.hagins@liu.edu
Howard McGuire	Professor	Psychology	howard.mcguire@liu.edu
Marjan Moghaddam	Professor	Media Arts	marjan.moghaddam@liu.edu
Dev Mondal	Administrator	Faculty Media Resource Center	devabrata.mondal@liu.edu
Zary Mostashari	Professor	Library	zary.mostashari@liu.edu
Louis Parascandola	Professor	English	louis.parascandola@liu.edu
Leighsa Sharoff	Professor	Nursing	leighsa.sharoff@liu.edu
Andrea Slonosky	Professor	Library	andrea.slonosky@liu.edu
Patricia Stevens	Professor	Writing Center	patricia.stevens@liu.edu
David Udry	Administrator	Academic Advisement	david.udry@liu.edu
Lourdes Zavitsas	Professor	Mathematics	lourdes.zavitsas@liu.edu
Stanley Zelinski	Administrator	English as a Second Language	stanley.zelinski@liu.edu
Susan Zinar	Professor	Education	susan.zinar@liu.edu

**Task Force on Facilities, Equipment,
and Other Resources**

Co-Chairs

Gary Kose	Professor	Psychology	gary.kose@liu.edu
Sylvia Walters	Professor	Communication Sciences & Disorders	sylvia.walters@liu.edu

Liaisons

Edward Donahue	Professor	Chemistry	edward.donahue@liu.edu
Constance Woo	Dean	Library	constance.woo@liu.edu

Members

Eileen Augente	Professor	Nursing	eileen.augente@liu.edu
Margaret Cuonzo	Professor	Philosophy	margaret.cuonzo@liu.edu
Jerome Garner	Administrator	Residence Life & Housing	jerome.garner@liu.edu
Stacey Gropack	Professor	Physical Therapy	stacey.gropack@liu.edu
Karlene Jackson	Administrator	Student Activities	karlene.jackson@liu.edu
Jeff Lambert	Professor	Special Education	jeff.lambert@liu.edu
Joseph Morin	Professor	Biology	joseph.morin@liu.edu
Margie Rubins	Dean	Education	margie.rubins@liu.edu
Liz Rudey	Professor	Art	liz.rudey@liu.edu
Audrey Sackner-Bernstein	Professor	Media Arts	audrey.bernstein@liu.edu
Joseph Slater	Administrator	Buildings and Grounds	joe.slater@liu.edu
Sam Watson	Professor	Chemistry	samuel.watson@liu.edu

Task Force on Institutional Effectiveness and Outcomes

Co-Chairs

Rhianon Allen	Professor	Psychology	rhianon.allen@liu.edu
Gladys Schrynemakers	Administrator	Provost Office	gladys.schrynemakers@liu.edu

Members

Bob Barry	Professor	Art	bob.barry@liu.edu
Mina Berkowitz	Professor	Education	mina.berkowitz@liu.edu
Pat Connors	Administrator	Bursar	patricia.connors@liu.edu
Donna Dolinsky	Professor	Pharmacy	donna.dolinsky@liu.edu
Ed Donahue	Professor	Chemistry	edward.donahue@liu.edu
Cris Gleicher	Administrator	Academic & Instructional Resources	cris.gleicher@liu.edu
Graduate Student			
Hildi Hendrickson	Professor	Sociology	hildi.hendrickson@liu.edu
Kevin Lauth	Professor	Media Arts	kevin.lauth@liu.edu
Yuko Minowa	Professor	Business	yuko.minowa@liu.edu
Nick Papouchis	Professor	Psychology	nicholas.papouchis@liu.edu
Lisa Samstag	Professor	Psychology	lisa.samstag@liu.edu
Jose Sanchez	Professor	Political Science	jose.sanchez@liu.edu
Hazel Sanderson	Professor	Nursing	hazel.sanderson@liu.edu
Tom Schmitz	Professor	Physical Therapy	thomas.schmitz@liu.edu
Harry Stucke	Professor	Business	harry.stucke@liu.edu
Lena Young	Administrator	Financial Services	lena.young@liu.edu

Task Force on Strategic Planning and Resource Allocation

Co-Chairs

Gale Haynes	Provost	Provost Office	gale.haynes@liu.edu
Al DiMaio	Professor	Political Science	alfred.dimaio@liu.edu
Kathy Waldron	Dean	Business	kathy.waldron@liu.edu

Members

Rhianon Allen	Professor	Psychology	rhianon.allen@liu.edu
Michael Arons	Vice President	Academic Affairs	michael.aronson@liu.edu
Bernice Braid	Dean	Instructional Resources	bernice.braid@liu.edu
Alan Chaves	Dean	Admissions	alan.chaves@liu.edu
David Cohen	Dean	Richard L. Conolly College	david.cohen@liu.edu
John Ehrenberg	Professor	Political Science	john.ehrenberg@liu.edu
Ofelia Garcia	Dean	Education	ofelia.garcia@liu.edu
Steve Gross	Dean	Pharmacy	stephen.gross@liu.edu

Barbara Grumet	Associate Provost	Provost Office, Westchester	barbara.grumet@liu.edu
Dawn Kilts	Professor	Nursing	dawn.kilts@liu.edu
Carol Magai	Professor	Psychology	carol.magai@liu.edu
Laura McKaie	Dean	Institutional Advancement	laura.mckaie@liu.edu
Bob Nathanson	Professor	Special Education	robert.nathanson@liu.edu
Gladys Schrynemakers	Administrator	Provost Office	gladys.schrynemakers@liu.edu
Bill Susman	Dean	Physical Therapy/Nursing	william.susman@liu.edu
Ed Travaglianti	Chancellor	Chancellor	
Constance Woo	Dean	Library	constance.woo@liu.edu

Task Force on Organization, Administration and Governance

Co-Chairs

Peter Salber	Dean	Library	peter.salber@liu.edu
Ruth Shackelford	Professor	History	ruth.shackelford@liu.edu

Liaisons

John Brennan	Professor	History	john.brennan@liu.edu
Dawn Kilts	Professor	Nursing	dawn.kilts@liu.edu

Members

Azzedine Bensalem	Professor	Chemistry	azzedine.bensalem@liu.edu
Mark Birchette	Professor	Biology	mark.birchette@liu.edu
Amy Brandt	Administrator	Honors	amy.brandt@liu.edu
Esther Brill	Professor	Nursing	esther.brill@liu.edu
Alan Chaves	Dean	Admissions	alan.chaves@liu.edu
Sealy Gillis	Professor	English	sealy.gillis@liu.edu
Gail Ann Greaves	Professor	Communication Studies, Performance Studies & Theatre	gailann.greaves@liu.edu
Simone Knight	Student	SGA President	
Guy Lombardo	Professor	Physical Therapy	gaetano.lombardo@liu.edu
Kristin Schaefer	Professor	Education	kristin.schaefer@liu.edu
George Sideris	Professor	Biology	
Liesel Schumacher	Asst. Dean	Pharmacy	anneliese.schumacher@liu.edu
Chris Sorensen	Professor	Business	chris.sorensen@liu.edu

**Task Force on Alumni and Community Relations,
Marketing, Catalogs, and Publications**

Co-Chairs

Jan Rosenberg	Professor	Sociology	jan.rosenberg@liu.edu
Laura McKaie	Dean	Institutional Advancement	laura.mckaie@liu.edu

Liaisons

Steve Gross	Dean	Pharmacy	stephen.gross@liu.edu
Kathy Waldron	Dean	Business	kathy.waldron@liu.edu

Members

James Allan	Professor	Mathematics	james.allan@liu.edu
Patricia Boswell	Administrator	Development & Alumni Relation	patricia.boswell@liu.edu
Alan Chaves	Dean	Admissions	alan.chaves@liu.edu
Anthony Cirincione	Administrator	Registrar	anthony.cirincione@liu.edu
Mary-Jo Dropkin	Professor	Nursing	maryjo.dropkin@liu.edu
Ellen Goodwin	Professor	Physical Therapy	ellen.goodwin@liu.edu
Barbara Henning	Professor	English	barbara.henning@liu.edu
Judith Kirchoff	Professor	Public Administration	judith.kirchoff@liu.edu
Laurie Lehman	Professor	Education	laurie.lehman@liu.edu
Vicci Hill-Lombardi	Professor	Sports Sciences	vicci.hill-lombardi@liu.edu
Charlotte Marchant	Professor	Education	charlotte.marchant@liu.edu
Terri Nackid	Administrator	Public Relations	terri.nackid@liu.edu
Sean O'Meara	Administrator	Admissions	sean.omeara@liu.edu
Lisa Poullard-Burton	Administrator	Pharmacy	lisa.poullardburton@liu.edu
Paul Ramirez	Professor	Psychology	paul.ramirez@liu.edu
Hania Lujan-Upton	Professor	Chemistry	hania.lujan-upton@liu.edu
Lester Wilson	Professor	United Nations Grad Cert. Program	lester.wilson@liu.edu

Task Force on Institutional Change and Renewal

Chair

Gale Haynes	Provost	Provost Office	gale.haynes@liu.edu
-------------	---------	----------------	---------------------

(Members to be appointed.)

Charges to the Task Forces

Charges to Task Force on Mission, Goals and Objectives

The review of Mission, Goals, and Objectives and related documents will be the responsibility of the entire Campus Self-Study Committee and will focus on the vision and obligations of the Mission Statement presented earlier in this self-study design. Attempting both to support and enhance the ways in which the Campus lives up its stated Mission, the committee will assess the relevance of the mission and its goals in light of current and projected learning needs of its diverse student population; moreover, it will determine if the stated mission, goals, and objectives are effectively operational in the work of the faculty and staff in Campus's programs, activities, and developments. In effect, this study will attempt to determine and demonstrate the degree to which the Campus accomplishes its mission and meets its goals in relation to its students, its staff, its supporters, and its community-at-large. Taking its cue from *Characteristics in Excellence* (p.7), the committee will focus on assessing the degree to which goals and objectives are utilized as guides for thought and action. The most recent (April 2001) Brooklyn Campus Strategic Plan 2001-2006, which flows from the Mission, generated a vision for the Campus. That Strategic Vision Statement is:

The Brooklyn Campus of Long Island University in an urban educational and cultural center – a resource for lifelong learning and community development. It will emerge as a recognized model among private urban centers as a university of inclusion, serving as a magnet for a diverse student population, as well as providing educational resources for business, civic and community interests. A well-coordinated array of educational programs, linked with opportunities for basic and applied research, field-based learning and with comprehensive student services and activities will enable students of all ages and cultural backgrounds to achieve their educational and career objectives.

An understanding of the relationship between the Mission Statement and the new Strategic Plan 2001-2006 and its goals and objectives will be one consideration of this task force's work. As a result, the committee will examine the impact of the Campus mission on the goals and objectives of the Strategic Plan to ensure their mutual congruity and analyze the consequence of implementing the plan on the mission.

Research Questions

In carrying out its charges, the committee will, as far as possible, relate its examination and analysis of the questions to the areas of special emphases: core curriculum, graduate education, and enrollment planning and services, as well as to overall activities and will be expected to reflect these special emphases in a clearly defined section of the report.

1. Are the Brooklyn Campus mission and goals clearly stated?
2. Do the mission and goals support the needs of students and community?

3. Does the mission statement reveal the purpose, educational, and societal obligation of the Brooklyn Campus?
4. Does the statement of mission, goals, and objectives provide a framework for the maintenance of Campus integrity, a guide for educational planning, and a frame of reference for the specific areas of emphases: core curriculum, graduate education, enrollment planning and services?
5. What impact do the elements of the LIU Plan (freshman orientation program, expanded personal counseling including financial aid advisement, experiential learning opportunities and options, and essential literacies) have in realizing mission, goals, and objectives of the Brooklyn Campus?
6. Does each component of the Brooklyn Campus have a mission statement or stated philosophy consistent with the Campus mission and goals, and do these statements contribute to the Campus assessment of overall effectiveness?
7. Are programs and activities designed to achieve the Campus mission and goals? To what degree are the mission and goals being realized?
8. Are the new Strategic Vision Statement and Strategic Goals for the Campus consistent with the Campus Mission and Goals?
9. What mutual impact or shaping influence do Campus Mission/Goals and Strategic Plan Implementation have on each other?
10. What is the relationship between the Campus's mission and goals and the area development (Metrotech, Brooklyn Cultural Zone, Empowerment Zone, Downtown Redevelopment)?
11. Are the human, physical and fiscal resources needed to achieve the Campus's aims now available? If not, are they likely to be available in the foreseeable future?

Methodology

The task force will identify and carefully review relevant documents and studies. Particular attention will be given to the current Campus Mission/Goals Statement, the Strategic Plan 2001-2006, the Outcome Assessment Plan, the Master Plan for Capital Expenditure, and the new Core Curriculum and the Student Services Strategic Plan, as well as the previous Middle States Self-Study and recommendations, and the findings of the previous Middle States Reaccreditation Visit. In addition to a review of documents, including relevant guides such as the Faculty Handbook, the Student Handbook, and the University Statutes, the task force will conduct selective interviews of administrators, faculty and students, trustees and alumni. The committee may wish to make use of focus groups to explore key questions of the committee's investigation. The task force will produce a report explaining and analyzing its findings, identifying strengths, weaknesses, challenges, and a set of recommendations for action in priority order.

Charges to Task Force on Students, Campus Life, Cultural Activities, and Athletics

The Task Force on Students, Campus Life, Cultural Activities, and Athletics will investigate, analyze, and propose recommendations for the improvement of student life and culture on Campus. While examining the impact of student services in the areas listed below as related to the mission and goals of the Campus, the task force will emphasize analysis of the impact of those services on core curriculum, graduate education, and enrollment planning and services. The task force will collect information and determine student needs and what serves those needs most effectively. It will make recommendations in priority order to improve student life and services. The areas to be examined are as follows:

- **Student and Campus Activities**
 - Clubs and Activities
 - Publications
 - Orientation/Commencement
 - Cultural Facilities and Activities
 - Office of Student Activities
 - Athletics –
 - NCAA Facilities and Activities
 - Intramural Activities

- **Student Support Services – Academic, Career, Personal**
 - Career Development
 - International Student Office
 - Campus Ministry
 - Academic Advisement
 - Residence Life
 - Health Services –
 - Student Health Services
 - Psychological Services (Clinic)
 - Student Right and Due Process –
 - Student Advocacy
 - Student Discipline
 - Student Appeals

- **Student Administrative Services**
 - Registrar
 - Student Financial Services
 - Bursar
 - Admissions Office

Research Questions

In carrying out its charges, the task force will, as far as possible, relate its examination and analysis of the questions to the areas of core curriculum, graduate education, and enrollment planning and services, as well as to overall activities at the Brooklyn Campus and will be expected to reflect these special emphases in a clearly defined section of its report.

The task force will attempt to answer the following questions in the course of its investigation:

1. Are there formal goals and objectives of the office or department relating to the student services being examined? What are they? Are they documented? What is the process by which they are formulated?
2. How do these goals and objectives fit within the Campus mission and goals? Are there conflicts or contradictions between department and Campus goals?
3. What information is available and what information is needed to evaluate the effectiveness of student services?
4. What are the strengths of the office or department that enable it to achieve its goals and objectives? Are there current or potential problems which are affecting or could affect the ability of the department to achieve its goals?
5. Based on available information, what is the quality of life for the diversity of students on Campus? What role do students play both in evaluating the quality of Campus life and in influencing the direction of Campus life and its quality? What improvements are needed and how might those be achieved?
6. How are information and decisions affecting student life and student services communicated to Campus constituencies? What is the evidence of such communication? Is the communication timely and adequate?
7. By what means does the Campus gather information about student characteristics, such as demographics, beliefs, attitudes, values, interests, skills, cultural awareness, and other aspects of psychological and social development? Does such data collection describe student characteristics before, during, and after enrollment? Is this process systematic or *ad hoc*?
8. What is the impact of student services on student learning and what is being done to assess its impact?
9. Is there evidence of a comprehensive plan for the development of student services? How does that plan relate to the stated mission and goals of the Campus? How does planning in the area of student life and services fit into Campus-wide planning processes?

Charges to Task Force on Faculty

The Task Force on the Faculty will identify the role and responsibilities of the faculty. The task force will study criteria and procedures applied to the selection, supervision, academic freedom, continuing professional development, and assessment of both full-time and part-time faculty. The task force will make recommendations in priority order to enhance the faculty's role

and to improve the opportunities for the faculty to realize the aims of Campus mission and goals. It will also consider the role of planning and coordination where relevant and likewise will make recommendations for improvement in the planning and coordination areas. To accomplish this, the task force will direct its attention to the following areas that influence faculty life:

- Faculty demography
- Professional characteristics
- Faculty activities: academic, professional, research, and service
- Faculty development
- Faculty participation in governance and committees
- Faculty involvement in the collective bargaining agreement
- The collective perceptions of faculty roles and responsibility reflected in the Campus mission statement, faculty handbook, contractual agreement, ARPT criteria, and student evaluations
- The relationship among current faculty, current and projected program directions, and the Campus mission and goals
- The effectiveness of communication of information and decisions

Research Questions

In carrying out its charges, the task force will, as far as possible, relate its examination and analysis of the questions to the areas of core curriculum, graduate education, and enrollment planning and services, as well as to overall activities on Campus, and will be expected to reflect these special emphases in a clearly defined section of its report.

1. Do the Campus and faculty consider teaching as the primary responsibility of faculty? If not, to what extent do competing responsibilities affect the teaching and learning that is anticipated by the Campus's mission and goals?
2. What are the demographics of the faculty? What is the projected (planned) portrait of the faculty as related to projected program/curricula needs? What are the professional characteristics of the faculty, such as degrees, discipline experience, teaching experience?
3. Are faculty in all departments or divisions appropriately prepared, and do they remain current, in the following areas: academic qualifications, commitment to scholarship, sensitivity to the strengths and needs of students, continuing professional development, and service to the community?
4. What are the professional activities of the faculty as evidenced by commitment to teaching and advising, research, grant development, and publication, and community and public service? What conclusions can be drawn from an analysis of these activities?

5. What types of faculty development projects are faculty pursuing? What is the significance of these faculty development projects, and how do they relate to the Campus mission and goals?
6. Does the Campus have an effective system for monitoring changes in program requirements; the needs of faculty for adequate and equitable procedures for conditions of employment, the employment and tenure status, workload and compensation, and support services for faculty; and their participation in governance? Does it have an effective system for implementing changes in these areas?
7. What is the faculty role in governance and Campus committees?
8. What is the faculty's involvement in framing the contractual agreement?
9. What is the Campus and University view of faculty roles and responsibilities as evidenced by the mission statement, union contract, criteria for ARPT?
10. What is the faculty's view of its roles and responsibilities?
11. What are the students' views of faculty roles and responsibilities?
12. What impact have the elements of the LIU Plan (freshman orientation program, expanded counseling, experiential learning opportunities and options, and essential literacies) had on the faculty role, responsibilities and demographics?
13. Is there evidence that information and decisions concerning the faculty, its role, and its responsibilities are communicated in a timely and adequate manner?

Methodology

In order to investigate the research questions, the task force will gather data from various sources. To gather information on faculty demography, it will access the relevant databases. The standardized curriculum vita will be used to gather information on faculty characteristics and professional activities. Faculty development will be examined through a review of project minutes and reports, Campus reports and the curriculum vita of faculty. The role of faculty in governance and committees will be determined by an examination of related documents. Collective perceptions of faculty roles and responsibilities will be analyzed from appropriate resources. A statement of strengths, weaknesses, challenges, and prioritized recommendations for action will be submitted.

Inventory of documents, interviews, survey instruments, and other materials

Preliminary Inventory of Data:

- Professional Reviews
- Committee Reports and Minutes
- Faculty Survey
- Faculty Handbook

- Department Chair's Handbook
- College Catalogues
- University Database
- Previous Campus Self-study
- Interview Reports
- Curriculum Vita
- Faculty Review Committee Reports
- Faculty Evaluation
- Institutional Grant Awards and Reports
- Joint Faculty-Administration Councils
- Contractual Agreements
- ARPT Criteria
- University Affirmative Action Policy
- Sexual Harassment Policy

Charges to Task Force on Educational Program and Curricula

The Educational Program and Curricula Task Force will undertake a comprehensive analysis and evaluation of the undergraduate, graduate, and collateral programs and curricula in the Campus's six schools, paying particular attention to the core curriculum, graduate education, and enrollment planning and services. The task force will consider both planning and coordination in the program and curricula areas and will also examine ways in which information and decisions are communicated. The task force's conclusions will provide a statement of strengths, weaknesses, and challenges and make recommendations for improvements organized in priority order and supported with evidence.

- **Academic Schools**
 - Undergraduate
 Richard L. Conolly College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
 School of Business, Public Administration and Information Sciences
 Arnold & Marie Schwartz College of Pharmacy and Health Sciences
 School of Education
 School of Nursing
 School of Health Professions
 - Graduate
 Richard L. Conolly College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
 School of Business, Public Administration and Information Sciences
 Arnold & Marie Schwartz College of Pharmacy and Health Sciences
 School of Education
 School of Health Professions

School of Nursing

- **Collateral Academic Programs**
 - School of Continuing Education
 - Extension Programs (Bushwick/Ridgewood, Borough Park, East New York, Decatur, Clearpool)
 - Academic Support and Enrichment (including academic and freshman counseling)

- **Special Academic Programs**
 - Honors
 - Interdisciplinary/Thematic Initiatives
 - Certificate Programs
 - Higher Education Opportunity Program (HEOP)

- **Experiential Academic Programs**
 - Common Ground
 - Cooperative Education
 - Undergraduate and Graduate Internship Program (Biology)
 - Independent Study

- **Collaborative Academic Programs**
 - Joint programs
 - Undergraduate/Graduate Combined Degree Programs
 - Contract Majors

Research Questions

In carrying out its charges, the task force will, as far as possible, relate its examination and analysis of the questions to the areas of core curriculum, graduate education, enrollment planning and services, as well as to overall activities at the Brooklyn Campus.

The task force will attempt to answer the following questions in the course of its study:

1. What are the goals and objectives of academic programs? Are they connected to the Campus Mission Statement? Are they documented? Are they clearly communicated to appropriate constituencies?
2. Are these goals and objectives being met? What evidence supports this conclusion?
3. Are information and decisions concerning programs and curriculum communicated to constituents in a timely and adequate manner?
4. Does the Campus engage in curricular experimentation, varied instructional methods, and the use of contemporary technology? To what degree are they encouraged and supported?

5. Do academic programs embrace public service and community involvement?
6. How do the continuing education programs support and contribute to the mission, goals and objectives of the Campus?
7. Do off-campus programs meet standards comparable to those of all other Campus offerings?
8. Is the new core curriculum consistent with the Campus mission and goals?
9. How is it anticipated that the new core will affect student learning and the college experience?
10. What procedures have been designed to assess the new components of the core?
11. Is there an appropriate balance between general education and specialized areas?
12. What are the goals of the existing graduate programs? Do they have adequate breadth, depth, and resources to meet their goals?
13. What structures exist for planning, funding, evaluating, and advancing graduate programs?
14. What supports and services are available to graduate students? Can they be improved?
15. Have the Campus's outcomes assessment activities led to improvements in educational programs, teaching and learning?
16. What plans are in place to enhance the Campus's ability to achieve its stated academic goals?

Methodology

The task force will investigate and collect information related to programs and curriculum with an aim of analyzing their fit with the mission and goals of the Brooklyn Campus. To accomplish this analysis, the task force will

- determine if programs as stated in official bulletins and documents are consistent with department offerings and curricular plans,
- ask appropriate department, school, and Campus curriculum committees and administrators to submit pertinent statements on goals and objectives or philosophy and ways in which student learning is being assessed,
- evaluate the role of faculty and administrators in program and curriculum within the university, the Campus, and various departments and programs,
- evaluate the recommendations and reports of all relevant registering, certifying, and accrediting bodies,
- survey graduates to determine success in entering graduate and professional programs, entering the work force, and qualifying in certifying and licensing examinations,

- examine the extent to which grants and contracts involve student learning,
- make recommendations concerning the programs and curricula in relations to core curriculum, graduate education, and enrollment planning and services, providing a statement of strengths, weaknesses, and prioritized recommendations for action, and
- consider and, where appropriate, make recommendations to improve planning and coordination between and among programs, departments, schools, and Campus units.

Preliminary Inventory of Information Sources

(Please note that the task force will supplement and change this list as part of its early deliberations.)

- Bulletins
- Core Curriculum Revision Proposal
- Curriculum Committee Reports and Minutes on All Levels
- Interviews with Curriculum Committee Chairs
- Postgraduation Surveys
- Accrediting, Certifying and Registering Recommendations and Reports
- Certification/Licensing Examinations
- Reports of Academic Advisory committee Chairs
- Progress and Final Reports of Relevant Grants and Contracts
- Strategic Plan 2001-2006

Charges to Task Force on Library, Informational Technology, and Other Learning Resources

The Task Force on the Library, Academic Educational Technology, and Other Learning Resources will conduct a two-fold study: (1) to assess the performance of the Library, Information Technology, and Other Learning Resources (Academic Reinforcement Center, Writing Center, and Math Center) in supporting the Mission of the Brooklyn Campus of Long Island University, and (2) to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the Library, Informational Technology, and Learning Resources, and the means by which their effectiveness may be enhanced. The task force will also consider whether information and decisions in their areas of investigation are communicated in a timely and adequate manner.

Research Questions

In carrying out its charges, the task force will, as far as possible, relate its examination and analysis of the questions to the areas of core curriculum, graduate education, and enrollment planning and services, as well as to overall activities on the Campus, and will be expected to reflect these special emphases in a clearly defined section of its report.

The task force will attempt to answer the following questions in the course of its investigation:

1. What are the goals and objectives within the units being investigated? Are they documented? What is the process by which they are formulated? In what ways are the unit goals and objectives congruent with the Campus mission, goals, and objectives?
2. Are the environmental factors of the library, information technology, and learning resources, both physical and social, conducive to effective use?
3. Do the criteria for leadership, organization and staffing of the library, academic computing, and learning resources, and the allocation of funds to operate them facilitate optimum functioning?
4. What are the plans for current or future activities to sustain or improve the library, information technology, and learning resources? Is there a mechanism for planning and evaluation? Are these plans integrated into a Campus-wide planning and development mechanism?
5. What are the major problems which are affecting or could affect the University's ability to maintain the library, information technology, and learning resources as well-functioning services?
6. Are the technologies in use adequate and appropriate for the services that must be performed and is the investigation and implementation of new technologies carried out in a thorough and timely fashion?
7. How do elements of the LIU Plan (freshman orientation program, expanded personal counseling, experiential learning opportunities and options, and essential literacies) affect library, information technology and learning resources?
8. Is there evidence that information and decisions concerning the library, information technology and learning resources are communicated in a timely and adequate manner?
9. To what extent are the resources actually utilized by students, faculty, and staff? Are there adequate data on the usage of all types of resources? Are the data and recommendations effectively linked to the Campus planning process?
10. Is there an adequate process for evaluating the content, procedures, and technologies of library, information technology, and other learning resources which sustain current programs and services? Is there an adequate process for planning which resources may need to be enhanced to facilitate the continued growth of the Campus?
11. How do the library's holdings, their current relevance to the Campus's educational programs, their integration into the curriculum, and the frequency of use fit within the Campus mission, goals, and objectives?
12. Are there information literacy programs designed to increase the information competence of students, faculty, and administrative staff to know when they have an information need and to evaluate and effectively utilize the information?

13. Do the scope of the books, journals, periodicals, standard reference works, non-print materials, etc., and the scope of library services foster the centrality of the library in the mission of the University?
14. Is there a process in place to evaluate and plan for new acquisitions?
15. How does the relationship of the library with the rest of the University libraries affect the satisfaction of the local needs of the Campus and the unique aspects of the mission of the Campus and the forward advancement of student learning?

Information Technology

16. Is the available hardware and software current and appropriate to the needs of the Campus?
17. Are the resources of information technology integrated with the needs of classroom instruction and of with research needs of students, faculty, and administration with emphasis on core curriculum, graduate education, and enrollment planning and services?
18. Are the resources accessible to individuals and to classroom needs, in accordance with the mission of the Campus? Are there plans in place to meet expected needs and to support strategic directions?

Learning Resources (Academic Reinforcement Center, Writing Center, and Math Lab)

19. Are the scope and accessibility of the services provided appropriate to the needs of the students and to the mission of the Campus?
20. Is there a mechanism in place to monitor the effectiveness of the services provided and to make necessary modifications when needed? Are these services clearly integrated into academic and Campus planning?
21. Are the services integrated with classroom instruction? Are the faculty included in the monitoring process?

Methodology

Library

The task force will review the library goals and objectives as they relate to the Brooklyn Campus mission statement with a special focus on core curriculum, graduate education, and enrollment planning and services. The task force will continue the work and further expand the reports of the Library Resources and Usage Committee, the Library staff's own Strategic Plan, and the Brooklyn Campus Strategic Plan, 2000-2001 that have been examining many of the above questions which are related to the Library and its connection to the overall academic needs of the Campus. Consequently, the task force will include in its investigation the quantity,

quality and condition of the library's holdings, the patterns and frequency of their use, and the relationship of the existing collection to the curriculum and the impact of new electronic sources of information. It will take into account the scope and effectiveness of library services.

Identification of library services provided to the Campus community and information on the use of these services will be analyzed and the task force will assess the degree to which the library meets national standards for comparable campuses. More specific data will be available to the task force through the online Horizon system for collection usage. The entire collection itself will also be profiled by academic discipline to provide quantitative information relating library holdings to the curriculum.

The task force will make use of current surveys of department chairpersons and a sampling of students in order to determine the sufficiency of library collections in supporting the curriculum and the adequacy of library services in support of the curriculum and American Library Association standards for academic libraries to determine the overall quantitative adequacy of the collection.

The task force will likewise evaluate the degree to which library staffing meets the ALA/ACRL standards for academic libraries and the adequacy of the library budget for ensuring effective operation. Library position descriptions, organizational charts, assignment of tasks, requirements for credentials and the use of services will be examined in order to determine the overall appropriateness of current staffing arrangements.

The task force will investigate the role of environmental factors in determining the effectiveness of the library. A review of existing seating/study facilities, shelving space available for collection growth and staff work areas will provide information to evaluate the adequacy of these resources and recent changes will be evaluated. The task force will review existing plans for activities to sustain or improve the library, noting any particular constraints or likely developments that might influence the successful implementation of such plans.

After reviewing all pertinent information and data available in existing reports and information gathered through its own investigation, the task force will propose recommendations to further improve and enhance the library and to advance a master plan for the future development of the library and its resources. The task force will provide a statement of strengths, weaknesses and a prioritized recommendation for actions.

Information Technology and Learning Resources

To answer research questions, the task force will review documents and statistics, interview relevant persons, including department representatives, administrators and students, and conduct necessary data collection. As it begins deliberations, the task force will generate a listing of documents to be examined. The task force will evaluate and make recommendations for improvement and will recommend ways in which to further enhance coordinated planning in these areas. These recommendations will be a part of a concluding statement of strengths, weaknesses and challenges.

Charges to Task Force on Facilities, Equipment, and Other Resources

The Task Force on Facilities, Equipment, and Other Resources will determine whether the plant, equipment, and related human, physical and financial resources of the university are sufficient to fulfill its statement mission, goals, and objectives and specifically whether they reinforce its core curriculum, graduate education, component and strengthen enrollment planning and services strategies. This task force will examine ways in which information and decisions concerning the plant and related resources are communicated. The task force will also identify whether plans exist to deal with areas of weakness and will make specific recommendations based on its investigation and organized in priority order recommendations to improve the plant and resources of the Campus.

Research Questions

In carrying out its charges, the task force will, as far as possible, relate its examination and analysis of the questions to the areas of core curriculum, graduate education, and enrollment planning and services, as well as to overall activities at the Brooklyn Campus and will be expected to reflect these special emphases in a clearly defined section of its report. Specifically, the task force will examine the availability and allocation of space for educational and student services uses; the availability and functionality of technology and equipment related to these areas; and the overall state of the physical plant.

The task force will attempt to answer the following questions:

1. Are there clear goals for supporting and improving the plant, equipment, and resources of the Campus? Are these goals an integral feature of ongoing self study and are they arrived at through a clear, well publicized planning process which involves a systematic review of resources and services utilization, as well as with the input of the members of the university community? Do these overall goals support the Campus mission?
2. Are student, staff, and faculty support facilities and services (residence, dining halls, and athletics and theater/performing arts facilities) adequate to meet the present and future needs and are they properly maintained to maximize efficiency and create a pleasant environment?
3. Is there sufficient educational space (classroom, laboratories, studios, etc.) to support current programs and to handle a significant shift in enrollment, an increase in evening and graduate classes, increased participation in the LIU plan, and an increase in sections arising in consequence of the new core?
4. Is this educational space adequately maintained with regards to lighting, heat and air conditioning, and cleanliness, so as to produce an atmosphere conducive to learning?
5. Is this educational space fully wired and networked, so as to support advanced technologies in the classroom?

6. How efficiently are existing instructional spaces being utilized and can the present method of class scheduling and space allocation be improved through the use of on-line registration?
7. Are there an adequate number of computers and computer laboratories and are these facilities up to date, networked, fully compatible and easily accessible to students?
8. Are technological teaching assets such as audio-visual equipment, multi-media networked devices, and specialized instrumentation properly funded and maintained so as to ensure their modernity and are such devices available to faculty and students in an efficient, timely manner?
9. Are facilities dedicated to student support (residence hall, dining facilities, athletic facilities, bursar/registrar/financial aid) adequate in space and layout to meet the present needs of the students and to accommodate future growth and are they wired and networked to allow students and staff reliable access to records and on-line registration data?
10. Are support facilities staffed on a schedule which meets the needs of the student population, many of whom work, and to support expanded evening graduate studies?
11. How will Campus facilities and services impact its ability to attract and retain students, faculty, and staff?
12. Are there clear goals for supporting and improving the plant, equipment and resources? Are these plans adequate and in priority order appropriate to the Campus's stated mission and goals? Is there a clear, well-publicized planning process in the area of plant, equipment, and related resources?
13. Is the physical plant made appropriately accessible to the outside community?
14. Is there adequate personnel to maintain the plant?
15. Is there evidence that information and decisions concerning plant and related resources are communicated in a timely and adequate manner?
16. How is the University responding to the present and future anticipated needs of the Campus community and the special education (physically challenged) needs?
17. Are there adequate facilities properly equipped and environmentally-controlled to support high technology items and long-term housing and preservation of important Campus documents, records, archives, and valuable University holdings such as the LIU art collection?
18. Is there a disaster-preparedness plan for the Campus and is it communicated adequately to the various campus constituencies and building occupants?
19. Is the organizational structure of Buildings and Grounds adequate for maintaining the physical plant?
20. Are there systemic problems with any buildings (HVAC, perennial water leakage, etc.) that need addressing?
21. Is there a preventive maintenance plan for the physical plant, and is it adequate for maintaining each facility in good condition?

Methodology

The task force will examine on-site facilities in instructional buildings and materials, laboratories, computer, telecommunications and audio-visual equipment and facilities and services related to the use of these resources. The task force will conduct a survey of occupants of various buildings and facilities to gather information and assess operational efficiency. It will also examine facilities for athletics, student activities, and residence life. One of the first things that the task force will do is to identify relevant documents and established plans regarding plant, equipment, and related resources before moving to a comprehensive analysis and set of recommendations. Special attention will be given to plant/resource issues identified in the recent Strategic Plan.

The task force will identify changes since the last Middle States Self-Study and assess their impact on the Campus's effectiveness. The task force will also provide a statement of strengths, weaknesses, and challenges and prioritized recommendations for actions.

Charges to Task Force on Institutional Effectiveness and Outcomes

The Task Force on Institutional Effectiveness and Outcomes will continue to play a key role in measuring the Campus's effectiveness by collecting and analyzing evidence of outcomes assessment. For the purposes of this charge, outcomes assessment is defined as the process by which the university measures how effective it is in developing its students according to the dimensions of growth and development outlined in the Campus's mission statement and goals and objectives. In addition to gathering and evaluating relevant information, the committee will consider ways in which outcomes assessment may be further developed to help improve Campus programs and policies in light of stated goals. Consequently, the primary purpose of the Institutional Effectiveness and Outcomes Committee is to investigate, describe, and document current outcomes assessment and to evaluate and recommend future plans for this area of concern across the Brooklyn Campus.

Research Questions

In carrying out its charges, the task force will, as far as possible, relate its examinations and analysis of the questions to the areas of core curriculum and retention as well as to overall activities on the Campus, will be expected to reflect these special emphases in a clearly defined section of the report.

In the course of its investigation, the task force will seek to answer the following questions in relation to goals and objectives:

1. What are the goals and objectives related to outcomes assessment at the various levels (Campus, school, division, department)? How are the goals and objectives documented?

2. What outcomes assessment data already exist at the various levels? What kinds of records, documents, and other materials are available? How are data gathered?
3. In what ways is the Campus conducive to outcomes assessment?
4. What impact have the elements of the LIU Plan (freshman orientation program, expanded counseling, experiential learning opportunities and options, and essential literacies) had in the area of outcomes assessment?
5. Are decisions and information on outcomes assessment communicated in a timely and adequate manner?
6. What current or potential problems exist at each level which may affect outcomes?
7. What current or future plans exist to implement, sustain, or improve outcomes assessment efforts at the various levels?
8. What impact does the core curriculum have on students? How will the new core curriculum be assessed in light of student learning?
9. Are assessment efforts in graduate education effective in improving the curricula and programs?
10. What structures and procedures need to be implemented at the various levels in order to assure congruency among the mission statement, goals and objectives and outcomes assessment? What must be done to integrate outcomes assessment into planning processes?
11. Are current strategies and applications effective in strengthening learning and advancing student progress towards graduation?

Methodology

1. Identify specific objectives that need to be measured,
2. Identify existing documents to support outcomes assessment,
3. Identify internal sources that can provide needed data (Registrar, Academic Reinforcement Center, Frosh Center, Honors, HEOP, and other areas),
4. Collect appropriate information, both qualitative and quantitative (for example, see Multiple Measure for Outcomes Assessment),
5. Analyze and interpret relevant data in order to formulate a statement regarding Campus effectiveness, and
6. Make specific recommendations in priority order for improvement in Campus efforts at outcomes assessment, providing a statement of strengths, weaknesses and prioritized statement for action.

Charges to Task Force on Strategic Planning and Resource Allocation

For the past five years, the Brooklyn Campus has been engaged in an intensive process of strategic planning. In the fall of 1999, the research and problem identifying aspect of the project,

known as Phase One, was completed. This first phase set forth a strategic vision and four goals for the further advancement of the Campus. Phase Two of Strategic Planning began in 2000 and identified seven strategic initiatives that flowed from these goals – initiatives that were judged to be at once bound to the University mission and its underlying educational charge and the compelling need to move the Campus forward by strengthening existing programs and developing areas that bear on these initiatives.

In March and April 2001, the Brooklyn Campus Strategic Plan, 2001-2006 was circulated to the Campus and discussed in several forums. The Strategic Planning Steering Committee now serves as the Task Force on Strategic Planning and Resource Allocation. The task force will develop a communication and implementation plan for the Campus strategic plan.

The seven strategic initiatives are:

1. Core Curriculum Development and Implementation
2. Development and Growth of Graduate Education
3. Outcomes Assessment
4. Enrollment Management and Retention
5. Library and Information Technology
6. External Affairs and Alumni Relations
7. Financial and Physical Resources

This Strategic Plan presents a series of recommendations for each of the seven initiatives, and the committee will generate an implementation plan, including a calendar for targeted action; tie the recommendations directly to the budgetary process; and create an environment that will infuse into the Campus policy a culture of planning and continual, critical self-review and analysis. Every strategic area involves decisions and commitments of resource allocation that must be clearly identified and secured.

In undertaking its charge, the Task Force on Strategic Planning and Resource Allocation (the existing Brooklyn Campus Strategic Planning Steering Committee) will pay special attention to the three areas of the self-study's emphases: core curriculum, graduate education, and enrollment planning and services. In addition, the task force's implementation plan will outline the means to move the Campus more consistently into the process of continual improvement.

Research Questions

1. Does the Brooklyn Campus have a well-defined, inclusive planning process? Is this process specifically supportive of the mission and goals? Is the setting of priorities well-known at the Campus? Is there effective consultation with appropriate constituencies?

2. Are decisions and information concerning mission, goals, planning, and resources consistently and clearly communicated to campus constituencies?
3. Are the planning processes effective? Are there sufficient and readily available resources, including data to support the processes? How might the planning processes be improved and better coordinated?
4. Is the recent Strategic Plan, along with its implementation, consistent with the Campus mission, goals, and objectives? Does implementation involve the appropriate constituencies and are both the planned implementation and the actual implementation being clearly communicated? Does implementation effectively build in necessary supports for successful achievement? Does implementation allow for adequate flexibility to adjust the plan for changed contingencies or circumstances?
5. Do the planning processes, particularly strategic planning, have a clear and productive connections with the budgetary process and with shaping of resource allocation at the Campus and the University levels? Do the budgetary considerations realistically support the chances for successful implementation of the Strategic Plan? Does the budget process provide sufficient input and clear identification of persons responsible for developing and executing the budget?
6. Do both strategic planning and its implementation promote an involved core Campus personnel? Do they promote a culture of critical self-analysis and self-improvement, and do they engage the appropriate leaders to help insure success?

Methodology

The task force will map out the implementation plan for the recently developed Strategic Plan. It will determine if additional documents beyond the extensive list utilized in the strategic planning process are needed and will work with appropriate Campus offices and bodies to produce a well-defined implementation plan, encompassing clear budgetary obligations and clear commitments for action and time tables. In the process of implementation, the Council of Deans will engage the appropriate University officers responsible for specific areas relating to the plan. The Council of Deans will present its findings regarding the proposed strategic plan implementation process, indicating strengths, weaknesses, and areas for improvement.

Charges to Task Force on Organization, Administration, and Governance

The Task Force on Organization, Administration, and Governance will study and analyze the organizational/administrative structure of the Brooklyn Campus to determine the degree to which organizational/administrative and governing structures support and advance the Campus mission and goals. In particular, the task force will undertake its charges with a special focus on the relationship and impact of organization, administration, and governance on the areas of core curriculum, graduate education, and enrollment planning and services. For its areas of examination, the task force will consider ways to improve planning and coordination and will look at ways in which information and decisions are communicated.

The task force will make recommendations in priority order backed with solid evidence to improve the organization/administration and governance of the Campus.

Research Questions

In carrying out its charges, the task force will relate its examination of the questions to the area of core curriculum, graduate education, and enrollment planning and services, as well as to overall activities on the Campus, and will be expected to reflect these special emphases in a clearly defined section of its report.

The task force will attempt to answer these questions in its defined area of investigation:

1. Is the organizational structure of the Campus effective in supporting its mission and educational programs? If so, what evidence exists to support this?
2. Are the goals and objectives of various Campus administrative/governing bodies and officers appropriate to advancing the mission and student learning?
3. How clearly delineated and well-understood are the organization and procedures under which the Campus functions?
4. Where does the Campus administrative organization have responsibility for each position defined? Is there clear accountability?
5. Is there evidence that information and decisions are communicated in a timely and adequate manner to relevant offices or constituencies?
6. How have the elements of the LIU Plan (freshman orientation program, expanded personal counseling including financial aid advisement, experiential learning opportunities and options, and essential literacies) affected organization and administration and their role in advancing the mission and goals of the Campus?
7. What is the impact of the University Board of Trustees on the organization and administration of the Brooklyn Campus? What is the responsibility of the Chancellor of the Brooklyn Campus?
8. What is the role of the Brooklyn Campus Faculty Senate and the University Faculty Senate in the organization and governance of the Campus and/or the university?
9. What is the role of the Student Government in the organization and governance of the Campus? What impact does it have on the quality of student life and learning?
10. Do organizational/administrative structures effectively relate to alumni and community?
11. Do adequate services and resources exist, e.g., administrative computing and data services, to provide sufficient and flexible support for pursuing the Campus mission?
12. What is the role of the collective bargaining agencies at the Campus and how does collective bargaining affect the Campus in its pursuit of its mission and goals? How do they and University/Campus decision makers maintain access to one another, and what are the channels of access?

13. Are the procedures or systems for identifying and developing Campus administrative leadership in place and effective?
14. What changes are needed to adapt the existing Campus organizational structure to meet future needs?
15. How do the Campus organization and administrative structure relate with University structure and does this relationship support and advance the mission of the Campus?

Methodology

The task force will examine relevant documents to ascertain the organization/ administrative structures of the Campus. This investigation will include the Mission and Goals Statement, University Statutes and the By-laws of the Board of Trustees, records of the governing bodies, and collective bargaining agreements.

The task force will conduct interviews with individuals such as the Provost, administrators (deans, and directors of major offices), Senate chairs, and Campus union officers and/or organization, as well as with university officers: President, Vice President for Academic Affairs, and University Development Vice President, and members of the Board of Trustees. The committee will also analyze and interpret data collected with an aim of enhancing the ability of the Campus to achieve its goals and objectives, especially regarding core curriculum, graduate education, and enrollment planning and services.

Among documents to be examined are bulletins and directories, tables of organization, faculty and student handbooks, electronic communication (e-mail system), past Middle States reports, and interim reports. In its early deliberations, the committee will conduct a survey of relevant documents. The committee will submit a statement of strengths, weakness, and prioritized recommendation for actions.

Charges to Task Force on Alumni, Community Relations, Marketing, Catalogs and Publications

The Task Force on Alumni, Community Relations, Marketing, Catalogs, and Publications is charged with determining whether the goals and objectives of the Office of Admissions, Public Relations, Institutional Advancement, and Alumni and Development are consistent with the Brooklyn Campus mission statement and goals. The task force will determine whether the plans and procedures employed by these offices will result in the achievement of these goals and objectives. The examination will address admissions processing and marketing activities, community related activities, development initiatives, and the connections with the academic areas of the Campus. The task force will recommend ways to enhance the effectiveness of these operations and will consider ways in which to strengthen these functions in overall Campus planning processes.

Research Questions

In carrying out its charges, the task force will, as far as possible, relate its examination and analysis of the questions to the areas of core curriculum, graduate education, enrollment planning and services as well as to overall activities at the Brooklyn Campus, and will be expected to reflect these special emphases in a clearly defined section of its report.

1. Are there formal goals and objectives for the offices and areas? What are they? Are they documented? What is the process by which they are formulated?
2. How do these goals and objectives fit within the Campus goals and objectives?
3. What information is available and what information is needed to evaluate the effectiveness of the offices and areas?
4. Are the offices/areas achieving their objectives? Are there current or potential problems that are affecting or could be affecting their ability to achieve these goals and objectives?
5. What are the plans for current or future activities to sustain or improve the ability of the Admissions Office and Public Relations Office to achieve these objectives? Are the planning processes effective? How might the planning processes be improved and better coordinated?
6. Are the special needs of graduate and professional students being met within the general framework of the Admissions Office and Alumni and Development?
7. With which offices does the Admissions Office interact? With which should it interact? Does the reporting structure for the Public Relations Office help the Campus meet its goals and objectives?
8. Who sets admissions policy at the Brooklyn Campus? What role does the faculty play in shaping admissions policy? What is the relationship among the various entities that deal with admissions policy? How tailored to the Campus are Public Relations practices and policies?
9. What is the role of new technology such as automation, communication, imaging, in improving the admissions process? public relations? alumni and development?
10. Are the marketing activities and admissions processes mutually supportive (e.g., coordination between admissions and each academic department and programs)? Is there a productive relationship between admissions and public relations?
11. Are the publications and other promotional materials appropriate, honest, and effective in recruiting students?
12. What impact do the elements of the LIU Plan (freshman orientation program, expanded counseling, experiential learning opportunities and options, and essential literacies) have on admissions and on public relations and on the distribution of resources to these areas?

13. How are decisions and information concerning admissions, public relations, alumni relations, and Campus advancement communicated to Campus constituencies? What is the evidence of such communication? Is the communication timely and adequate?
14. What is the fit between students recruited and the Brooklyn Campus, and how does the admissions process support retention (e.g., freshman orientation, testing, student interest inventory)?
15. Is there a comprehensive admissions plan related to demographic projections? And is there an adequate mechanism or process to insure periodic updating?
16. Is the alumni relations area adequately meeting the needs of the Campus and supportive of the mission and goals? Does the area of alumni relations adequately communicate to Campus constituents?
17. How can the current organization and effectiveness of alumni relations be improved?

Methodology

To answer research questions, the task force will review documents and reports relating to Admissions and the Registrar's statistical reports on enrollment trends and other related statistical surveys. The task force in its early deliberations will generate a comprehensive inventory of relevant materials. The task force will interview appropriate persons, including departments, administrators and students, and collect original data. It will pay special attention to the connection between admissions and such activities as the freshman orientation program and early advisement programs and several of the admissions-related initiatives begun under the LIU Plan. The task force will evaluate the materials it examines, provide a statement of strengths and weaknesses, and make recommendations in priority order for improvements in its areas of investigation. It will pay special attention to the recommendations of the recent Strategic Plan, 2001-2006.

Outcomes Assessment

As emphasized in the "Overall Purpose" subsection of the "Nature and Scope of Self-Study" section of this design document, outcomes assessment is a fundamental part of the self-study process. For example, critical components of outcome assessment are embedded in each task force's charges and research questions as well as in the reporting of the studies' data collections, findings and recommendations. Moreover, the completed self-study will explore both on-going and emerging evaluative efforts to inform and further strengthen the Campus's effectiveness, especially as it makes recommendations for change.

Various departments and services conduct periodic outcomes in both an informal and formal manner. The collective findings, from these assessments have proven invaluable to the continuing development, refinement, and support of the various programs and departments. In order to communicate these practices effectively to the entire Campus, the Council of Deans authorized the establishment of a Campus-wide Outcomes Assessment Committee in early 1997.

The currently operating development and implementation assessment plan reflects the critical components of all academic programs, curriculum development, and the development of service departments at the Brooklyn Campus. The Outcomes Assessment Committee has been guided by the premise that assessment practices must be consistent with the University and Campus mission statements. Therefore, Campus outcomes efforts are grounded on developing the cognitive skills of our students by constantly assessing and improving their educational experience. This means that assessment of student outcomes, more than any other single process, will strengthen and advance the educational mission of the Campus. Hence, with this philosophical underpinning, the Outcomes Assessment Committee has established and implemented a practical and reliable assessment model, which can be applied both to academic and non-academic units. For the most part, academic outcomes focus mainly on the knowledge and skills developed in the major field of study and also on the intended outcomes of the core curriculum, while non-academic outcomes are directed towards the development of character, and towards understanding diversity, building leadership, and fostering a sense of community service.

To further integrate outcomes assessment in the Middle States process, the Campus Accreditation Review Committee, which includes the two co-chairs of the Outcomes Assessment Committee, will serve as a resource and monitor the task forces to ensure that assessment is an integral part of their work. In so doing, the Campus Accreditation Review Committee and the Outcomes Assessment Committee will make available the following materials:

- Core Curriculum Model and support documents
- Core Curriculum Review Committee Charges
- The Noel Levitz Student Services Survey
- Findings of the Educational Testing Service General Education Examination
- Outcomes Assessment Web Page
- Outcomes Assessment Departmental Plans
- Library Outcomes Assessment Plan
- The Matrix for Student Services Outcomes Assessment Plans
- The Long Island University Report
- On Persistence for New Freshmen and Transfer Students by Campus and Entering Major
- Outcomes Assessment Effort of Campus Professional Schools and Accreditation Reports

Inventory of Support Documents

A comprehensive inventory of support documents, keyed to the 14 *Characteristics of Excellence*, has been developed by the Office of Institutional Research and the Office of Academic Affairs at University Center and is attached to this design document as Appendix A.

That inventory includes Middle States publications, University-wide documents and reports (e.g., University Mission Statement, Capital Plan, Catalogues, Collective Bargaining Agreements, etc.), recent reports on specialized accreditations and curriculum reviews, previous Middle States reports and periodic reviews, and a host of campus-specific documents.

Timetable

The University-wide Middle States Steering Committee has adopted a timetable for the Self-Study. That timetable, which is incorporated in the University-wide section of this design, will be followed in conducting the campus-level accreditation review.

Editorial Style and Format

The report of the Campus Accreditation Review Committee will conform to the editorial style and format prescribed in the “Style Guide for Preparing Middle States Self-Study and Campus Accreditation Review Reports,” which was adopted by the University-wide Middle States Steering Committee and is attached to this design document as Appendix B.

Format of the Self-Study Report

The outline and table of contents for the overall University Self-Study and the outline of the Campus Accreditation Review Committee Reports are provided in the University-wide section of this design.

Profile of the Evaluation Team

Recommendations concerning the profile of the Evaluation Team are presented in the University-wide section of this design.