

Report to the
Faculty, Administration, Trustees, Students
of

STONY BROOK UNIVERSITY
Stony Brook, NY 11794-1970

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 campus on March 28-31, 2004

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 education service for the benefit of the institution. All comments in the report are made in good faith, in an effort to assist Stony Brook 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.

Members of the Evaluation Team:

James V. Maher (Chair)

Senior Vice Chancellor and Provost
University of Pittsburgh
801 Cathedral of Learning
Pittsburgh, PA 15260

Ronald Baenninger

Professor
Department of Psychology
Temple University
Weiss Hall
1801 North Broad Street
Philadelphia, PA 19122

Jannette L. Dates

Dean
John H. Johnson School of Communications
Howard University
2400 Sixth Street, NW
Washington, DC 20059

Charles J. Fey

Vice President for Student Affairs
University of Maryland, Baltimore County
1000 Hilltop Circle
Baltimore, MD 21250

Robert Griffith

Professor of History
American University
108 Grant Avenue
Takoma Park, MD 20912

Brent D. Ruben

Executive Director
Center for Organizational Development &
Leadership
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
SCILS 222
4 Huntington Street
New Brunswick, NJ 08901-1071

Working With the Team:

Generalist Evaluator:

Barbara G. Hornum

Associate Professor of Anthropology
Drexel University
3141 Chestnut Street
Room #102
Philadelphia, PA 19104

State University of New York

Representative:

Anne Huot

Associate Provost, Doctoral Degree-granting
Institutions
State University of New York
State University Plaza
Albany, NY 12246

AT THE TIME OF THE VISIT

President: Shirley Strum Kenny

Chief Academic Officer: Robert McGrath

I. Context and Nature of the Visit

Institutional Overview

Stony Brook University (hereinafter “Stony Brook”) is an outstanding public research university. Its recent inclusion in the Association of American Universities (AAU) signals the accomplishment of one of its primary missions “to carry out research and intellectual endeavors of the highest international standards.”

Over the past decade, Stony Brook has sought to transform the undergraduate educational experience in order to achieve a separate aspect of their mission: providing undergraduates an education of the “highest quality.” The focus chosen by the institution for its Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) self-study – “The Student Experience at Stony Brook” – provided a creative and useful framework for engaging the campus in a conversation about undergraduate education.

This framework helped the institution examine many facets of Stony Brook’s effectiveness in relation to the experiences of its students—particularly that of its undergraduates. The use of the framework contributed to a greater understanding of the challenges facing the institution, and to the identification of numerous possible opportunities for improvement. The campus dialogue on these issues – which is estimated to have involved as many as 500 members of the administration, faculty, staff and student body – has enhanced the University’s already considerable efforts to improve undergraduate education.

Scope of Stony Brook University at the time of the evaluation:

Degree level(s):

Bachelor’s, Master’s, Certificate, First Professional, Doctorate

Additional Locations:

Study abroad programs are offered in Italy, France, Germany, Spain, Japan, Tanzania, England, South Korea, Russia, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Austria and Jamaica. Stony Brook offers a number of classes for college credit at the surrounding middle schools, high schools, libraries and community colleges; courses and an Executive MBA will be delivered in Manhattan, NY.

Distance Learning:

Stony Brook University does offer distance learning through the use of CD-ROMs and on-line instruction through the internet and its World Wide Web site.

Other:

Self-Study Process and Report:

Stony Brook University impressed the evaluation team from the beginning with its acknowledgement of strengths and weaknesses in the self-study. The administration and

faculty repeatedly expressed a desire to improve Stony Brook's undergraduate program and align it with its exceptional reputation as a research university.

Support and enthusiasm for this initiative is pervasive at Stony Brook. They fill every level and area of the campus from the faculty and students to the administration and staff. Stony Brook has already made great progress on many fronts. Yet as the Self-Study acknowledges, much additional work remains to be accomplished. This comes at a challenging time as New York State finds itself tightening its budget for higher education. The nature of Stony Brook's obstacles helps to reinforce the need for team work across the campus.

We identified three distinct areas to which Stony Brook could profitably pay special attention to during its continuing programs of improvement: student recruitment, student satisfaction and retention, and relationships with crucial partners. These areas appear to be central to Stony Brook's mission, and we are happy to offer collegial suggestions, which are explained in greater detail within the relevant sections below.

II. Affirmation of continued compliance with Eligibility Requirements

Based on review of the self-study, other institutional documents, and interviews, the team affirms that the institution continues to meet eligibility requirements 1-6 (Characteristics of Excellence, p. xi).

III. Compliance with federal requirements; issues relative to state regulatory or other accrediting agency 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 or that the institution has an acceptable plan in place to address federal compliance issues.

IV. Compliance with Accreditation Standards

A. Standards addressed substantively within the Selected Topics

Standard 7: Institutional Assessment

Stony Brook meets Standard 7 Institutional Assessment.

Summary of Evidence and Findings

The administration and faculty of Stony Brook are dedicated to improving undergraduate education, while maintaining a long-standing commitment to excellence in graduate and professional education and research. Institutional assessment activities are employed in a variety of ways to support this effort. The president, provost, and other senior administrators utilize institutional analysis to identify and clarify impediments to achieving greater distinction in undergraduate education. The Office of Planning and Institutional

Research also works collaboratively to assist with evaluation efforts in various academic, student services, and administrative departments, in addition to accommodating state and federal reporting requirements.

Stony Brook's self-study has employed a number of independent and/or ongoing assessment reports (e.g., the National Study of Student Engagement, the CIRP New Student survey, the SUNY general education assessment instruments), as well as formal surveys, and a range of informal data-gathering approaches undertaken specifically for the MSCHE review. The analyses variously take into account the perspectives of students, faculty, staff and alumni. These tools have been used to highlight various phases and aspects of the student experience, and the academic, student life, and administrative processes that support them. Through this work, Stony Brook is establishing a culture of assessment and continuous improvement on its campus.

Suggestions

- We suggest Stony Brook develop a more proactive and comprehensive assessment plan to further its goal of institutional assessment.

A master assessment plan could be organized around the self-study framework, serving to specify the kinds of information Stony Brook should gather in assessing each phase of the student experience. The plan would direct from whom, by whom, when, and how the data should be gathered to evaluate Stony Brook's programs. It might also indicate how the entire effort would be coordinated, and the way results would be analyzed, disseminated and used.

Such a master plan would allow Stony Brook to identify and better employ the types of longitudinal and comparative data needed for the effective assessment of the Stony Brook student experience. Data on faculty and staff satisfaction, student preparedness, marketing and recruitment, business and administrative support effectiveness and efficiency, and other issues discussed with us during the evaluation visit, but not currently evaluated in a systematic manner, could be incorporated. It would also be highly desirable to emphasize communication with alumni and inclusion of alumni contributions in the institutional reflections on programmatic improvement.

Standard 8: Student Admissions

Stony Brook meets Standard 8 Student Admissions.

Summary of Evidence and Findings

The University has made serious strides in the improvement of the student body as shown by the increased averages in GPA and SAT scores over scores collected from previous years. Stony Brook developed and implemented appropriate policies, which reflect the University's mission and vision, and articulated them in written communications with prospective students and in their publications. These measures have provided to all students

sufficient information about the availability of financial aid and scholarships by utilizing print and electronic media, direct mailings, and email.

Suggestions

We submit the following suggestions for Stony Brook's consideration regarding their concerns and our observations.

- Implement branding and utilize all available marketing resources to spread the word that Stony Brook is a great university to attend for an undergraduate education. First impressions of the campus for visitors and prospective students and parents are less favorable than they could be. We recommend better signage and directions, more attractive and better maintained public walkways, and the placement of appropriate campus signage celebrating the "brand" Stony Brook University.
- Increase geographic diversity in the student body at Stony Brook by using branding and outreach to draw students from outside New York State and from Upstate New York.
- Address concerns faced by transfer and commuter students.
- Continue to bring creative solutions to the need for more housing on campus.

Standard 9: Student Support Services

Stony Brook meets Standard 9 Student Support Services.

Summary of Evidence and Findings

Stony Brook has a program of student support services appropriate to student strengths and needs that reflects its goal of consolidating the university's future as a student-centered research university and it has qualified professionals to supervise and provide appropriate student support services and programs.

Creative use of limited funds appears to be a hallmark of Stony Brook University. But the funds are indeed limited and enrollments in the past nine years have been increasing. This inevitably means many students are balancing jobs, either on- or off-campus, with their studies.

Concerns were expressed both by Stony Brook and the team regarding serious housing and enrollment problems. Fifteen to twenty percent of students reported serious problems getting into classes because there were too few sections offered, or too few classrooms. Additionally, large numbers of entering students are housed either in triples or lounges. For example, Fall 2003 data showed 1200 students were placed in triples or lounges while 500 students were placed on a waiting list for on-campus housing. Stony Brook is addressing one-third of the current demand for housing by adding approximately 638 new beds for Fall 2004, but a significant number of students still need accommodations.

The University's focus on six undergraduate themed colleges is a bold attempt to deliver a more student-centered, academically supportive environment that will ultimately help in incoming students' perceptions of the campus as a more humane, welcoming environment. Overseen by the Office of Undergraduate Academic Affairs and working hand in hand with the provost's and academic affairs offices, the themed undergraduate colleges and the Living/Learning Centers work together around the theme of the college to support student interests and needs. The Living/Learning Centers deliver exceptional learning opportunities and community building that was completely innovative when conceived and remains an exciting, innovative approach today.

Suggestions

We agree with Stony Brook on many of the observations in their Self-Study and reinforce them with the following suggestions:

- Continue to enhance scholarship and financial aid opportunities for new students at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.
- Improve registration and advising for new undergraduate students.
- Strengthen and expand coordination among orientation activities.
- Identify ways for transfer students to make a smoother transition to Stony Brook.
- Encourage students to make academic and career goals a priority and address these early in the students' academic life at Stony Brook.
- Provide mentoring opportunities for every student.

Standard 10: Faculty

Stony Brook meets Standard 10 Faculty.

Summary of Evidence and Findings

Stony Brook has an outstanding faculty, nearly all of whom hold the doctorate or appropriate terminal degree in their field and many of whom have distinguished national and/or international reputations. (Self Study, 13-14.) Former and current faculty members include both a recent Nobel Prize winner in Medicine and a National Medal of Science winner. The University's recent induction into the AAU is eloquent testimony to the achievement of its faculty. The University has in place sound, faculty-centered governance processes for the management of appointment, promotion and tenure, curriculum and other critical academic issues. (Senate Constitution, Faculty-Staff Digest¹) The University has identified faculty salaries and support for faculty research among the goals of its current, five year strategic plan, and has recently reviewed and adjusted them upwards. (See, Five Year Plan, 3.Faculty.ⁱⁱ report by Lawrence Martin, 3/29/04.) Some concerns were expressed over the cost of living, especially for young faculty and graduate students.

In regard to teaching, the University's criteria for appointment, promotion and tenure include "effectiveness in teaching," and the University annually recognizes outstanding teaching through the Chancellor's Award for Excellence in Teaching (Self Study, 13). The

College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Engineering and Applied Sciences recently revised their promotion and tenure criteria to place greater emphasis on undergraduate teaching.ⁱⁱⁱ The University provides support for teaching effectiveness through its Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CELT) and through its Academy of Scholar-Teachers, (Self-Study, 59), although both programs are currently on hold due to budgetary considerations. In 1999, the University received the Theodore Hesburgh Certificate of Excellence for "Faculty Development to Enhance Undergraduate Teaching and Learning."^{iv}

As is the case with many large, public research universities, there is somewhat of a disconnect between the culture of the faculty, focused primarily on research and graduate education, and the aspirations and lived experience of the student body. This tension may be heightened at Stony Brook by a number of factors, including the student-faculty ratio, a substantial number of commuter students, the economic background of its student body (30% of its fall 2002 applicants report family incomes of less than \$30, 000; Self-Study, 28), and its ethnic composition (e.g., while the entering freshman class is 34% Caucasian; the faculty is 82% Caucasian; Self-Study, 13-14).

The Self-Study seeks to address these challenges through a variety of approaches, focusing especially on faculty development, assessment of learning, the integration of research into undergraduate education (an area in which Stony Brook has been a national leader), and an ambitious effort to build coherence and community during the first year through the introduction of six new "thematic colleges."

The Self-Study points out that many classes are quite large, especially at the introductory level (see additional discussions, Standard 11, Standard 12). This may reflect both the general low level of faculty resources (according to *U.S. News*, Stony Brook ranks 171 among the nation's top doctoral institutions in this critical category),^v as well as the deployment of faculty resources within the University.

While the issue of faculty diversity is addressed in the University's current Five Year Plan, which calls for a 50% increase in faculty from underrepresented groups, we were unable to determine how successful the University had been in this regard, either in the Self-Study, which did not address the issue, or in the two most recent online presidential reports on "Accomplishments of the Five Year Plan."^{vi}

Perhaps the most important observation was that most faculty express great enthusiasm for their institution. "It's a great place to be a faculty member," was a typical comment shared with our team.

Suggestions

We endorse efforts to:

- Allocate increased faculty attention to the large gateway courses and to reward faculty for outstanding performance in these courses.

- Improve recognition and rewards for faculty and others who have demonstrated excellence in directing undergraduate research and creative academic projects.
- Improve teaching through renewed support for the Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching (CELT) and the Academy of Scholar-Teachers.
- Renew commitment to building a diverse faculty.^{vii}
- Encourage faculty to endorse the assessment of courses and programs as a path to improvement.

Standard 11: Educational Offerings

Stony Brook meets Standard 11 Educational Offerings.

Summary of Evidence and Findings:

In the decade since its last review, Stony Brook has devoted considerable time and energy to improving the quality of undergraduate instruction, an effort that was accelerated with the appointment of President Kenny in 1994. Progress has been marked by the introduction of a number of innovative programs, by an increase in the number of undergraduates attending the University and by an increase in the quality of entering students as measured by test scores.

The University provided national leadership for the Boyer Commission's important study, "Educating Undergraduates in the Research University."^{viii} In 1997, the University's progress was recognized by the National Science Foundation, which awarded the University one of its prestigious Recognition Award for the Integration of Research and Education (RAIRE). In turn, the RAIRE award provided support for curricular reform and the introduction of research and active learning into a wide range of undergraduate courses.^{ix} Fully 42% of the undergraduate student body report involvement in some form of research. The University has made notable progress in some of its introductory sequences, especially in General Chemistry, Undergraduate Biology and Writing and Rhetoric. The introductory Calculus course has been reorganized around team learning. Several programs, including General Chemistry and Calculus, have introduced computer graded quizzes as a means of supplementing and individualizing course instruction. The University also continues a small honors program and a Women in Science and Engineering (WISE) program. The University has recently expanded and renamed its principal academic support unit, the Academic and Pre-Professional Advising Center. (Self-Study, 48-52.)

As the Self-Study makes clear, in spite of the real progress made over the course of the past decade, problems in the area of undergraduate education remain. The Self-Study highlights that "a large percentage of undergraduates have never had any discussion with faculty outside of class." (The Student Experience Survey, 6-7; Self-Study, 61.) While many undergraduate students are engaged in research, the practice is by no means universal; nor, according to the Self-Study, are the programs fully integrated into the undergraduate culture. (Self-Study, 61-62.) The SUNY Student Opinion Survey, which compares Stony Brook with its SUNY peers, is mixed. The National Survey of Student Engagement, which compares Stony Brook with a diverse cross section of other doctoral institutions, ranks Stony Brook

especially low in “active and collaborative learning,”^x “student interactions with faculty members,” and “supportive campus environment.”^{xi} Stony Brook fares even worse in a comparison with other AAU institutions. (Institutional Benchmark Report, November, 2003.)

As with most large state universities, resources remain a perennial problem. In comparison with other doctoral institutions, Stony Brook has fairly low faculty resources (*US News* ranks the University 171st among doctoral institutions.) It has a relatively high student-faculty ratio, which may be further skewed by the University’s heavy commitments to research and graduate education.

Physical resources somewhat limit the University’s effectiveness in undergraduate instruction. Much of the campus has been dramatically transformed for the better in recent years; and Stony Brook has many excellent laboratories, including a new state of the art biology facility. Nevertheless, the campus is struggling to accommodate the recent surge in enrollments and there is a disconnect between class sizes and classroom capacities. Significantly, most classrooms are not equipped with the latest teaching technology. (Self-Study, 65.)

The University Library holds some two million bound volumes and four million publications in micro format. Most students appear reasonably satisfied with the Library’s holdings. (The Student Experience Survey, 7.) Although Stony Brook’s library ranks relatively low among the libraries of comparable, research oriented institutions (in 2002, the Association of Research Libraries listed Stony Brook near the bottom (107) among the 114 research libraries in its annual report on library holdings),^{xii} it has done an excellent job of enabling student and faculty access to online databases. Faculty and students both praised the availability of materials in the library, as well as its physical appearance.

The Self-Study reports “a large number of computing facilities,” but the report did not make clear how extensive its systems were or how ubiquitous access to computing was. Recent additions to the University’s SOLAR system promise to better integrate the flow of information for faculty, staff and students and better network the Stony Brook community as a whole. However, information literacy did not figure as a prominent concern in the Self-Study. Stony Brook students ranked the campus last among the SUNY doctoral centers in frequency of use of computer technology in the classroom. (SUNY Student Opinion Survey, Spring 2003.)

The Self-Study reports (and both The Student Experience Survey and the SUNY Student Opinion Survey document) fairly widespread discontent with the campus bookstore.

Suggestions:

- We endorse the recommendations made in this section of the Self-Study (Recommendations 15-27, Self-Study, 68-69).
- We strongly applaud the University’s commitment to bolder initiatives such as the thematic colleges and the enhanced learning communities.

- We also suggest that more attention be paid to the installing of new instructional technologies and to the training and support of faculty in its use.
- We endorse continuing to improve the foundational experience.
- We endorse improving the availability of courses for incoming students.

Standard 12: General Education

Stony Brook meets Standard 12 General Education.

Summary of Evidence and Findings

Stony Brook offers a thoughtfully conceived and well structured general education program [the Diversified Education Curriculum (D.E.C.)], which “stresses writing, quantitative literacy, and the serious examination of intellectual and societal issues.” (Undergraduate Catalogue, 8.) The program includes: mathematics, basic communication and critical thinking, foreign language, information management, the natural sciences, the social sciences, American History, Western & other World Civilizations, the Humanities and the Arts. The program is divided into four categories: Entry Skills, which students are expected to attain before admission, but which they may also satisfy through a variety of Stony Brook courses in mathematics, writing and, for students entering Arts and Sciences, a foreign language; University Skills, which focuses on learning skills common to the entire university experience and the subject matter of liberal education; Disciplinary Skills, which exposes students to the subject matter and ways of knowledge in the various disciplines; and Expanding Perspectives and Cultural Awareness. (Undergraduate Catalogue, 61.) Oversight of the general education program is vested in the Curriculum Committee of the College of Arts and Sciences.

Established more than a decade ago, General Education at Stony Brook has undergone a process of continuous, evolutionary development, driven largely by the collaborative efforts of a dedicated community of faculty and administrators from across the campus. It is currently in the process of a SUNY initiated assessment of general education, to which the campus has responded with a variety of approaches. These efforts began in Spring 2003 with pilot programs in mathematics, psychology, sociology, technology and society, and astronomy. The most ambitious and innovative of these occurred in Biology 150 (The Living World), in which the instructor, together with other faculty developed an assessment pilot that involved analyzing a random sample of student laboratory reports to learn how well the course fostered student learning in science, communication, information management and critical thinking. The results of this preliminary assessment were used in turn to redesign and improve the course itself. These efforts continued in 2003-2004, with new pilots added in math, writing, biology and information management. (See, A Multi-Stage Plan for Assessment of General Education at Stony Brook: Generation a Culture of Assessment, and; Assessment of General Education, Discussion Points, CAS Chairs Meeting, March 31, 2004.)

As the Self-Study notes, General Education at Stony Brook faces significant challenges: the program has historically occupied a relatively low status at an institution whose early mission was to become a major research university. As is the case at many large

research universities, most faculty are primarily focused first on research and graduate education, then on the education of majors and only lastly on general education; moreover, the Self-Study (and in particular The Student Experience Survey) documented a disconnect between the goals and expectations of incoming students, whose aspirations are highly vocational, and the values and goals of the faculty, which are expressed in the traditional vocabulary of the liberal arts, stressing problem solving and ability to draw connections across the disciplines. We view neither of these characteristics as surprising, though they do provide important context for the University's efforts to improve the quality of student learning in the first two years. Stony Brook has in place a very good general education program, carefully stewarded by a deeply committed community of faculty and administrators.

Suggestions

- We endorse the Self-Study's many suggestions for improving the student experience in the first two years, as well as other recommendations that address undergraduate education in general.
- We strongly endorse the University's efforts to better communicate the value of general education, to simplify the process of course selection for new students and to better integrate general education with the campuses' learning communities and with the new "thematic colleges."
- We applaud the campuses recent efforts to better assess the general education offerings.

Standard 13: Related Educational Activities

Stony Brook meets Standard 13 Related Educational Activities.

Summary of Evidence and Findings

Stony Brook implemented remediation efforts in their Chemistry and Math departments due to the underperformance of their students and large class sizes. The introductory Chemistry class typically has 1500 students enrolled in it each year and the professors observed a correlation between poor math skills and poor performance in chemistry. By offering a separate noncredit course to approximately two hundred students according to their math placement scores, grades improved dramatically.

The University offers a one credit course to prepare students for success by orienting them to the Stony Brook environment, and more generally, to academia. SBU101 includes material on how to use the libraries, where to find resources that students need on campus and in the surrounding community, and how to behave in a variety of situations. Career decision-making, what to expect from faculty and classes, and a variety of other matters that are rarely covered explicitly in college classes, are discussed in these seminars.

Learning Communities, include mentoring and advising. These communities began in 1998 and flourished. To date they encompass 300 students who choose to join. These

communities are a remedy to Stony Brook's large impersonal lecture courses. Commuting students in particular appear to rely on Learning Communities to connect with the campus.

Several programs are offered that are designed to assist students from underrepresented populations. These programs, the EOP programs and the Turner Fellowships, in particular, provide excellent interventions, preparation for college, and in the doctoral programs, support that is particularly helpful for students from underrepresented populations.

Stony Brook encourages its students to pursue international education opportunities. Ten Study Abroad programs for groups are offered, including the most recent one in Bangalore, India, that is primarily for technical/business students, and another in Eritrea with USAID, for nursing students. Programs for individual students also exist, and some of these help recruit students to the Long Island campus.

The Career Center is a spacious, well-staffed (with seven professional counselors and seven staff assistants for supporting the Center activities), professional organization that maintains close ties with the business community and has an exemplary record of job placements. They hold job fairs, networking sessions and information sessions for students interested in professional careers.

Stony Brook University in Manhattan is operational for about 100 course sections serving approximately 1,000. The services offered in Manhattan are essentially through electronic means that most Stony Brook students use in their normal interactions with the University.

Suggestions

- We suggest that special attention be paid to include the commuter students within the life of the thematic colleges who could otherwise feel left out of these important, residentially based initiatives.
- We also suggest that creative use of continuing education programs at the new Manhattan location could help in the institutionally crucial project to strengthen and develop ties to the alumni.

Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning

Stony Brook meets Standard 14 Assessment of Student Learning.

Summary of Evidence and Findings

Stony Brook has identified general student learning/educational objectives for each of the stages in the undergraduate experience identified in the self-study report, with particular clarity for the "Foundational Experience" (Self-Study Report, p. 40) and transition to a major (p. 45). Stony Brook also participates in the National Study of Student Engagement, which compares Stony Brook to peers with regard to a number of important learning outcomes.

Academic departments participate in self-study external reviews undertaken by the provost on a seven-year cycle. These reviews include a focus on undergraduate education, and results are also reported to the SUNY System. Discussions of the value of, and strategies for, the assessment of general education have taken place with arts and science department chairs and others. Integrating the review of general education requirements with the departmental review process is a longer-term goal.

A pilot multi-stage plan for assessing general education (“A Multi-Stage Plan for Assessment of General Education at Stony Brook: Generating a Culture of Assessment”) is in place, as are discipline-specific goals. The criteria are coordinated with SUNY System guidelines, and a university general education assessment committee coordinates campus efforts to assess goals and outcomes.

Stony Brook is promoting and making substantial use of a variety of measurement tools to identify student learning improvement needs and priorities, and has translated these into a series of specific recommendations enumerated in the self-study report.

Suggestions

We applaud the Self-Study Report’s general recommendation to create a “structure for ensuring continuous improvement of the student experience,” a commitment to annual assessment of progress and the integration of recommendations flowing from this process into the regular strategic planning cycle (See, also, Recommendation 12). We were impressed by the University’s use of assessment to improve its undergraduate orientation program and applaud the recommendation that a similar process be employed for graduate and international students (Recommendation 14). Furthermore, we endorse the continuous assessment and improvement of curricular offerings (Recommendation 17), efforts to improve alumni record keeping and communication (Recommendation 30), and to continuously assess the quality of the University’s sense of community (Recommendation 26).

We also support suggestions that Stony Brook:

- Promote a culture of constructive assessment throughout the university.
- Build a culture of constructive assessment of student learning.

B. Standards addressed partially within the Selected Topics

Stony Brook addressed Standards 7 through 14 within their Selected Topics, and Standards 1 through 6 were reviewed via documentation. No Standards were addressed partially within the Self-Study.

C. Standards reviewed via documentation (not within the Selected Topics)

Based on the review of documentation, the team has determined:

The institution meets the following standards:

- Standard 1: Mission, Goals, and Objectives;
- Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocations, and Institutional Renewal;
- Standard 3: Institutional Resources;
- Standard 4: Leadership and Governance;
- Standard 5: Administration;
- Standard 6: Integrity.

V. Summary of team recommendations and requirements

The team does not find a need for any recommendations or requirements.

List of Interviewees:

Mark Aronoff, Steering Committee Co-Chair, Deputy Provost, Professor of Linguistics

Peter Baigent, Associate Vice President for Student Affairs

Petar Djuric, Steering Committee Co-Chair, Professor of Electrical Engineering

Norman Edelman, Vice President for the Health Sciences Center, Dean of the School of Medicine, Professor of Medicine, Professor of Physiology & Biophysics

Gail Habicht, Vice President for Research, Professor of Pathology

Shirley Strum Kenny, President, Professor of English

Robert McGrath, Provost & Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs, Vice President for Brookhaven Lab Affairs, Professor of Physics

Yacov Shamash, Vice President for Economic Development, Dean of the College of Engineering & Applied Sciences, Professor of Electrical Engineering

James Staros, Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences, Professor of Biochemistry & Cell Biology

Elyce Acierno, Senior Staff Assistant to the Provost

Christopher Berndt, Professor of Materials Science, Associate Dean of Engineering & Applied Science

William Collins, Associate Professor of Neurobiology & Behavior, Director of Undergraduate Biology, Chair, Senate Undergraduate Council

Stephanie Foote, Staff Associate of New Student Orientation

Martha Furie, Professor of Pathology

Rosanne Howell, Graduate Student

Alan Inkles, Director of the Staller Center for the Arts

Partap Khalsa, Associate Professor of Orthopedic Surgery & Biomedical Engineering

Craig Lehmann, Professor of Clinical Laboratory Sciences, Dean of the School of Health, Technology & Management

Manuel London, Professor of Business Management, Associate Provost for Enrollment & Retention Management

Marianna Savoca, Director of the Career Center

Emily Thomas, Director of Planning & Institutional Research

Fu-Pen Chiang, Distinguished Professor of Mechanical Engineering
David Conover, Dean & Director of the Marine Sciences Research Center, Professor of Marine Sciences
Gilbert Kalish, Distinguished Professor of Music
Helen Lemay, Distinguished Teaching Professor of History
Xiaolin Li, Professor of Applied Mathematics & Statistics
Milton Lodge, Distinguished Professor of Political Science
Serge Luryi, Distinguished Professor of Electrical & Computer Engineering
Mario Mignone, Distinguished Service Professor of European Languages, Literatures & Cultures
Barry Rifkin, Dean of the School of Dental Medicine
Tadesse Ghirmai, Graduate Student Representative
Lawrence Martin, Associate Provost for Planning & Analysis, Dean of the Graduate School, Professor of Anthropology
Doug Panico, Director of Analysis, Management and Audit
Irene Solomon, Associate Professor of Physiology
Michael Zannettis, Undergraduate Student Representative, Anthropology Major
Anne Byrnes, Director of the University Counseling Center
Deborah Firestone, Associate Dean of the School of Health, Technology & Management
Rick Gatteau, Director of Academic Advising
Stefan Hyman, Graduate Student Representative
Jerry Stein, Dean of Students
Randy Susman, Faculty Advisor to Athletics, Professor of Anatomical Sciences
Laura Valente, Director of Residential Programs
Minghua Zhang, Director of the Institute for Terrestrial and Planetary Atmospheres, Professor of Marine Sciences
Anas Sawas, Undergraduate Student Representative, Political Science & Pharmacology Major
John Corrado, Member of the Stony Brook Council
Robert H. Flynn, Member of the Stony Brook Council
Karan Kumar, Member of the Stony Brook Council

Richard Nasti, Chair of the Stony Brook Council
Frank Petrone, Member of the Stony Brook Council
Michael Russell, Member of the Stony Brook Council
William Arens, Professor of Anthropology, Dean of International Academic Programs
Ora Bouey, Assistant Dean of the School of Nursing
Kimberly Chu, Undergraduate Student Representative, Psychology Major
Marvin Glockner, Associate Dean of the School of Professional Development
Cheryl Hamilton, Director, Educational Opportunity Program/Advancement on Individual Merit
David Hanson, Professor of Chemistry
David Hicks, Associate Provost
Marion Mastauskas, Assistant to the Director of Special Projects in the College of Engineering & Applied Sciences
David Maynard, Faculty Director of the Learning Communities
Alexis Simeonidis, Undergraduate Student Representative, Mechanical Engineering Major
William Turner, Dean of the College of Business
Olufemi Vaughan, Associate Dean of the Graduate School, Professor of Africana Studies
Akshay Athalye, Graduate Student Representative
Bruce Bashford, Undergraduate Program Director and Associate Professor of English
Joanne Daly, Professor of Technology & Society, Chair of the College of Engineering & Applied Sciences Curriculum Committee
Naomi Edlin, Undergraduate Student Representative
Robert Goldenberg, Undergraduate Program Director and Professor of History
Wilbur Miller, Professor of History
Anthony Phillips, Professor of Mathematics, Associate Dean, College of Arts & Sciences
Wendy Tang, Associate Professor of Electrical & Computer Engineering
Judith Burke-Berhannan, Dean & Director of Admissions
Donna DiDonato, Assistant Provost for Undergraduate Academic Affairs
Gosia Lewandowska, Undergraduate Student Representative
Loretta Mulle, Academic Advisor in the College of Engineering and Applied Sciences
Scott Sutherland, Associate Professor in the Institute for Mathematical Sciences

Michelle Turner, Graduate Student Representative, Biochemistry & Structural Biology
Janet Clarke, Senior Assistant Librarian of Melville Library
Nancy Duffrin, Director of Instructional Computing
Perry Goldstein, Professor of Music, Director of the Undergraduate College of Arts, Culture & Humanities
Sabrina Hom, Graduate Student Representative
Imin Kao, Professor of Mechanical Engineering, Director of the Undergraduate College of Information & Technology
Adam Zimmerman, Undergraduate Student Representative
Joseph Auner, Professor of Music History and Theory
Joanne Davila, Associate Professor of Psychology
Celia Marshik, Associate Professor of English
Stanley Alexander, Distinguished Teaching Professor of Dental Medicine
Gail Habicht, Vice President for Research, Professor of Pathology
Janos Kirz, Distinguished Professor of Physics
Cindy Lee, Distinguished Professor of Marine Sciences
Dusa McDuff, Distinguished Professor of Mathematics
Lorne Mendell, Distinguished Professor of Neurobiology & Behavior
Daniel O'Leary, Distinguished Professor of Psychology
Lee Miller, Associate Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences, Professor of Philosophy
Jeri Schoof, Assistant Provost for Human Resources
Gene Sprouse, Professor of Physics, Chair of the College of Arts & Sciences Promotion & Tenure Committee
Alan Tucker, Professor of Applied Math, Chair of the College of Engineering & Applied Sciences Promotion & Tenure Committee
Angeliki Pollatou, Graduate Student Representative, Physics & Astronomy
Suzanne Sullivan, Director of Commuter Student Services
Esam Al-Shareffi, Student Representative
Robert Cerrato, Professor of Marine Sciences, Chair of the of Arts & Science Senate Curriculum Committee
Norman Goodman, Chair of the Department of Sociology, SUNY State-wide Senator

Elaine Kaplan, Assistant Dean for Curriculum of the College of Arts & Sciences
Joan Kenny, Assistant Dean of the College of Engineering & Applied Sciences
Robert Kerber, Distinguished Teaching Professor of Chemistry
Joan Miyazaki, Curriculum Coordinator and Professor of Undergraduate Biology
Sheela Rao, Undergraduate Student Representative, Linguistics Major
Frederick Preston, Vice President for Student Affairs

ⁱ Senate Constitution at:

<http://naples.cc.sunysb.edu/Admin/fshotlinks.nsf/By+Section?OpenView&CollapseView;>

Faculty and Staff Digest at:

<http://naples.cc.sunysb.edu/Admin/fshotlinks.nsf/By%20Section?OpenView&Start=1&Count=60&Expand=8#8>).

ⁱⁱ Five Year Plan at: <http://www.stonybrook.edu/pres/5yrplan/page4.html>

ⁱⁱⁱ

^{iv} <http://ws.cc.stonybrook.edu/ureca/Urecahistory.htm>

^v <http://www.usnews.com/usnews/edu/college/rankings/premium/natudoc/tier1/t1natudoc.php>

^{vi} <http://ws.cc.stonybrook.edu/sb/5yrplan02/faculty.shtml>;

<http://ws.cc.stonybrook.edu/sb/5yrplan03/faculty.shtml>

^{vii} For details, see the Report of the Five Year Plan Task Force on Diversity and Internationalization at:

<http://ws.cc.stonybrook.edu/pres/Taskforces/Reports/5%20diversity%20for%20web.html>

^{viii} See *Reinventing Undergraduate Education: A Blueprint for America's Research Universities* (1998) at:

<http://naples.cc.stonybrook.edu/Pres/boyer.nsf/>. USB has a long history of integrating research into undergraduate education, though primarily in the sciences. In 1987 it was among the first large university to establish an Office for Undergraduate Research and Creative Activities. [Self-Study, 60.]

^{ix} See Wendy Katkin, "The Integration of Research and Education," in *Reinvigorating the Undergraduate Experience* at: <http://ws.cc.stonybrook.edu/ureca/Urecahistory.htm>

^x "Virtually no school scores as low as SB on the *Active and Collaborative Learning* category." National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) 2000, p.8.

^{xi} "Virtually none of the schools that participated in this survey scored less than SB." *ibid.*, 11.