

Progress Report to the
Middle States Commission on Higher Education
from
SUNY College at Old Westbury
Old Westbury, NY 111568

President Calvin O. Butts, III

(April 1, 2018)

Subject of the Follow-Up Report:

At its session on November 17, 2016, the Middle States Commission on Higher Education acted:

To accept the Periodic Review Report, reaffirm accreditation and commend the institution for the quality of the periodic Review Report. To request a progress report, due April 1, 2018, documenting further implementation of the assessment of non-academic units (Standard 7). The next evaluation visit is scheduled for 2020-2021.

Table of Contents

Title Page	i
Table of Contents	ii
Introduction.....	1
Substantive Narrative and Analysis	3
Conclusion	6
Appendices.....	7ff.

Introduction

The Commission's request for follow-up:

At its session on November 17, 2016, the Middle States Commission on Higher Education acted: To accept the Periodic Review Report, reaffirm accreditation and commend the institution for the quality of the periodic Review Report. To request a progress report, due April 1, 2018, documenting further implementation of the assessment of non-academic units (Standard 7). The next evaluation visit is scheduled for 2020-2021.

In the period that has followed our 2016 reaccreditation, SUNY Old Westbury has made substantial progress in enhancing the culture of assessment, and in further implementing activities and practices in the assessment of non-academic units. This report documents that progress. The recent history of this request demonstrates the importance of the steps taken since early 2016.

As a result of our decennial site visit, in 2011, the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) reaffirmed the College's accreditation, while issuing only one Recommendation: "Formalize and implement a systematic, defined assessment plan for the non-academic areas of the college." By 2016, when Old Westbury submitted its Periodic Review Report (PRR), that Recommendation had still not been satisfied. Thus, as indicated above, the Middle States Commission on Higher Education reiterated the requirement for Old Westbury to document its further implementation of processes for systematic assessment of non-academic areas at the College. Accordingly, this Progress Report is submitted to satisfy that requirement.

As our 2016 PRR indicated, steps had already been taken by that time to comply with the 2011 Recommendation: the position of Assistant Vice President for Institutional Research and Assessment (AVP-IRA) had been approved. In January 2017, SUNY Old Westbury did hire a new AVP-IRA, whose main focus was to further develop and implement our college-wide assessment process. This proved to be a crucial factor in our ability to establish a comprehensive institutional assessment program, and resulted in the College satisfying the 2016 Middle States requirement. We now have in place an institutional assessment system that assesses all non-academic areas of the College; our system is systematic, continuous, consistent, coordinated, sustainable and in compliance with MSCHE's accreditation standards. It requires the development of mission-based performance outcomes, their assessment, and ongoing plans for continuing assessment and improvement. Under the guidance of our AVP-IRA, we also standardized and strengthened our academic assessment cycle, systematizing our rotation of student learning outcomes assessment within academic departments and in support of our five-year academic program assessment protocols. The improved College-wide annual assessment process concludes with an evaluation of the assessment process itself, in the form of an online survey questionnaire (see Appendix F).

Despite unforeseen personnel changes (our AVP-IRA resigned his position in October 2017), we

successfully completed the 2016-17 cycle of assessment of non-academic areas at the College, and in March 2018, our President, Dr. Butts, received the “Institutional (Non-Academic) Assessment Summary Report for the 2016-17 Academic Year” (see Appendix D; hereafter, *2016/17 IA Summary Report*). That assessment process also included the establishment of performance outcomes for *this* academic year (2017-18, the second year of the process), and the expectation that previously assessed performance outcomes will be revisited in succeeding years, as part of institutionalized assessment practices, going forward utilizing a 3-year rotation cycle. With the experience gained from the 2016-17 assessment process and our assessment of it, we anticipate a more efficient campus-wide assessment process for 2017-18, improved by the recommendations offered by assessment participants included as part of the 2016/17 IA Summary Report. The next AVP-IRA will be expected to consider those recommendations for the completion of the 2017-18 and subsequent assessment cycles. Recommendations for the new AVP-IRA to consider include:

The introduction of variable assessment time frames that fit more meaningfully with operational (and project) calendars (the academic year is not appropriate for all departments/units), including explicit multi-year time frames with annual updates.

The creation of alternative institutional assessment forms, according to the nature of the performance outcome (e.g., project-based outcomes vs. ongoing operational outcomes)

The provision of enhanced opportunities for assistance in locating existing data sources and/or developing new ones, as well as training and data collection and analysis assistance for persons who may be unfamiliar with these tasks.

We completed our first full, systematic, comprehensive assessment of non-academic areas for 2016-17. We are well on our way towards completion of our second annual cycle of institutional assessment, with documented performance outcomes for 2017-18 in place for every area on the campus. With data collection currently ongoing, we are confident that we have put in place a strong, supported, useful institutional assessment process.

Substantive Narrative and Analysis

To address the issues we identified in our 2016 Periodic Review Report (PRR), specifically, that the then-constituted Institutional Assessment Committee suffered from a “lack of focus, absence of ardent adherence to timelines and being too large a committee with disparate strategies and goals” (2016 PPR, p. 34) , the College moved decisively to implement new, comprehensive, ongoing, systematic, and sustainable assessment processes. In January 2017, the College concluded a national search and filled the newly created Assistant Vice President for Institutional Research and Assessment (AVP-IRA) position. This position was conceived and funded specifically to guide and manage institutional assessment, improve institutional research responsiveness, and enable stronger empirical bases for strategic planning and assessment, in anticipation of our latest (nearly complete) strategic planning process. Effective leadership from the AVP-IRA was anticipated to be the lynchpin of the College’s efforts to engage in ongoing assessment and resultant continuous improvement.

The new AVP-IRA quickly formulated procedures and a timeline for the development and implementation of an assessment process that was systematic, continuous, consistent, coordinated, sustainable, and in compliance with MSCHE standards. This reorganized and formalized existing non-academic institutional assessment (some of which was already highly developed, but not consistent or systematized across the College), and began embedding more uniform assessment practices. The AVP-IRA promulgated an assessment timeline (see Appendix A), distributed a guide for the development and assessment of performance outcomes (see Appendix B), and developed standardized templates for annual unit Assessment Reports (see Appendix C). Unfortunately, the AVP-IRA resigned his position at the College in October 2017, and the position is currently unfilled, though a new search process is nearing completion. This was a crucial moment in our assessment processes, as divisions, departments, and units were completing their first-draft assessments. Until a new AVP-IRA is hired, the Provost appointed an “assessment coordinator” to oversee the Institutional Assessment process on January 2, 2018. This discontinuity created some difficulties in meeting the original timelines, and while some divisions submitted their institutional reports well in advance of the AVP-IRA’s original timetable, others took significantly longer to submit them (see Table 1). Exemplars of completed unit Assessment Reports (for the Writing Center and the Office of Public and Media Relations), two of the 55 submitted, are attached as Appendix E.

Month	Institutional Reports Received	Cumulative Reports Received
Dec 2017	15	15
Jan 2018	11	26
Feb 2018	2	28
Mar 2018	27	55

Even so, by the end of March 2018, 100% of areas had submitted assessment reports, assessing a total of 110 performance outcomes, and identifying an additional 148 performance outcomes for assessment in 2017-18 and beyond (see Table 2).

Table 2: Non-Academic Divisions, Departments/Units, Performance Outcomes, and Assessed Outcomes			
Non-Academic College Areas	Department/Unit Reports	Performance Outcomes Identified	Performance Outcomes Assessed 2016-17
Office of the President	1	5	2
Academic Affairs	24	116	48
Administration	2	10	4
Institutional Advancement	2	10	4
Business and Finance	15	64	30
University Police	1	5	2
Faculty Governance	1	5	2
Student Affairs	9	43	18
Totals	55	258	110

As evidenced by the attached documents, our planning, procedures, and actual assessment for the 2016-17 year achieved the four steps identified in Standard 7:

1. Developing clearly articulated written statements, expressed in observable terms, of key institutional and unit-level goals that are based on the involvement of the institutional community, as discussed under Standard 1 (Mission and Goals);
2. Designing intentional objectives or strategies to achieve those goals, as discussed under Standard 2 (Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal);
3. Assessing achievement of those key goals; and
4. Using the results of those assessments to improve programs and services, as discussed under Standard 2 (Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal), with appropriate links to the institution’s ongoing planning and resource allocation processes.

Admittedly, not every department or unit fulfilled all of these steps perfectly in their assessment practices, and recommendations identified in the *2016/17 IA Summary Report* to the President propose that the incoming AVP-IRA consider providing focused assistance to individual departments and units who experience difficulty aligning performance outcomes with appropriate assessment measures and/or data.

Information gleaned from the post-assessment survey questionnaire suggests that some work remains to create a true “culture of assessment” in the non-academic areas. For example, the lowest overall average “rating” in the assessment of institutional assessment survey was 2.9 (in the middle of the scale of 1-5) for the item, “The assessment process uncovered important information that caused (or will cause) my unit/department to take an action it would otherwise not have taken.” This finding is open to interpretation, of course.

Other issues raised in narrative comments in the assessment survey related to (1) the one-size-fits-all template for reporting assessment results, (2) uncertainty about how to disentangle academic from institutional performance outcomes (for administrative units managing academic programs), and (3) the perception that a unit “not have many activities to assess.” This last comment echoes the issues raised in the quantitative survey questions. As the assessment process becomes more embedded, as multiple cycles of assessment begin to show concrete results for the individual units, as well as for the College as a whole, the value of assessment will become clearer to everyone.

Following is the aggregate summary of assessment of non-academic units in 2016-17:

100% of Old Westbury’s identified non-academic areas reported supporting the College’s mission and goals.

100 % of Old Westbury’s identified non-academic areas reported having formal performance outcomes developed.

100% of Old Westbury’s identified non-academic units reported using direct evidence to learn how well the unit is performing.

Since our formalized institutional (non-academic) assessment process has only recently been put in place, we have only completed the collation and reporting of the 2016-2017 cycle of assessment. We are therefore not yet able to report on any long-term outcomes resulting from the new process. We believe, however, that we have developed and implemented an assessment process that evaluates our overall effectiveness in achieving our Mission and goals and is in compliance with MSCHE accreditation standards.

Conclusion

At the same time that the College was developing and implementing the assessment process described above, we undertook a comprehensive strategic planning process that incorporates institutional assessment as a central feature of the resultant Strategic Plan. In fact, every aspect of the College's draft 2018-2023 Strategic Plan (which is currently undergoing final revisions before being presented to the College's President for approval later in the semester) calls for robust and ongoing institutional assessment as a central component to the Plan's integrity and implementation. Early in the development of the Strategic Plan the following principles were articulated as "foundational assumptions":

1. Decisions would be based on assessment of current program needs, costs/benefits, and projections;
2. Strategies would be prioritized through collective, integrative (or "cross-silo") processes; and
3. Strategy proposals would consider costs and include explicit benchmarks with unit responsibilities and deadlines to ensure clear accountability and accomplishment within established timeframes.

These embody the principles of institutional assessment within the strategic planning process, and indicate the extent to which the College has internalized the importance of ongoing institutional assessment for its long-term growth and continuous improvement. The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment coordinates and supports the assessment process. Substantively, the results of Old Westbury's assessment of non-academic areas constitute a report to the leadership of the College – to the President, his Cabinet, the leadership of the Faculty, and the Deans and Directors in the College's administration – who share responsibility for the oversight of the conduct of business and the realization of progress towards achievement of our Mission and goals.

Moreover, we believe that the *2016/17 IA Summary Report* provides evidence that assessment results are shared and discussed with appropriate constituents and will be used in institutional planning, resource allocation, and renewal. In fact, the College's draft 2018-2023 Strategic Plan calls for the creation of a "Strategic Planning, Assessment, Analysis and Review (SPAAR) Committee" to improve and gain efficiencies in programs, offerings, and administrative services, especially those specific Goals and Objectives identified in the 2018-2023 Strategic Plan.

Appendices

Page #

Appendix A: Assessment Timeline/Plan	8
Appendix B: Guidelines for Institutional Assessment in Non-academic Units.....	10
Appendix C: Assessment Report Template	16
Appendix D: <i>2016/17 IA Summary Report</i> (main text only)	18
Appendix E: Exemplar 2016-17 Assessment Reports:	
Writing Center	27
Office of Public and Media Relations	30
Appendix F: Survey Questionnaire Administered to Institutional Assessment Participants.....	34

Timeline

For completing April 1, 2018 Progress Report to the
Middle States Commission on Higher Education
(2016-2017 for non-academic units; Fall 2017 for academic depts.)

<u>TIME</u>	<u>ACTIVITY</u>
FEB 2017 - MAR 2017	Assistant Vice President for Institutional Research and Assessment develops a College-wide assessment process that is systematic, continuous, consistent, coordinated, sustainable, and in compliance with the MSCHE Accreditation Standards.
APR 2017	AVP for Institutional Research and Assessment presents the newly developed College-wide assessment process to the President's Cabinet. The President's Cabinet approves the newly developed College-wide assessment process. Division Head nominates an assessment liaison for the division. (Division Head may designate self as the assessment liaison for the division.)
APR 2017 – MAY 2017	AVP for Institutional Research and Assessment, and the Director of Academic Assessment present the newly developed College-wide assessment process to the Deans, Chairs, Liberal Education Committee, and Curriculum and Academic Planning Committee.
CAP will decide the date	Curriculum and Academic Planning Committee will present the changes to the Academic Assessment process to the Faculty Senate. (Per the new College-wide assessment process, effective 2017-18, academic programs will be assessing at least two student learning outcomes each year. This is a change from the current practice of assessing all student learning outcomes (programmatic) once every 5 years as a part of the 5-year program review process.)
MAY 2017 – NOV 2017 (7 Months)	Non-academic units housed in each division will implement the newly developed assessment process by following the guidelines provided by AVP for Institutional Research and Assessment. Office of Institutional Research and Assessment will assist the non-academic units in implementing the assessment process.
AUG 2017	Non-academic units will provide an update to their division head on the status of assessment in their unit.

Appendix A: Assessment Timeline/Plan

<u>TIME</u>	<u>ACTIVITY</u>
DEC 01, 2017	Non-academic units will submit their 2017-18 annual assessment report to their division head for review and approval.
JAN 15, 2018	Division Head submits the assessment report to the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment.
FEB 15, 2018	AVP for Institutional Research and Assessment submits the draft progress report to the Co-Chairs of the Middle States Accreditation Committee for preparing the final version of the progress report.
MAR 2018	Middle States Accreditation Committee Co-Chairs submit the final version of the progress report to the President's Cabinet for review and approval.
MAR 26, 2018 – MAR 30, 2018	SUNY Old Westbury submits the Progress Report to the Middle States Commission on Higher Education.

Guidelines for Institutional Assessment in Non-academic Units

Assessment is a systematic process of gathering and interpreting information to learn how well a unit is performing, and using that information to modify operations in order to improve its performance. Middle States Commission on Higher Education requires documented evidence that the institution is fulfilling its mission and achieving its goals, and all activities using institutional resources are supporting the institution's mission. The non-academic assessment process at SUNY OW revolves around the College's mission and goals, which are operationalized into performance outcomes and assessed by the non-academic units.

Following are the **suggested** steps for the annual assessment of performance outcomes:

Step 1: Establish a listing of the services: For institutional assessment purposes, the unit will need to establish a listing of the services it provides.

Step 2: Establish a linkage to the College's Mission and Goals: Non-academic units should review the College's strategic plan (<https://www.oldwestbury.edu/about/president/strategic-plan>) to identify portions of the mission statement, goals, objectives, or strategies that are supported by the services provided by the unit.

Step 3: Define the Mission Statement of the Unit (Department): A mission statement is a general explanation of why the unit exists and what it hopes to achieve. It articulates the unit's essential nature, its values and its work. Define the unit's mission statement by using the services linked to the College's mission/goals/objectives/strategies, and by following the format below. Developing a service related mission statement is important because it is assessment of those services that will provide the data that will give the unit information concerning the unit's level of effectiveness and provide direction for making improvements. If the unit already has a mission statement, the unit will add a sentence to its existing mission statement indicating the services provided.

Structure of Mission Statement: "The mission of **(name of the unit)** is to **(primary purpose)** by providing **(primary services or activities)** to **(stakeholders).**"
(Additional clarifying statements)

Appendix B: Guidelines for Institutional Assessment in Non-academic Units

(Note: the order of the pieces of the mission statement may vary from the above structure.)

Example 1: Career Center of a Hypothetical College

- The mission of the Career Center is to help students and recent graduates of the College identify and fulfill their career goals. By providing career counseling, workshops on resume writing and interviewing, we help students and recent graduates improve their marketability and make informed career decisions.

Example 2: Facilities Department of a Hypothetical College

- The Facilities Department provides quality facilities operations and services to the campus community, while creating an environment that enhances the opportunity to learn, discover and share.

Example 3: Library of a Hypothetical College

- The Library provides information resources and services to support and enrich the education, research, and community service mission of the College.

Step 4: Define the Performance Outcomes of the Unit: Outcomes are precise, specific and clear statements about the intended accomplishments of a non-academic unit. Outcomes will primarily describe what the unit is going to do and what its impact will be on key stakeholders (students, alumni, parents, employers, etc.). They can relate to the operations and processes of the unit, and may include a consideration of quantity, quality, efficiency and effectiveness. There is no minimum or maximum, but most units tend to have around five outcomes. Since the purpose of outcomes assessment is improvement, your expected outcomes should be at least somewhat aspirational, but not unattainable given existing resources. Educational support units may have student learning outcomes instead of, or in addition to, operational performance outcomes. Student learning outcomes can focus on the intended abilities, knowledge, values and attitudes a student should demonstrate after having used certain services or having participated in an activity. There are four simple guidelines to use when formulating unit outcomes:

1. Outcome is related to something that is under the control of the unit.
2. Outcome should be worded in terms of what the unit will accomplish or what its clients should think, know, or do following the provision of services.
3. Outcome should lead to improved service. This means that when outcomes are assessed, the results should provide information/data the unit can use to determine what aspects of its services need improvement.

Appendix B: Guidelines for Institutional Assessment in Non-academic Units

4. Outcome is linked to a service described in the unit's mission statement.

Example 1: Career Center of a Hypothetical College

- Students attending Career Center resume workshops will produce quality resumes.

Example 2: Budget Office of a Hypothetical College

- The Budget Office will provide services that enable College departments to effectively administer and manage their funds.

Example 3: Department of Information Technology of a Hypothetical College

- Department of Information Technology will increase the quality of service to end users through an expanded help desk.

Step 5: Identify the Means of Assessment and Criteria for Success for each Outcome.

Answering the question, "What will provide us with the information as to whether we are accomplishing this outcome, and what level of accomplishment will we hope to see?" will help in identifying the means of assessment and criteria for success.

Types of Assessments for non-academic units:

- **Direct measures of assessment:** Counting (e.g. using a rubric):
 - Volume of service, such as number of persons served
 - Levels of efficiency, such as the average time for response
 - Measures of quality, such as average errors per audit
- **Attitudinal assessment** (indirect means of assessment): Measuring the levels of client satisfaction (e.g. using surveys, questionnaires, feedback forms).
- **External validation:** Offered by agencies or peers not associated with the institution.
- **Observation:** Observation by a member of the staff regarding some aspect of the service not working the way the unit had hoped it would.

Example 1: Career Center of a Hypothetical College

- Using a rubric (e.g. checklist, scoring, etc.) describing the quality components of a resume, the Career Center staff will analyze resumes submitted for company referrals. The resumes of 80% of students who attended a current resume workshop will receive greater than 4.0 overall rating on a scale of 0 to 5. No quality indicator will be below average of 3.0.

Appendix B: Guidelines for Institutional Assessment in Non-academic Units

Example 2: Office of Research of a Hypothetical College

- The Office of Research will receive an evaluation of satisfactory or above for support provided by 95% or more of faculty who submitted grant proposals and completed the assessment instrument (e.g. questionnaire, evaluation form).

Step 6: Conduct Assessment: Each year, select no fewer than two and no more than three outcomes, and assess the extent to which your unit is achieving those outcomes.

Step 7: Analyze the Results: Goal of analysis is to determine what needs improvement, and what actions to take. If you meet the success target, the goal is still continuous improvement. Raise targets, or choose another outcome to assess.

Example 1: Career Center of a Hypothetical College

- 536 resumes were reviewed by Career Center. 316 resumes were from students who attended workshops. Of those, 302 (95%) resumes received overall rating of 4.0 or greater (213 (67%) resumes received overall quality score of 5; 89 (28%) scored 4; 14 (4%) resumes received a 3). This exceeds the predetermined target of at least 80% receiving overall rating of 4.0 or greater. However, the quality indicator consistently missed by students was the “use of action verbs”.

Example 2: Office of Research of a Hypothetical College

- Results from follow-up surveys sent to faculty who submitted grant proposals indicated that over 95% were satisfied with the quality of assistance provided by the Office of Research in submitting application for external funding. Therefore, next year, Office of Research will assess a different outcome, “the effectiveness of its workshops on proposal writing, particularly for agencies that fund STEM-related topics”.

Step 8: Use of Assessment Results for Improvement: This is the most important step of the assessment process and is the focus of the Middle States Commission on Higher Education. This is commonly referred to as “closing the loop”. Assessment results must be shared appropriately within the division and the unit, and should be used for resource allocation and planning.

Example 1: Career Center of a Hypothetical College

- While quality resumes were produced by students who attended the workshops, to address the weakness revealed by the assessment process, Career Center staff decided all students who submit

Appendix B: Guidelines for Institutional Assessment in Non-academic Units

resumes for referrals should be required to attend a workshop on resume writing, and developed a skit for the workshops stressing the importance of using action verbs. Decided to use checklist again next year to compare results.

Example 2: Facilities Department of a Hypothetical College

- After reviewing the results of assessment, the Facilities Department implemented a more effective approach to custodial services, providing a structure for better service delivery and management of this operation.

Of Note

1. Before you start:
 - a. Identify any assessment-related information that you are already collecting, and assessment processes already in place. No need to reinvent the wheel.
 - b. Review assessment-related information of similar departments at other universities.
 - c. Review assessment-related information from external agencies (e.g. American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO), National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA), National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO), Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL)).
2. According to Suskie (2015), “Nowhere is a culture of candor and honesty more important than with accreditors. In fact, if you misrepresent your college to your Title IV gatekeeper, you expose your college to possible charges of Title IV fraud and abuse, with fines that can run into millions of dollars” (p. 223).
3. For assistance, contact Kuldeep Puppala, Assistant Vice President for Institutional Research and Assessment at (516) 628-5076, or email at puppalak@oldwestbury.edu.

References

Nichols, James O. and Nichols, Karen W. (2005). A Road Map for Improvement of Student Learning and Support Services Through Assessment. New York, NY: Agathon Press.

Suskie, L. (2015). Five Dimensions of Quality: A Common Sense Guide to Accreditation and Accountability (1st ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

SUNY Old Westbury
Non-academic Unit/Department Assessment Report
AY 2016-17

Division:

Assessment Liaison for the Division:

Non-academic Unit/Department:

Non-academic Unit/Department Head:

Non-academic Unit/Department Mission Statement:

Non-academic Unit/Department Performance Outcomes (Please list all outcomes and the year each outcome will be assessed)

Performance Outcome 1:

Performance Outcome 2:

Performance Outcome 3:

Performance Outcome 4:

Performance Outcome 5:

Current Year Assessment Results (Please list at least two outcomes your unit assessed in the current year, along with the means of assessment and criteria for success, analysis and use of results, and lead responsibility.)

Performance Outcome 1:

Supports College Mission/Goals/Objective/Strategies (list portions of the mission statement, or goals/objectives/strategies the outcome supports):

Appendix C: Assessment Report Template

Means of Assessment and Criteria for Success:

Summary of Assessment Results:

Use of Assessment Results to Improve Unit Services (describe specific actions taken and planned):

Lead Responsibility (who is responsible for accomplishment and improvement of this outcome):

Performance Outcome 2:

Supports College Mission/Goals/Objective/Strategies (list portions of the mission statement/goals/objectives/strategies the outcome supports):

Means of Assessment and Criteria for Success:

Summary of Assessment Results:

Use of Assessment Results to Improve Unit Services (describe specific actions taken and planned):

Lead Responsibility (who is responsible for accomplishment and improvement of this outcome):

SUNY – Old Westbury
 Institutional (Non-Academic) Assessment Summary Report for the 2016-17 Academic Year
 March 30, 2018

I. Executive Summary

This report presents the College’s first completed annual cycle of Institutional Assessment under the plan devised by Kuldeep Puppala, the former Assistant Vice President for Institutional Research and Assessment (AVP-IRA), and marks a milestone in how institutional assessment is conducted at Old Westbury. It includes a brief commentary on the process itself, and offers recommendations going forward. It describes the procedures and timeline of the 2016-17 institutional assessment process, and presents the accumulated assessment findings of the College’s non-academic areas. In brief,

- The 2016-17 institutional assessment process substantively demonstrates compliance with the Middle States Commission’s request for documentation of further implementation of the assessment of non-academic units (Standard 7),
- All departments/units are engaged in efforts to achieve their mission goals, and
- Every performance outcome has been linked to the relevant College, Division, and/or Departmental/Unit mission, ensuring that all assessments are related to the strategic goals of the College.

The 2016-17 assessment includes fifty-five individual assessment reports, from all non-academic areas of institutional function¹, and identifies a total of 258 specific institutional performance outcomes, 110 of which have been assessed as part of this cycle (see Table 1 for a specific breakdown). All institutional assessment reports are included in Appendix E.

Non-Academic College Areas	Department/Unit Reports	Performance Outcomes Identified	Performance Outcomes Assessed 2016-17
Office of the President	1	5	2
Academic Affairs	24	116	48
Administration	2	10	4
Institutional Advancement	2	10	4
Business and Finance	15	64	30
University Police	1	5	2
Faculty Governance	1	5	2
Student Affairs	9	43	18
Totals	55	258	110

While most departments/units have developed meaningful operational goals to continue to improve services and outcomes, some had difficulty articulating assessable performance outcomes, developing meaningful assessment tools, or meeting the initial assessment timeline (see Table 2). This indicates the need for improvement in assessment practices, both within divisions/departments/units, and at the institutional level (see Section V for specific

¹ Academic Assessment falls under the umbrella category of “institutional assessment,” but those assessments operate under a faculty-driven system of student learning outcome assessment that has separate criteria and processes that are incompatible with the administrative-process nature of this non-academic assessment process. It was not covered by the Middle States Commission’s request for documentation. The Academic Assessment process has, however, been included as one of the units whose administrative function is assessed within this report (see p. 29, Appendix E).

recommendations). Many of the difficulties are probably attributable, in large part, to the departure of the former AVP-IRA (who developed this assessment process) in the middle of the preparation of the unit reports. Furthermore, inconsistencies in the communication occasioned by the changes in personnel reduced the number of performance outcomes identified by some units (the initial expectation had been that each report would include five performance outcomes, but not all departments/unit reports do).

More productive coordination of the assessment process, including assistance with the development of performance outcomes, and certainly in terms of more effective assessment measures, will improve the timeliness and usefulness of the next assessment cycle (2017-18).

The purpose of institutional assessment is to foster reflective engagement with the Mission of the College as a way to measure and adjust activities and practices, leading to continuous improvement. This should advance the strategic, operational, and project-based goals within each division, department, or unit, but assessment *must not* become an evaluation system: conflating assessment with unit or individual evaluation risks undermining honest assessment and can confound efforts to improve performance.

In terms of the institutional effectiveness of each non-academic area, and any constituent departments/units, the overall assessment of the achievement of the outcomes described in the accumulated reports is outside the scope of this document, and rests with Divisional and Department/Unit heads, and with the Office of the President (or, in the case of Faculty Governance, with the Faculty). In terms of process, this assessment should be considered a success, despite problems caused by staffing difficulties and the normal process complications to be expected when implementing a new campus-wide set of procedures for the first time. The 2016-17 institutional assessment process and outcomes provide the necessary structure and a solid foundation for conducting the ongoing assessment that is an integral part of the proposed 2018-2023 Strategic Plan.

II. Procedures and Description of Assessment Process

In January 2017, the College completed a national search and filled the newly created Assistant Vice President for Institutional Research and Assessment (AVP-IRA) position. This position was conceived and funded specifically to guide and manage institutional assessment, improve institutional research responsiveness, and generate stronger empirical bases for strategic planning and assessment. Effective leadership from the AVP-IRA forms the lynchpin of the College's efforts to engage in ongoing assessment and continued institutional improvement. The new AVP-IRA established the procedures and a timeline for the development and implementation of an assessment process that was systematic, continuous, consistent, coordinated, sustainable, and in compliance with Middle States standards. This reorganized and formalized existing non-academic institutional assessment (some of which was already highly developed, but not consistent or systematized across the College), and began the implementation of more uniform assessment practices. The AVP-IRA promulgated a timeline (see Appendix A), developed standardized templates for annual assessment reports (see Appendix B), and produced guidelines for the process (see Appendix C). Unfortunately, the AVP-IRA resigned his position at the College in October 2017, and the position remains unfilled pending the results of an ongoing search. In the interim, Patrick O'Sullivan, the Provost, appointed Jacob Heller as "assessment coordinator" for the Institutional (Non-Academic) Assessment process on January 2, 2018. This discontinuity created some difficulties in meeting the original timelines, and while some divisions submitted their institutional reports well in advance of the AVP-IRA's timetable, others took significantly longer

to complete (see Table 2).

Each non-academic area designated an “assessment liaison” (indicated on each unit assessment report) who served as the contact person between that area and the person coordinating the assessment at the College. Within divisions, these liaisons typically served as divisional coordinators of assessment, and, as departmental/unit reports were submitted, a productive dialog began that involved the liaisons, divisional heads, department/unit heads, those coordinating assessment, and often individuals who bore “lead responsibility” for assessment. These conversations formed an important part of the assessment process, and the development of “a culture of assessment.”

Month	Institutional Reports Received	Cumulative Reports Received
Dec 2017	15	15
Jan 2018	11	26
Feb 2018	2	28
Mar 2018	27	55

Despite delays and other difficulties, this initial assessment cycle has demonstrated the College’s commitment to institutional assessment, and, going forward, each successive cycle of assessment can be expected to run more smoothly, and to deliver increased value to the College, based on this, the first year, of implementation.

III. Narrative Summary

This Assessment Summary Report picks up where the College’s assessment practices were in June 2016, when Old Westbury submitted its Periodic Review Report (PRR) to Middle States. At that time, the College’s non-academic units were engaged in extensive assessment practices (as the PRR noted) that provided a wealth of information about the activities of the non-academic units of the College. However, those practices fell short of the expectations articulated by Middle States, lacking the coordinated and institutionalized guidance needed. Since then, the College has implemented a systematic, defined assessment plan covering non-academic areas; this report constitutes a final step in the collection and dissemination of the results of the 2016-17 assessment cycle, the first year of that plan’s implementation.

Standard institutional assessment practices focus on a cycle of goal-setting, creation of an action plan, implementation, and assessment, culminating in a “closing of the loop” activity. In closing the loop, goals, plans, and methods of assessment and operation are re-examined in light of the assessment findings, and revised according to the data, current needs, and available resources. The 2016-17 assessment cycle is therefore a first step in a continuing process of strategic planning, establishment of specific objectives, action plans, and assessments – always closing the loop and re-starting the process. This produces the continuous improvement Middle States expects institutions to engage in, and which is necessary for the continued success of the College.

Beginning in April of 2017, the AVP-IRA presented the newly-developed institutional assessment process to the President’s Cabinet, Deans, Academic Department Chairs, the Faculty Senate and relevant Faculty Committees for consideration and approval. (The new assessment process includes a new schedule for Academic Assessment of student learning outcomes, though that process and its findings are not reported here.)

From May through November 2017, non-academic units of the College were expected to implement the new processes, with assistance from the Office of Institutional Research and

Assessment. Assessment reports from department/unit heads were to be submitted to Division heads on an ongoing basis.

In October 2017, the AVP-IRA's resignation resulted in necessary changes to the reporting regime causing delays that abrogated the planned schedule; as an interim measure, all assessment reports were directed to Anthony Barbera, the Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs. The absence, for more than two months, of an individual devoted solely to facilitating and monitoring institutional assessment had the unavoidable consequence of delaying completion of assessment reports, which were to have been delivered by January 15, 2018; many were delivered much later (see Table 2). On January 2, 2018, the Provost appointed an "assessment coordinator" to streamline and centralize the completion and delivery of assessment reports.

The detailed assessment reports appended to this document (Appendix E) are an account of the institutional goals and achievements for the 2016-17 year by the non-academic areas of the College. They reflect far more than the culmination of over a year of work and planning for the assessment process, they reflect the dedication and achievements of countless individuals engaged in the non-academic areas necessary to the College's Mission, without whom the institution could not function.

Any interpretation of the assessment reports is complicated by the existence of three classes of performance outcomes: strategic, operational, and project-based, which are related to the kinds of work done by different divisions and departments/units, not all of which fit easily into the existing processes, as developed by the former AVP-IRA. In future assessments, it might be wise to include a designation of the performance outcomes according to these three categories, enabling more appropriate assessment measures and expectations.

Strategic performance outcomes directly address key College goals in service of the Mission. These can be found at all levels of the assessment process, but are typically most relevant to divisional performance. Examples include the Office of the President's performance outcome #2, "To increase the six-year graduation rate of FTC cohort" (see p. 25, Appendix E), and the Academic Affairs performance outcome #1, "To increase the headcount enrollment of the College" (see p. 27, Appendix E), each of which encompasses and involves activities under multiple divisions, departments, and units. The achievement of these performance outcomes will move the College forward in profound ways and do not relate to specific operations.

Operational performance outcomes call for the assessment of regular operations in terms of efficiency and outcomes that are related to mission; these are the "standard" form of performance outcomes, and it was with these in mind that the forms and processes of this assessment were initially developed. Examples include the University Police Department's performance outcome #3 (to be assessed in 2017-18), "Foster a more positive and less-adversarial relationship with our community by increasing the number of positive interactions and programs hosted by members of the police department" (see p. 142, Appendix E), and the Department of Athletics and Recreation's performance outcome #1 "Improve student athletes' academic performance with their participation in the PAWS (Panthers Academic Will Succeed) program, with a PAWS mentor discussing the following topics: time management, study skills and test taking strategies." (see p. 145, Appendix E) While they are connected to the College's Mission, these performance outcomes directly address the operations of the specific department/unit, and the outcome of the assessment will provide information for ongoing improvement and revision of specific operations.

Project-oriented performance outcomes focus on the achievement of specific – usually time-sensitive – goals. This makes their assessment needs different than those for operational and

strategic performance outcomes. For example: was the roof project completed within the expected timeframe? (see “Capital Planning – Construction,” performance outcome #2, p. 128, Appendix E) Another example is the School of Education’s performance outcome #1, “Purchase and install a new data management system” (see p. 83, Appendix E), which will be assessed, like the roof repair, by its successful completion, rather than as part of an ongoing assessment process. Both of these performance outcomes clearly serve the needs of the College and support the Mission, though indirectly through their achievement and the activities they will support (i.e., safe utilization of structures, and fostering academic excellence through more effective communication between student teachers and mentors, respectively).

The procedural and substantive issues around assessment that have been raised by the 2016-17 institutional assessment cycle will help to improve the College’s assessment practices going forward, as we work together under the coordination of the new AVP-IRA to develop better practices that are more useful for the achievement of the College’s Mission.

IV. Assessing the New Assessment Process

Anecdotally, the actual operation of institutional assessment process varied greatly across divisions. Those areas in which assessment was already an established practice had little difficulty completing the required reports in a timely manner. Other areas, however, struggled with the language and conventions of institutional assessment, and many appeared to find the deadlines difficult to meet.

In March 2018, the assessment coordinator distributed an anonymous online survey to all individuals who furnished an institutional report for the 2016-17 assessment process. The response rate for this survey was 48% ($n = 19$), and Table 3 (below) summarizes the substantive findings of the survey. It included 17 items that provide information about assessment participants’ experiences with regard to timelines, forms, assistance, hours devoted, and usefulness of the assessment process (see Appendix D for the survey instrument).

Questionnaire Item	Average score
The goals of the College’s institutional assessment process were clear to me	3.83
The forms provided were easy to use	3.67
This assessment process helped me do my job better	3.11
The timelines for completing the assessment were clear to me	3.94
I feel that completing this assessment was time well spent	3.17
I have a clear sense of how my assessment report will be used at the College	3.28
I have a clear sense of how my assessment report will be used in my unit/department	3.44
The assessment process uncovered important information that caused (or will cause) my unit/department to take an action it would otherwise not have taken.	2.94
I worry that the assessment report I completed could be used against me	2.11*
I was able to get the help I needed in IDENTIFYING my unit’s performance outcomes	3.61
I was able to get the help I needed in ASSESSING my unit’s performance outcomes	3.94
I would like to learn more about how better to assess my department/unit	3.44
The timelines for completing this assessment were realistic	3.72
When I report on assessment for this year (2017-18), I think that it will be a smoother process	3.78
How many hours did you personally spend completing the assessment tasks?	17 hrs.
How many hours did others in your department or unit spend completing the assessment tasks?	7.93 hrs.
Please add any comments or suggestions regarding the assessment process	N/A

*this item is scaled “backwards,” and a lower number represents a more favorable response

The survey responses can be broadly interpreted as indicating that, for a first-time experience, participants generally viewed it in a positive light. To the extent possible, the findings of the assessment of the assessment process have been incorporated into the “Outcomes and Recommendations” section below, though they represent only a small set of data points in the context of a college-wide assessment process.

V. Outcomes and Recommendations

Listed below are notable outcomes and suggested recommendations, based on the experiences, procedures, and findings of the 2016-17 institutional assessment.

Outcomes:

1. This assessment process substantively complies with Middle States’ request for documentation of further implementation of the assessment of non-academic units (Standard 7).
2. The new assessment process effectively engaged all the non-academic areas of the College.
3. Coordinated assessment of performance outcomes promises to ensure closer self-monitoring of projects and operational initiatives, and more effective achievement of strategic goals and objectives.
4. By publicly sharing the assessment reports in Appendix E with the College community, the effect of institutional “silos” will be reduced, as important information about projects and operations become known and acknowledged outside the department/unit where they are undertaken
5. Greater awareness of efforts across campus will facilitate inter-departmental cooperation, reducing duplicated efforts.

Recommendations:

1. The outcomes of the assessment should be collated and made available to the campus community in an appropriately (personally) de-identified form.
2. The time-frame for the assessment period should be varied according to operational (and project) calendars: e.g., the academic year is not appropriate for all departments/units (meaningful alternatives are summer, the fiscal or calendar year, the admission cycle, etc.), including multi-year time-frames with annual updates.
3. With a year’s experience using this system, the deadline for submission of 2017-18 Assessment Reports should be earlier than it was in 2016-17, ideally by July 2018. Completion of the 2017-18 assessment cycle should be a priority for the new AVP-IRA.
4. More consistent engagement by the new AVP-IRA throughout the assessment process should significantly improve the quality of the assessment measures used and timeliness of submissions.
5. Individuals responsible for producing assessment reports should receive more assistance in locating existing data sources and/or developing new ones, as appropriate (i.e., some campus professionals do not possess the specialized knowledge needed to develop effective survey questions).
6. Much more data collection and analysis assistance needs to be provided for persons

responsible for producing assessment reports.

7. The Strategic Planning, Assessment, Analysis and Review (SPAAR) Committee, proposed in the draft 2018-23 Strategic Plan, should be convened at the earliest possible time, to facilitate the operationalization of the existing institutional assessment processes for use with the Strategic Plan goals, objectives, and strategies.

Jacob Heller, Assessment Coordinator

VI. Appendices	page
A. Initial Assessment Timeline/Plan	10
B. Assessment Report Template	12
C. Guidelines for Institutional Assessment in Non-academic Units.....	14
D. Survey Questionnaire Administered to Institutional Assessment Participants.....	21
E. Comprehensive Library of Reports	
<u>Area</u>	
Office of the President	25
Academic Affairs	
Academic Affairs	27
Academic Assessment.....	29
<i>The Catalyst</i>	33
College Readiness	35
Distance Learning	37
Enrollment Services	39
Enrollment Services – Admissions	45
Enrollment Services – International.....	49
Equal Opportunity Program (EOP).....	53
First Year Experience (FYE/Call).....	55
Honors.....	59
Institutional Research.....	62
Library.....	65
Math Learning Center	67
Math Redesign Lab	70
Radio Station (OWWR).....	72
Registrar	74
School of Arts & Science (SAS).....	77
School of Business (SOB).....	79
School of Education (SOE).....	83
School of Professional Studies (SPS)	86
Wallace Gallery.....	89
Women's Center	92
Writing Center.....	94
Administration	
Facilities	96
Human Resources	98
Institutional Advancement	
Institutional Advancement	100
Public and Media Relations	103
Business and Finance	
Business Affairs – Accounting/Budget.....	107
Business Affairs – Bursar	109
Business Affairs – Financial Aid	111
Business Affairs – Payroll/Accts Payable.....	113

Business Compliance – Auxiliary Services Corporation (ASC)	115
Business Compliance – Office of Facilities Rentals	117
Business Compliance – Internal Controls	119
Business Compliance – Purchasing	121
Business Compliance – Research Foundation - Grants Management Office	123
Business Compliance – Research Foundation - Research and Sponsored Programs	125
Capital planning – Construction	128
Capital Planning – Design.....	130
Info Tech Services – Enterprise Application Services.....	132
Info Tech Services – Instructional Technology	134
Info Tech Services – Security	136
Faculty Governance	138
University Police.....	142
Student Affairs	
Athletics and Recreation	145
Career Planning and Development	148
Center for Student Leadership & Involvement (CSLI).....	151
Counselling and Psychological Wellness Services	153
Orientation	156
Office of Services for Students with Disabilities	160
Res Life	162
Student Conduct.....	164
Student Health.....	167

SUNY Old Westbury
Non-academic Unit/Department Assessment Report
AY 2016-17

Division: Academic Affairs
Non-academic Unit/Department: Writing Center

Assessment Liaison for the Division: Anthony Barbera
Non-academic Unit/Department Head: Jody Cardinal

Non-academic Unit/Department Mission Statement:

The primary mission of the Writing Center is to promote excellence in writing across the curriculum by providing one-to-one writing assistance to Old Westbury students.

Non-academic Unit/Department Performance Outcomes (Please list all outcomes and the year each outcome will be assessed)

Performance Outcome 1 (2016-2017): The Writing Center will assist 640 clients in one-to-one tutoring sessions per year.

Performance Outcome 2 (2016-2017): Staff education will effectively convey core pedagogical concepts important for the teaching of writing.

Performance Outcome 3 (2017-2018): Writing assistance will be provided during hours convenient for students.

Performance Outcome 4 (2017-2018): Student satisfaction with writing assistance will be at least 4.5 on a Likert scale with 5 being highly satisfied.

Performance Outcome 5 (2018-2019): Online writing assistance will be provided during hours convenient for students.

Current Year Assessment Results (Please list at least two outcomes your unit assessed in the current year, along with the means of assessment and criteria for success, analysis and use of results, and lead responsibility.)

Performance Outcome 1 (2016-2017): The Writing Center will assist 640 clients in one-to-one tutoring sessions per year.

Supports College Mission/Goals/Objective/Strategies (list portions of the mission statement, or goals/objectives/strategies the outcome supports):

This outcome supports the following aspects of our mission and strategic plan:

- Mission: “SUNY College at Old Westbury is a dynamic and diverse public liberal arts college that fosters academic excellence through close interaction among students, faculty and staff.”
- Guiding principle: “Old Westbury promotes rigorous intellectual inquiry.”
- Objective: “Improve academic support services.”
- Objective: “Expand student support services.”

Appendix E: Exemplar 2016-17 Assessment Reports: Writing Center and Office of Public and Media Relations

Means of Assessment and Criteria for Success: The number of clients receiving writing assistance is tracked through our online scheduling software program, WOnline. The criteria for success is assisting the target number of clients: 640.

Summary of Assessment Results: According to the data recorded by WOnline, we assisted a total of 631 clients in AY 2016-2017 and thus fell slightly below our performance outcome by 9 clients or 1%.

Use of Assessment Results to Improve Unit Services (describe specific actions taken and planned): Although we came close to meeting our performance outcome, maintaining even this level of service is difficult given current staffing levels and high staff turnover due to low part-time salaries. The Director is working with the Dean of Arts and Sciences to explore options for expanding the Writing Center's budget and for addressing salary levels for part-time professionals. Despite these challenges, we aim to meet or exceed this performance outcome in AY 2017-2018.

Lead Responsibility (who is responsible for accomplishment and improvement of this outcome): Jody Cardinal, Director.

Performance Outcome 2 (2016-2017): Staff education will effectively convey core pedagogical concepts important for the teaching of writing.

For this year's assessment, we examined the effectiveness of staff education designed to prepare tutors to help students develop portable writing skills. Specifically, we assessed training on the concept of writing transfer and on tutors' comfort level with "transfer talk," which aims to help students adapt writing knowledge and skills to new tasks.

Supports College Mission/Goals/Objective/Strategies (list portions of the mission statement/goals/objectives/strategies the outcome supports):

- Mission: "SUNY College at Old Westbury is a dynamic and diverse public liberal arts college that fosters academic excellence through close interaction among students, faculty and staff."
- Guiding principle: "Old Westbury promotes rigorous intellectual inquiry."
- Objective: "Improve academic support services."

Means of Assessment and Criteria for Success: Twelve staff members who attended one or two professional development meetings on the concept of writing transfer responded to an IRB-approved survey administered eight weeks after the second meeting. The fifteen-question survey contained both Likert-scale and open-ended questions asking tutors to define transfer talk, identify the activity most conducive to their learning about transfer, rate their comfort level engaging in transfer talk, and assess changes in their tutoring. Criteria for success include a high number of tutors understanding and feeling comfortable using transfer talk.

Summary of Assessment Results: According to survey results, most staff members (11 of 12) reported feeling moderately (4) or significantly (7) better prepared to engage in transfer talk as a result of training, and all felt at least somewhat better prepared. Similarly, more than half (8 of 12) felt their tutoring practices changed either moderately (6) or significantly (2). At the same time, some staff members had trouble incorporating transfer theory into their existing knowledge about tutoring, suggesting the need for a better sequencing and integration of future staff training on the topic of transfer.

Appendix E: Exemplar 2016-17 Assessment Reports: Writing Center and Office of Public and Media Relations

Use of Assessment Results to Improve Unit Services (describe specific actions taken and planned): When covered, the topic of writing transfer will be better integrated into staff education by connecting the new material on transfer more effectively to the best practices for tutoring presented at initial training. The survey results and planned revisions to staff education are discussed in more detail in an article titled "Transfer Two Ways: Options and Obstacles in Staff Education" forthcoming in the peer-reviewed journal *WLN: A Journal of Writing Center Scholarship*.

Lead Responsibility (who is responsible for accomplishment and improvement of this outcome): Jody Cardinal, Director.

SUNY Old Westbury
Non-academic Unit/Department Assessment Report
AY 2016-17

Division: Institutional Advancement
Non-academic Unit/Department: Public & Media Relations

Assessment Liaison for the Division: Michael Kinane
Non-academic Unit/Department Head: Michael Kinane

Non-academic Unit/Department Mission Statement:

- The **Office of Public & Media Relations** is the primary communications and marketing organization for SUNY Old Westbury. Public & Media Relations enhances and protects Old Westbury's institutional reputation, advances and strengthens the College's brand, encourages community engagement, and reinforces the College's relevance in the lives of key target audiences, including current and prospective students, alumni, donors, friends, and faculty and staff.

Non-academic Unit/Department Performance Outcomes (Please list all outcomes and the year each outcome will be assessed)

Performance Outcome 1 (2016-2017): Improve and increase online engagement with key constituent groups.

Performance Outcome 2 (2016-2017): Build awareness among campus constituents of important news, information, updates, through consistent and comprehensive communication.

Performance Outcome 3 (2017-2018): Strengthen SUNY Old Westbury's reputation through strategic, integrated communications.

Performance Outcome 4 (2017-2018): Ensure efficient, effective service of client departments that aids in achieving their desired or required outcomes and goals.

Performance Outcome 5 (2018-2019): Identify, instruct and empower internal and external brand champions.

2016-17 Assessment Results (Please list at least two outcomes your unit assessed in the current year, along with the means of assessment and criteria for success, analysis and use of results, and lead responsibility.)

Performance Outcome 1: Improve and increase online engagement with key constituent groups.

Supports College Mission/Goals/Objective/Strategies (list portions of the mission statement, or goals/objectives/strategies the outcome supports):

- The outcome being reviewed here is supportive of at least three goals within the College's most recent strategic plan – the enrollment goal, the retention goal and the financial goal – in that engaging constituents online, as technologies and specifically mobile devices continue to grow in use, enhances the ability of the College to provide meaningful, actionable messaging to drive response from whatever constituent group is targeted.

Means of Assessment and Criteria for Success:

- **Social Media:** Year-over-year growth in actions that reflect engagement (followers, likes, retweets, links visited, etc.) as relevant to each media.
- **Website:** Year-over-year improvements in common engagement criteria including overall and new sessions, average session duration, pages per session, bounce rate, and admissions inquiry completion. Both past performance of the existing site and benchmarks of similarly sized and trafficked sites are used.
- **Web virtual tour:** Year-over-year growth in in lead form completion and "other actions" as identified by the third-party tool.

Appendix E: Exemplar 2016-17 Assessment Reports: Writing Center and Office of Public and Media Relations

- **Pay-Per-Click advertising:** Year-over-year improvements in click through rate, number of user sessions generated, conversions to inquiry and pages per user session. Both past performance and benchmarks against national data are used.

Summary of Assessment Results:

- **Social Media**

<i>Instagram</i>				
	2015-16	Goal	2016-17	Change
Profile likes	1,172	+20%	1,521	+29.7%
AER	5.9%	+25%	6.9%	+17%

<i>Twitter</i>				
	2015-16	Goal	2016-17	Change
Profile likes	1,891	+10%	2,182	+15.4%
AER	4.10	+15%	3.10	-23%

<i>Facebook</i>				
	2015-16	Goal	2016-17	Change
Profile likes	5,564	+5%	5,997	+7.8%
Posts exceeding imp goal	84%	+2%	79%	-7%

- **Website**

<i>Overall Sessions</i>				
	2015-16	Goal	2016-17	Change
vs. OW	1,055,588	+10%	1,351,826	+28%
vs. Natl.	742,071	+75%	763,620	+77%

<i>New Sessions</i>				
	2015-16	Goal	2016-17	Change
vs. OW	408,512	+20%	468,813	+14.5%
vs. Natl.	361,389	+20%	381,657	+18%

<i>Average Session Duration</i>				
	2015-16	Goal	2016-17	Change
vs OW	2:58	+9.5%	2:48	-6%
vs. Natl.	+6.06%	+16%	-0.31%	-1%

<i>Pages Per Session</i>				
	2015-16	Goal	2016-17	Change
vs. OW	2.93	2.5%	2.49	-15%
vs. Natl.	-1.63%	1.5%	-13.97%	-16%

<i>Bounce Rate</i>				
	2015-16	Goal	2016-17	Change
vs OW	29.37%	-6.5%	22.45%	-23%
vs. Natl.	+43.47%	+16%	+56.51%	+30%

<i>Admissions Inquiries via Web</i>				
	2015-16	Goal	2016-17	Change
vs. OW	1,560	+20%	2,289	+46.7%

- **Web Virtual Tour (YouVisit)**

	2015-16	Goal	2016-17	Change
Leads Generated	747	+20%	893	+19.5%

	2015-16	Goal	2016-17	Change
Other Actions	474	+20%	615	+29.7%

Appendix E: Exemplar 2016-17 Assessment Reports: Writing Center and Office of Public and Media Relations

- **Pay Per Click Advertising** -- conversions to inquiry and pages per user session.

<i>Clicks</i>				
	2015-16	Goal	2016-17	Change
vs. OW	6,927	+5%	5,642	-18.2%

<i>User Sessions</i>				
	2015-16	Goal	2016-17	Change
vs. OW	7,422	+5%	6,124	-17.5%

<i>Conversions to Inquiry</i>					
2015-16 OW	2015 National	Goal	2016-17 OW	2016 National	Change
2.69%	4.13%	+15%	3.04%	2.20%	+13%

<i>Pages Per Session</i>				
	2015-16	Goal	2016-17	Change
vs. OW	2.42	2.5%	2.21	-9.6%

Use of Assessment Results to Improve Unit Services (describe specific actions taken and planned):

- The College is having success in driving visitors to its website via social media and its pay-per-click and in converting a growing number of visitors into admissions inquirers. Even with a strong performance related to bounce rate, there are clear signs that improvement in the content is warranted giving ongoing reductions in session duration and pages per session. Efforts in 2017-18 and beyond will focus on improving landing page content, including increased graphics and, when possible, video, on key pages related to admissions, admissions events, and key academic programs (graduate programs initially) to reverse the decline in session duration and pages per session and continued growth in the conversion of visitors to inquirers.
- On social media, the College did well in growing its audience but must also review and improve the content it shares to solicit more interaction and engagement. The aging of user demographics related to the Facebook and Twitter platforms are likely affecting engagement metrics given the key focus in the College’s efforts is to target messaging to prospective students. Going forward, the Office will revisit the target audiences for each channel and seek to direct more compelling content (including increased graphics and video) to stakeholders of each channel. Further, new channels will be investigated and student input sought to provide insight into the types and frequency of content that would or could enhance engagement. Lastly, specialized software for social media management will be considered to ease the development and management of this growing area.

Lead Responsibility (who is responsible for accomplishment and improvement of this outcome): Michael Kinane, Assistant to the President for Advancement

Performance Outcome 2:

- Build awareness among campus constituents of important news, information, updates, through consistent and comprehensive communication.

Supports College Mission/Goals/Objective/Strategies (list portions of the mission statement/goals/objectives/strategies the outcome supports):

- This outcome supports to the Enhance Outreach and Image Goal of the current Strategic Plan, and directly relates to the “expand marketing and information campaign for targeted stakeholders” and “promote activities which get more campus personnel involved” strategies.

Means of Assessment and Criteria for Success:

- Targets reached (goal: 100%) for distribution of regularly scheduled campus e-letters to campus constituent groups
- Growth in email open/click-through rates for key constituent groups
- Improvements in non-cancellation among students at risk who receive automated phone calls.

Summary of Assessment Results:

- *Campus E-Letter Distribution*

	2015-16 Actual	2016-17 Goal	2016-17 Actual
The Current (Faculty & Staff)	84	81	82
Student Connections (Students)	30	30	30

- *Email Open/Click-Through Rate*

	2015-16	Goal	2016-17	Change
	23.4%	+5%	28.3%	+8%

	2015-16	Goal	2016-17	Change
	5.24%	+25%	12.8%	+244.4%

	2015-16	Goal	2016-17	Change
	n/a	+18%	20.11%	+11.7%

	2015-16	Goal	2016-17	Change
	n/a	4%	2.3%	-40%

- *Effects of Automated Calls on Students at Risk for Financial Cancellation*

	2015-16 Paid (at risk/not canceled)	2015-16 Paid (called/not canceled)	2016-17 Paid (at risk/not canceled)	2016-17 Paid (called/not canceled)
Fall	760	420 (55%)	1,275	847 (67%)
Spring	1,286	880 (68%)	777	513 (66%)

Use of Assessment Results to Improve Unit Services (describe specific actions taken and planned):

- The immediate lesson of this review is that the Office needs to determine more and better metrics to measure awareness gained through information distribution and sharing. Information regarding distribution speaks to the consistency with which information is shared, but not to the impact of that sharing. While open rates and click through rates can be measures of people receiving information, they are not the strongest measure of whether getting that information affected “awareness” regarding the content. To improve, the Office will explore and/or implement such ideas as including increased calls to action (which can be measured) in campus communiques, coordination with offices in other divisions to track attendance at key events that are promoted/announced via campus communiques, surveying campus constituents regarding the effectiveness of campus e-letters, etc. The ability of campus technologies to gather and track usage/participation may impact our ability in some of these efforts.

Lead Responsibility (who is responsible for accomplishment and improvement of this outcome):

- Michael Kinane, Assistant to the President for Advancement

Assessment of OW Institutional Assessment

Please complete this brief survey, so that Old Westbury can understand the successes and failures of our recent round of institutional assessment, and to improve assessment processes going forward. Your responses will not be connected to your name or email, unless you voluntarily enter that information.

• Rectangular Snip

Your response is anonymous.

1. Please Respond to the following questions based on your OWN personal experiences.

(Click the circle that best describes your own experiences and attitudes.)

	strongly disagree	disagree	neither agree nor disagree	agree	strongly agree
The goals of the College's institutional assessment process were clear to me	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The forms provided were easy to use	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
This assessment process helped me do my job better	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The timelines for completing the assessment were clear to me	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel that completing this assessment was time well spent	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

I have a clear sense of how my assessment report will be used at the College

I have a clear sense of how my assessment report will be used in my unit/department

The assessment process uncovered important information that caused (or will cause) my unit/department to take an action it would otherwise not have taken.

I worry that the assessment report I completed could be used against me

I was able to get help the help I needed in IDENTIFYING my unit's performance outcomes

2. Please Respond to the following questions based on your OWN personal experiences.

(Click the circle that best describes your own experiences and attitudes.)

strongly disagree disagree neither agree nor disagree agree strongly agree

I was able to get help the help I needed in ASSESSING my unit's performance outcomes

I would like to learn more about how better to assess my department/unit



The timelines for completing this assessment were realistic



When I report on assessment for this year (2017-18), I think that it will be a smoother process



Rectangular Snip

3. How many hours did you personally spend completing the assessment tasks?
(please enter a number)

The value must be a number

4. How many hours did others in your department or unit spend completing the assessment tasks?
(please enter a number)

The value must be a number

5. Please add any comments or suggestions regarding the assessment process.

Enter your answer

6. Name (optional)

7. Email (optional)

Submit

This content is created by the owner of the form. The data you submit will be sent to the form owner. Never give out your password.

[Privacy and Cookies](#)

Powered by Microsoft Forms