

Report to the
Faculty, Administration, Trustees, Students
of

Long Island University
Brookville, New York

by
An Evaluation Team representing the
Middle States Commission on Higher Education

Prepared after study of the institution's self-study report
and a visit to the institution on March 17-20, 2013

The Members of the Team:

Jack P. Varsalona, Chair
President
Wilmington University
320 N. DuPont Highway
New Castle, DE 19720

Dr. Louis Mayer
Vice President for Financial Affairs and Treasurer
Saint Joseph's University
5600 City Line Avenue
Philadelphia, PA 19131

Dr. Joseph Asike
Professor of Philosophy
Howard University
Locke Hall, Room 222
2400 6th Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20059

James Mooney
Associate Professor of English
Immaculata University
1145 King Road Box 723 Office #30, FC
Immaculata, PA 19345

Dr. Erin DiMarco
Vice President for Academic Support Services
Wilmington University
320 N. DuPont Highway
New Castle, DE 19720

Dr. Patrick Progar
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Caldwell College
120 Bloomfield Avenue
Caldwell, NJ 07006

Dr. Marianne Huger
Assistant Dean of Students and
Interim Director of Disability Support Services
American University
206 Mary Graydon Center
4400 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20016

Dr. Aileen Trainer
Assistant Vice President for Assessment
Towson University
8000 York Road
Towson, MD 21252

Dr. Cathy Lebo
Assistant Provost for Institutional Research
Johns Hopkins University
3400 North Charles Street
Wyman Park, Suite 600
Baltimore, MD 21218

Dr. Walter Woerhide
Vice President & Dean
The American University
270 Bryn Mawr Avenue
Bryn Mawr, PA 19010

This report represents the views of the evaluation team as interpreted by the Chair; it goes directly to the institution before being considered by the Commission. It is a confidential document prepared as an educational service for the benefit of the institution. All comments in this report are made in good faith, in an effort to assist Long Island University. This report is based solely on an educational evaluation of the institution and of the manner in which it appears to be carrying out its educational objectives.

AT THE TIME OF THE VISIT

President/CEO:
Dr. David J. Steinberg

Chair of the Board of Trustees:
Edward Travaglianti

Long Island University Team Report
March 2013

I. Context and Nature of the Visit

Institutional Overview

Long Island University is one of America's largest and most comprehensive private universities, with locations and programs in the New York metropolitan area, overseas and online. Chartered by the Board of Regents of the State of New York in 1926, LIU is a non-sectarian, non-profit institution, offering academic programs at all levels from the associate degree through the doctorate. LIU's core mission of access and excellence is to provide an outstanding education to men and women of all ethnicities, ages, socioeconomic backgrounds, and levels of academic preparedness. The University maintains two residential campuses: LIU Brooklyn and LIU Post; and four non-residential (regional) campuses: LIU Brentwood, LIU Riverhead, LIU Hudson at Rockland and LIU Hudson at Westchester. Other academic units include LIU Pharmacy which prepares students for careers in the fields of pharmacy and health care; and LIU Global which has locations in China, Costa Rica, India, Australia, Ecuador, Peru, Taiwan, Thailand and Turkey.

Scope of Institution

The University has been accredited by the Middle States Commission of Higher Education since 1955.

Each year the University enrolls more than 24,000 students in credit, non-credit and continuing education programs. LIU offers nearly 500 degree and certificate programs, many of which are recognized or accredited by specialized agencies and professional associations. The student body is diverse, with minority students comprising 56 percent of the student population. Although the University operates on multiple campuses, each of which maintains an individual identity, it is chartered as a single institution, governed by a single Board of Trustees and led by one president.

Believing in a student-centered approach, LIU provides excellence and access in private higher education to people from all backgrounds who seek to expand their knowledge and prepare themselves for meaningful, educated lives and for service to their communities and the world.

Self-Study Process and Report

The Long Island University 2013 Self-Study was conducted under the "Basic Comprehensive Model" design. Task forces with wide representation worked diligently to collect and examine evidence supporting the University's compliance with the fourteen standards in the *Characteristics of Excellence*.

In the course of the self-study process, the University identified two overarching recommendations for action. The recommendations covered several of the Characteristics of Excellence.

The team was impressed with the energy, enthusiasm, and excitement exhibited by the entire campus community during the visit that helped to bring the self-study document to life for us.

II. Affirmation of Continued Compliance with Eligibility Requirements

Based on a review of the self-study, other documents, and interviews during the site visit, the team affirms that the institution continues to meet eligibility requirements 1-7.

III. Compliance with Federal, State, and Other Requirements

Based on review of the self-study, other institutional documents, and interviews, the team affirms that the institution's Title IV cohort default rate is within federal limits.

IV. Compliance with Accreditation Standards

Standard 1: Mission, Goals, and Objectives

Long Island University meets this standard. There are no recommendations.

Summary of Evidence, Findings and Significant Accomplishments

- The University has a very clear and concise mission statement which is well understood by all constituent groups. The mission statement says “Long Island University was founded on the principle of educating and empowering men and women from all walks of life. Through our mission of Access and Excellence, the LIU community remains committed, above all else, to the educational needs and interests of our diverse student body. We strive to cultivate and expand academic, professional, artistic and co-curricular opportunities, enabling students to realize their full potential as ethically grounded, intellectually vigorous and socially responsible global citizens.” The University's first priority is the student experience, both inside and outside of the classroom. As a student-centered institution, the University offers a broad range of financial aid and payment options to assist students in meeting their educational expenses. This is evidenced by how the mission and vision statements guide decision making at all levels, from the Board of Trustees to faculty and staff committees. Programs and operations correspond to the mission and vision.
- The Strategic Achievements for 2006-2013 are consistent with the mission and fully describe the strategic priorities and measurements the University must take to address the challenges in future years. This is evidenced by reviewing the Agenda for Strategic Planning (2006).
- In 2010, a University-wide Mission Statement Committee of faculty, students, trustees, deans, administrators and alumni convened to assess the then mission statement and its

continued relevance. In 2012, the Board of Trustees adopted the new mission statement as a result of the committee's efforts.

Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal

Long Island University meets this standard. There are three recommendations.

The institution is committed to strategic planning. In April 2006, the University adopted "An Agenda for Strategic Planning" that identified five key priorities along with several related questions to prompt the development of action steps to achieve their goals and objectives. In addition, as part of its self-study process, the University developed a report of Strategic Agenda Achievements for 2006 to 2013 which summarized the status of each planning priority and the related allocation of resources to achieve various planning goals.

Summary of Evidence, Findings and Significant Accomplishments

- The Team commends the University for the sharp focus of its strategic planning priorities on the primary areas of significant importance to the institution, such as student-centered educational environment, faculty & collegiality, and financial stability.

Recommendations:

- The Team recommends a more comprehensive approach to strategic planning, including the development of individual strategic plans for specific areas such as academic affairs, enrollment management, information technology, and financial management. Each of these individual plans should identify explicit goals, objectives, timelines, and resource requirements. Individual plans should link to the overall strategic plan for the University. Annual reports should be developed to monitor and manage the status of progress towards achieving targeted goals for each year.
- The Team recommends that the University enhance and strengthen the link between strategic planning and budgeting and develop a multi-year financial plan, including Statements of Activities, Statements of Financial Position, and Statements of Cash Flow for a three to five year period. The rationale for prioritization of resource allocation decisions in the annual budgeting process should be well documented and provide clear explanations for funding of planning priorities. In this way, the resource allocation process will be less tactical and more strategic.
- The Team recommends developing a formal and transparent institutional strategic planning committee with representation from all campus constituencies---faculty, staff, administrators, and students. The enhanced planning committee should participate in identifying planning goals and reviewing and evaluating annual progress towards achieving such goals.

Standard 3: Institutional Resources

Long Island University meets this standard. There are no recommendations.

Summary of Evidence, Findings, and Significant Accomplishments

- The University maintains balanced operating budgets with positive, albeit modest, operating margins. If and when actual results differ from budget assumptions, steps are taken to adjust expenses accordingly. Considerable resources have been dedicated to enterprise resource planning in order to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of University operations and processes.
- The University is to be commended for its consistent discipline in balancing its operating budget even during periods of financial stress. The University's financial reporting is of high quality. Financial forecasts are developed in a manner that facilitates the identification of actual vs. budget variances which are addressed with corrective action steps in a timely manner.

Suggestions for Improvement:

- The Team suggests that increased efforts be dedicated to enhancing the precision of enrollment assumptions and tuition revenue projections in developing budgets and forecasts. These assumptions should be supported by an enrollment management plan including multi-year projections from the admissions and financial aid areas. In developing its financial planning projections, the University should increase its focus on net tuition revenue, which as a percentage of gross tuition revenue has declined from 80% to 76% between fiscal years 2010 and 2013. Increased attention should be devoted to minimizing the significance of negative variances in the operating budget and the resulting cost cutting measures which can be disruptive to the organization, demoralizing to faculty and staff, and impeding the achievement of key strategic planning goals and objectives. In this way, the University can be less reactive and more proactive in its financial planning activities.
- The Team suggests that the University continue to enhance and sharpen its analysis of the financial profiles of its colleges, schools, and programs, as well as their related patterns of change. Consideration should be given to adopting methods for deans and program directors to enhance student demand, maximize enrollment capacity, increase net tuition revenue, and continue to improve and strengthen their respective financial profiles. The University may want to consider adopting institution-wide protocols for adopting new programs with high student demand and retiring old programs with low student demand. Data from the University's assessment activities should be incorporated into this process.

Standard 4: Leadership and Governance

Long Island University meets this standard. There are no recommendations.

Summary of Evidence, Findings, and Significant Accomplishments

- Long Island University demonstrates strong governance as is evidenced in its Board of Trustees' membership. The Trustees understand and fulfill their responsibilities for hiring and evaluating the President of the University. The Trustees play an active role in the decision making process. The trustees fully understand the type of students Long Island serves and governs the institution for their benefit. Their length of service and generosity illustrate their dedication to the institution.
- The University has an effective leader in its president who understands and embraces the mission. The President has created an atmosphere where innovative ideas flourish. Dr. Steinberg is known for his philosophy that: "students are the subject of every sentence at this University; everything and everyone else falls into the predicate."
- Executive administrative and academic leadership fully understand the mission of the University and governs accordingly.
- At all levels of governance, students are put first.

Standard 5: Administration

Long Island University meets this standard. There are no recommendations.

Summary of Evidence, Findings, and Significant Accomplishments

The Board of Trustees is the governing body of Long Island University. The Board is responsible for upholding LIU's educational mission and for the fiscal and academic health, quality, and integrity of the University. The administration has a strong organizational structure divided and shared among the University officers reporting directly to the President. Under the leadership of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, all academic operations are managed centrally. Finance, Information Technology, Planning, Human Resources, Legal Services and Marketing Services are managed at the University Center (administrative hub of the institution), while others such as student services and support, are managed at the campus level. The University's demographic makeup differs between campuses and as a result student needs differ. Therefore, the administration creates a culture for students to succeed at each campus by providing campus specific policies and resources.

Suggestions for Improvement:

- An organizational chart should be publicly available to all faculty, staff, and administration to ensure clarity of reporting lines. In addition, the number of direct reports for administration should be evaluated to ensure that supervision of direct reports is optimized.

Standard 6: Integrity

Long Island University meets this standard. There are no recommendations.

Long Island University meets this standard because it provides sound practices and policies for fair and impartial hiring, evaluation, and dismissal of employees; a conflict of interest policy, and a process for resolving student grievances. Faculty Governance Handbooks and Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreements also affirm the principles of academic freedom. The University provides accurate factual information about the university, including licensing pass rates. The University discloses changes in mission, goals, sites, programs, and operations to Middle States and other appropriate regulatory bodies in an accurate and timely manner. Current and archived versions of the catalogs for each campus are available online in PDF format.

Summary of Evidence, Findings, and Significant Accomplishments

- LIU worked with current students and alumni in the new Rebranding and Recruitment Initiative to ensure that recruitment materials matched the actual student experience. Public relations works directly with Institutional Research to verify the accuracy of information used in marketing.
- The Office of Academic Affairs strongly encourages the development of new and innovative academic programs. Policies and procedures have been put in place to assure the quality of academic programs and to clearly define the processes by which they are submitted for institutional and New York State Education Department approval.
- The University has developed a process for employees to report any good faith belief that a possible legal or policy violation has occurred in University activities and operations including, but not limited to, finance, research, human resources, athletics, risk and safety and information technology. The Whistle Blower policy applies to all members of the University community, including students, faculty, staff, and officers.

Suggestions for Improvement:

- The University should periodically review the integrity evidenced in institutional policies, processes, and practices, and the manner in which these are implemented.
- For a significant portion of the faculty and staff at LIU, HR policies are explicated by collective bargaining agreements. Policies governing the appointment, evaluation, and dismissal of non-union employees should also be described on the university web site.
- The University should make it easier for current and prospective students to find key information on the web site, including graduation rates, student support services, and the conduct code.
- Establish a schedule and process for continuing to monitor that required and elective courses are sufficiently available to allow students to graduate within the published program length.

Standard 7: Institutional Assessment

Long Island University meets this standard. There is one recommendation.

Summary of Evidence, Findings, and Significant Accomplishments

The development and implementation of assessment processes associated with student learning have been fully realized. The team's findings with respect to this area are included in Standard 14. These assessment processes are clearly linked to learning outcomes. The institution has committed sufficient resources and expertise to the assessment of student learning. The results are useful and valued at all levels of the institution. Program directors and deans across the institution confirm the results of the process and validate their continued support. Significant improvements in teaching effectiveness in specific classroom settings are reported by faculty. Course evaluation results support these findings as well as the changes to programs and courses summarized in the annual assessment reports prepared by faculty. Improvements reported by faculty via the self-study, interviews and supporting documentation include changes in course content, curricular changes, pedagogical changes and enhancements to assessment processes.

In addition to the assessment of student learning, the Division of Academic Affairs is using institutional data to examine departments within the division. The Office of Institutional Research designed a data template on credit hour production, faculty support, and financial data that is used for review at the department, college, campus and institutional level. These reports are used to examine efficiency and effectiveness of programming. The Vice President for Academic Affairs indicates these reports are essential in assessing academic departments. At this point, data on learning outcomes are not yet included. These data are also required in requests for new resources and for new programs. In addition to these metrics, the processes associated with requests for additional resources require an overview of the results of the assessment of student learning for existing programs and assessment plans related to student learning for new programs.

The review processes associated with specialized accreditation also provides an additional level of assurance regarding academic programming. Thirty-four programs have sought and achieved recognition by their respective specialty organizations. Academic leadership indicates these recognitions are highly valued and resource issues by the specialized accrediting agencies typically received high priority in funding.

The unit responsible for institutional effectiveness outside of student learning is not clearly indicated. The director of assessment has direct responsibility for student learning but is not responsible for assessment in non-academic areas.

Also presented in the self-study as evidence the institution is effectively evaluating is the institution's success in achieving institutional priorities. As a part of the planning process, five strategic priorities have been identified with corresponding research questions. Specific questions are prioritized and assigned to appropriate divisions and/or committees for further review and recommendation. As reported in the self-study and validated during the site visit, specific programs/operational consolidations have occurred in recent years due to these initiatives. One example is the consolidation/centralization of financial aid processes to

enhance student service. Another is the consolidation of several academic and instructional services on the Brooklyn campus into an Office of Student Development and Retention to provide increased seamless support for students. Draft unit level strategic plans have been developed in the division of academic affairs for each school.

With the exception of the assessment of student learning, limited evidence is available as to the systematic nature of the processes. With the exception of the assessment processes associated with student learning, the collection and use of data to support the four remaining goals/priorities appears to be of an ad hoc nature with assessment occurring on an as needed basis with little evidence of monitoring to judge the effectiveness of the action. In particular, issues related to student retention require a deeper level of analysis using direct measures. In addition, little evidence is available regarding unit level assessment.

While the institution articulates a commitment to institutional effectiveness, the implementation and use of processes to drive institutional planning appears to be uneven and inconsistent across the institution and campuses. Further, evidence is not presented on how data collected by these processes have been used for improvement.

Suggestions for Improvement:

- None.

Recommendations:

- The institution should systematize its institutional effectiveness assessment processes. The systematic approach should enable the University to provide evidence of the effectiveness of the strategic plan as well as the efficiency and effectiveness of unit-level plans and operations.

Standard 8: Student Admissions

Long Island University meets this standard. There are no recommendations.

Long Island University meets this standard because it admits students whose interests, goals, and abilities are consistent with the university's mission of Access and Excellence, educating and empowering men and women from all walks of life. The University has developed programs and services appropriate to the academic and financial profile of LIU students, which are designed to increase student retention. The University provides accurate information about admissions policies and criteria, financial aid, placement and transfer credit to prospective students.

Summary of Evidence, Findings, and Significant Accomplishments

- The University has limited tuition increases and expanded institutional aid to fulfill its mission of access and help students afford an undergraduate education. The University increased financial aid to offset a \$2.9 million decline in state and federal grants.
- The University has undertaken several key retention initiatives that has increased freshman retention at LIU Brooklyn from an average of approximately 62% (over a five-year period) to a range of 66-71%. The Office of Student Development and Retention

(OSDR), the English Summer Institute (ESI), and the new Student Engagement Model, and integrate and expand services to students at risk of dropping out because of financial difficulties, social problems, or academic pressures.

- A new financial aid model introduced at LIU Brooklyn included persistence grants tied to specific goals for academic performance for freshman, sophomores, and juniors. Retention rates for the 2009 and 2010 entering cohorts were higher than at any time in the preceding decade.

The implementation of an Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) solution in 2007 provides an integrated information system, improving access to critical recruitment and retention data. LIU Brooklyn created an automated system to evaluate transfer credit that includes core coursework for approximately 30 college feeder schools.

Suggestions for Improvement:

- Establish goals for graduation rates for first-time freshmen and transfer students, recognizing the academic and financial profile of LIU students. Continue to improve student persistence to graduation, monitoring the university's progress towards these goals.
- Statements of expected student learning outcomes and information on assessment results for each program should be made available to prospective students.

Standard 9: Student Support Services

Long Island University meets this standard. There are no recommendations.

Summary of Evidence, Findings, and Significant Accomplishments

- The team was impressed by the high level of commitment of the student-support staff at the university. The staff showed passion for both the educational mission of LIU and the success of the students whom they serve.
- Faculty and staff showed a good degree of responsiveness to student issues. The Brooklyn campus piloted several successful programs: the Scholarship Assistance Program, the establishment of the Office of Student Development and Retention, "Triple E" courses, and learning communities. The services for veterans, personal counseling services, the Division of Student Success, and First-Year Only courses are to be commended at Post. Additional assessment data and replication of effective programs is needed.
- Staff members are aware of campus colleagues and offices that support students. This awareness of campus resources provides a supportive atmosphere for students in which staff members are able to refer students to appropriate resources.

Suggestions for Improvement:

- The students who are enrolled in New York State's Higher Education Opportunity Program (HEOP) are well supported. As evidenced in the self-report and validated in conversations with students, HEOP students are retained through graduation at rates that far surpass their similarly situated peers at LIU. The HEOP program embodies

Standard 9, and its most effective attributes could be replicated across campus. The team suggests that the university continue to perform assessments that target the most effective aspects of the HEOP program for replication. Appropriate and accurate academic and financial advising should be improved.

- The Brooklyn and Post campuses have established student intervention models. Research has established models for student risk assessment and behavioral intervention teams. All campuses should review this research in order to identify a cohesive system for supporting and identifying distressed and distressing students.
- Student support services should be clearly defined for branch campuses, particularly the compliance based services (i.e. Title IX and ADA).

Standard 10: Faculty

Long Island University meets this standard. There are no recommendations.

Summary of Evidence, Findings, and Significant Accomplishments

- Qualified professionals devise, develop, monitor, and support the institution's instructional, research, and service programs.
- The faculty is qualified to do this work and they are dedicated professionals with strong commitments both to the institution and to its work. Their work supports the mission and goals of the institution.
- Faculty members participate actively in planning, curriculum review, program development, and governance on a departmental level. They are dedicated to teaching, research, and scholarship.
- The institution encourages and supports faculty research, scholarship, and advancement. This includes adjunct faculty who can apply for promotion.
- The institution supports and encourages program development.
- Faculty participated actively in the preparation of the Middle-States self-study which gave involvement within the work of the university. Many believe that the open participation in assessment gave them new understanding of their own work in relationship to others.
- Faculty members take pride in the uniqueness of the three sites---Post, Brooklyn, and Pharmacy--- and see it is a primary strength of the university that shapes its programs to meet the needs of the students. In the three sites faculty concerns are represented by faculty councils that efficiently represent the work of the faculty that is unique to their division. Faculty were pleased with the uniqueness of the three divisions and wish to retain their academic autonomy that meet different and special needs while also being part of the oneness of the university at large.

Suggestions for Improvement:

Faculty members have not actively participated on an institution wide basis in the institution's governance structure since 2001. The restoration of the Faculty Senate (April 4, 2013) is an important first step planned by the University to address this concern. Long Island University

should explore additional methods to improve communication between the faculty and administration to the Board of Trustees. This would enhance full participation of all constituencies in the university governance.

Standard 11: Educational Offerings

Long Island University meets this standard. There are no recommendations.

Summary of Evidence, Findings, and Significant Accomplishments

- The university incorporates expected learning outcomes in their syllabi as evidenced by inspection of a subset of syllabi included as exhibits in the self-study and through multiple interviews during the visit.
- The university offers opportunities to integrate instructional and non-instructional experiences through cooperative education and internship experiences as evidenced by a review of the self-study and associated documents and by interview with several LIU faculty and staff.
- Both internal (faculty review of course syllabi) and external review of academic programs occurs on a regular basis.
- Undergraduate research appears to be valued and supported as evidenced by an annual honors conference and faculty and student participation at the Northeast Regional Collegiate Council and Discovery Day at LIU Brooklyn.
- The development of new academic programs in response to changing social needs is evident (e.g., MS in Nurse Education, RN to BSN program, School District Business Leader programs).
- A commitment to academic assessment is evidenced by the assignment of Faculty Assessment Fellows, the hiring of FT Assessment staff and the work they have completed to date.

Suggestions for Improvement:

- While the growth of new programs cited above as a commendation can be a sign of institutional vigor, growth of new programs combined with declining enrollments, loss of federal and state aid, a relatively small endowment combined with a proliferation of academic programs can be a drain on a university. Thus, to ensure that each academic program remains congruent with the mission of LIU, some sort of academic prioritization that incorporates more than just financial indicators should be considered.
- There appears to be no external review of any academic program unless required by professional accrediting bodies (e.g., CCNE). Periodic evaluation of curricular, co-curricular, and extra-curricular activities within any academic program should be conducted by the department itself as well as an external evaluator (e.g., every 5 years on a rotating basis).

Standard 12: General Education

Long Island University meets this standard. There are no recommendations.

Summary of Evidence, Findings, and Significant Accomplishments

- The institution's undergraduate programs at LIU Brooklyn and LIU Post require students to take a sequence of 39-45 credits in Liberal Arts and Sciences in the core curriculum. The self-study demonstrates evidence that the institution is engaged in continual assessments and evaluation of the core curricula, the impact of the core courses on the quality of the general education, and the contributions of general education to the core subject areas of upper-level students.
- In assessing the Core and General Education, the Self-Study focuses on three primary areas: the First Year Experience (FYE) and the First Year Only (FYO) sections; courses in the core curriculum; and Senior Artifact Studies (SAS).
- The data provided in the study show that FYE and FYO offer superior learning environments to students and result in higher student retention rates. The institution meets its goals in the core curriculum which are designed to expose students to a broad range of knowledge and perspectives across disciplines in Arts and Sciences, and ground them in the skills needed to succeed in college. Further assessments of the programs are either ongoing or scheduled by the faculty three-year cycle of Student Artifact Studies (SAS) at the junior and senior levels (written communication / information literacy, 2012/2013; ethics, 2012/2013; quantitative analysis and problem-solving 2012/2013; critical thinking and/or integrative learning 2013/2014.)
- The institution notes the success of its Gateway courses as foundations for the major(s) to provide the initial training to students in research work, analytical and problem solving skills, necessary for their later academic careers. Evidence of their effectiveness is seen in the study at LIU Brooklyn which has implemented all ten practices listed by American Association of Colleges and Universities. The institution's two primary goals with the Gateway experiences include: sustaining good practices and developing new high impact first-year practices; and strengthening intervention strategies for at risk first year students who underperformed in critical core liberal arts foundation courses like, English, Math, Science, History and Philosophy.
- The Self-Study and interviews with key personnel revealed that revisions made in Mathematics and English placement procedures have resulted in a significant decline in the number of students placed in remedial math and also confirmed the effectiveness of the new English placement policy of using a combination of SAT scores and high school GPA. The study also notes that campus support services have resulted in enhanced orientation experience for students. In 2010, Student Life and Services hired an outside consultant to assist in developing a plan to address student learning outside the classroom. The highlights of the plan include: improving student leadership development, energizing student organizations and creating specific programming for international students.

In assessing the Core and general Education, the skills to be assessed in first three year cycles are as follows:

- LIU Brooklyn: Written communication/ information literacy (2011-2012)
- LIU Post: Critical thinking and critical reading (2011-2012)
- LIU Brooklyn: Quantitative analysis and problem solving (2012-2013)
- LIU Post: Ethics/written communication (2012-2013)
- LIU Brooklyn: Critical thinking and/or integrative learning (2013-2014)
- LIU Post: Selected skills to be determined (2013-2014).

Suggestions for Improvement:

- The evaluation team concurs with the plans of action in the Self-Study that in, “transforming LIU into a 21st century institution,” the University should place special focus on collaboratively further developing and improving its first- and second- year programs.
- Long Island University should develop an intentional approach to improve critical thinking/ethical reasoning skills compared to other skills in the core courses.

Standard 13: Related Educational Offerings

Long Island University meets this standard. There are no recommendations.

Summary of Evidence, Findings, and Significant Accomplishments

- The Basic Skills component is met as evidenced by the specification of admission criteria for under-prepared students, the provision of relevant courses and preparation activities for these students, and remedial courses that either carry no academic credit or academic credit that is for only a portion of the class meeting time.
- The Certificate Programs component is met as evidenced by the programs being consistent with institutional mission, having available and effective student support services, and offered with academic oversight consistent with that provided to all other academic programs.
- The Experiential Learning component is met as evidenced that faculty and staff regularly visit students in their coop and internship positions and have the students, where practical, back on campus during the term to discuss the experience.
- The Non-credit Offerings is met as evidenced by their being consistent with institutional mission and goals, clearly articulated objectives, academic oversight and periodic assessment.
- The Branch Campuses, Additional Locations, and Other Instructional Sites component is met as evidenced by faculty oversight of all programs offered at external locations.
- The Distance Education, Distributed Learning, and Correspondence Education Component is met as evidenced by the effective integration of distance learning within current programs, formal training programs for faculty involved in online learning.
- The Contractual Relationships and Affiliated Providers component is met as evidenced by the consistency of the programs with the institution’s mission and goals.

- Under-prepared students benefit from basic skills or development courses as evidenced by several programs, including Orientation Workshops, HEOP student support, the English Summer Institute, and the Program for Academic Success.
- The pass rates on the various licensure exams and national exams that students qualify for in certificate programs are monitored and program content is adjusted where the pass rates fail to meet targeted pass rates.
- The experiential learning includes internships, co-op experiences, study abroad and travel opportunities, practicums, and other programs. Faculty work to help students identify which coop and internship positions are valuable and which are of limited value in terms of the experience gained. No academic credit is offered for the coop or internship positions.
- An aggressive outreach to provide high school students with exposure to college-level courses, as well as the opportunity to earn credits that count toward both their high school and college degrees, and that the full-time faculty at LIU POST provide oversight to this program (SCALE).
- All course materials for blended and online programs are developed by members of the LIU faculty, and students in these programs receive the same support services as students on campus.

Suggestions for Improvement:

- Create a formal schedule for reviews of non-credit programs.
- Monitor the extent to which faculty are using the SafeAssign program to check for plagiarism in course papers.
- Explore methods for more effectively monitoring online exams.
- Develop definitions for what constitutes a credit hour in blended and online courses.

Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning

Long Island University meets this standard. There are no recommendations.

Summary of Evidence, Findings, and Significant Accomplishments

- Long Island University is committed to providing high quality educational experiences to students across its multiple campus system. The processes associated with the assessment of student learning are standardized across the campuses and departments of the institution.
- Student learning outcomes are clear and specific to courses and programs. Student learning outcomes are included in all course syllabi. The institution conducts audits to ensure inclusion of outcomes and contract hour in compliance with state regulations. Any courses not meeting expectation are modified to ensure continued compliance. Faculty link learning outcomes to assignments and course expectations as required. Data from the 2011 review process indicate most courses include clearly described learning outcomes. Student learning outcomes in general education are campus specific. General education learning outcomes are included in relevant campus materials included catalogs and websites. Program learning outcomes are also available and are appropriate to the

level and discipline being taught. Curricular maps for each program are available showing the linkages within program requirements. Certificate programs are not currently included in the institutions assessment of student learning process.

- A university-wide assessment process was established in 2009 that includes assessment of student learning at the course and program levels. Reports for the past two years indicate the programs and courses offered by the institution are achieving their desired outcomes. Institutional review of these reports indicated that the University has made significant progress in terms of increased collection of assessment data and greater faculty understanding of the assessment process. The assessment process includes the development of assessment plans addressing specific learning outcomes, followed by annual review and analysis of data. Assessment reports include rich information of program and course improvement efforts. Multiple assessment methods address different learning styles and are primarily direct measures. Interviews across the various campuses and locations indicate widespread support and understanding about the use and value of assessment. Assessment reports reveal changes in pedagogy, instruction delivery and/or curriculum. Assessment of the effectiveness of information literacy occurs at the undergraduate level and is being developed at the graduate level.
- As a teaching institution, faculty members are actively involved in improving their teaching practice and assessment of student learning is an essential component of that practice. Assessment is valued in the promotion and tenure process. Faculty interviews, review of promotion and tenure reports and discussions with deans across the institution confirm the institution's commitment to classroom based instruction and a process of continuous improvement at both the course and program levels.
- In addition to faculty support, Long Island University has made significant resource commitment to the assessment of student learning. At the institutional level, increased resource support for assessment was provided including: hiring a Director of Assessment and Assessment Specialists; supporting 15 stipend-funded Faculty Assessment Fellows; increasing faculty development opportunities as well as increasing the training materials available on University and campus-based assessment websites. These additions have resulted in significant improvements in the quality of assessment processes and assessment activities. Assessment plans and reports are reviewed at the unit, department and campus levels. Campus-level assessment committees review reports and identify issues requiring further action.
- Assessment of co-curricular activities is also evident. The institution makes use of national surveys and other feedback loops. In addition, surveys and other outcomes based activities are reported with specific changes resulting from those processes.
- The creation of a campus wide culture of assessment focused on student learning is outstanding. The Assessment Fellows program is valued by faculty. Assessment of student learning is not viewed as an additional responsibility, but as an inherent part of teaching.
- The commitment of significant resources to enhance the revised assessment process. Exploration of Campus Labs should facilitate process.

Suggestions for Improvement:

- Explore the creation and use of an assessment data base to enhance the assessment report function and reduce the paperwork burden associated with the process.

- Explore adding certificate programs to the established student assessment process or create other methods to assess program effectiveness.
- Continue to develop strategies to assess information literacy at the graduate level.

Summary and Conclusions

We have never experienced a more diverse institution in student diversity, geography, and academic programs. Yet, every aspect of the LIU community we witnessed are dedicated to student opportunity and success.

We have all been extremely impressed by what we have seen at Long Island University. We applaud the pride that you show at this institution. You have created a culture here which is rare. You have a very dedicated faculty, administration, and staff, academically challenging programs, and students who truly feel that everyone at the University cares about them.

You have outstanding leadership from the Board and the President. We want to commend you on the outstanding institution that you have fostered. We have come to see that it is truly a special place.